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This chapter focuses on how early modern history and culture explored and debated, and redefined, the role of the maritime hero and what was meant by heroism at sea. Questions about who and what qualified as heroic are particularly central in this period of history since, for Europeans, there was a substantial increase in voyaging and exploration, especially to distant regions. In turn, maritime activities and achievements became key cultural markers of, and justifications for, Europeans’ beliefs about the superiority of their value systems, and their physical and mental characteristics. These beliefs have left enduring historical legacies, since the success of European seaborne activities inaugurated what has been popularly termed the ‘Age of Empire’ whereby Europe’s maritime and colonial empires came to dominate geo-politics globally, and underpinned the development of the nineteenth-century theory of ‘Great man’ history, where the impact of exceptional men (aka ‘heroes’) continues to dictate cultural narratives. It is beyond the remit of the essay to address in detail or dismantle these historiographical legacies, but it is essential to acknowledge their persistent cultural influence, even as I explore some of the early modern ideologies and values that contributed to that ascendancy.

Notwithstanding the worldwide system of domination generated by early modern European maritime expansion, it is important to recognize that the practice of travel to far-flung locations was actually undertaken by a small percentage of the population, both because of its cost, and because of the strict requirements governing the purposes of voyages. In England in this period, for instance, the Crown permitted travel only for education, pilgrimage, commerce, and diplomacy, and a licence was required. Yet, despite these restrictions, from the turn of the seventeenth century onwards, people and goods were in motion across lands and seas to distances and on scales hardly imaginable just a century before. There were geo-political factors within Europe that affected the patterns and rates of travel and expansion by individual states or polities at particular times. It was only at the end of the sixteenth century, for instance, that the English seriously attempted for the first time to express ambitions for an empire
to rival the expansionism of the Iberian nations in the New World and of the Ottomans in the East. After Columbus made landfall in the Caribbean in 1492, a series of bulls issued by Pope Alexander VI the following year, and ratified by the Treaty of Tordesillas in 1494, had divided both the known and unknown worlds between Spain and Portugal, thereby excluding other Christian nations from seeking trade and territory in the New World. The Treaty of Saragossa of 1529 added a further line of demarcation in the Pacific, splitting control of lands in this region between Spain and Portugal. As a result, Iberian power and wealth increased both in regions remote from Europe, and in Europe itself, as colonial treasure funded activities domestically and across the continent. Northern European states, including the Dutch, French, and English, who were excluded from colonial and/or imperial expansion, valuable natural resources, and trading opportunities in distant regions, and also felt the impact in Europe of the newfound colonial wealth of the Iberians, responded by plundering their rivals and seeking ways to break the monopoly through actual and textual seafaring activities.

In response to this increase in exploration and voyaging, there was a proliferation of written accounts documenting maritime travel and life at sea, as well as imaginative treatments of maritime themes. Accounts of voyages and exploration inspired and transformed material culture, with descriptions of unfamiliar objects, peoples, ideas and beliefs, commodities, and creatures encountered through voyaging. Ships and fantastic marine creatures, in particular, were popular decorative motifs, featuring on – and as – innumerable and varied objects, ranging from minute and intricate maritime-themed jewellery, through intricate automata ships that trundled across aristocratic dining tables and ornate nefs, to large-scale architectural features such as fountains and functional models. These objects also carried ideological and emotional significance. Ship models were a popular votive in maritime communities, for instance, suspended in churches as a vow to God following sailors’ safe return from the sea, and/or signalling the economic importance of maritime industries to the prosperity of the community. Moreover, ships were important intercultural spaces, travelling between the edges or borders of a polity, contact zones of encounter, and facilitating exchange between cultures. Equally, the fantastic or monstrous proportions that characterized early modern depictions of marine creatures can be seen as expressions of cultural hybridity, or as a site where two cultures meet to form a ‘third space’.

This chapter seeks to explore how ideas of what constituted heroism both shape and were shaped by this burgeoning and diverse early modern maritime culture, as European nation states debated the characteristics needed to undertake successfully long-range voyaging, or to forge and maintain colonial territory and imperial networks through maritime activities, and how to assimilate new ideas, people, and phenomena. My discussion assesses maritime heroism in relation to both people and objects produced from a range of European countries and cultures, but due to reasons of space, its chief areas of focus are the English traditions of oceanic heroism. The chapter also brings together ‘literary’ and ‘historical’ perspectives since debates about what constituted heroism were staged in a variety of early modern blockbuster plays (such as Christopher Marlowe’s *Tamburlaine*, and William Shakespeare’s
Macbeth) which, I suggest, informed and were informed by explorers’ accounts of their maritime heroism. As Europeans sought to traverse by sea a world that for the first time was conceptualized in global terms, the ‘heroism’ of both human and non-human voyagers became a key measure of the advancement of an individual polity vis-à-vis this newly expanding worldview, and of their place in a newly globalized world order.

**Defining the maritime heroic**

In early modern European culture there were a number of influential models of masculinity that were measured against conceptions of what should be included or excluded from the idea of the ‘hero’. Bruce R. Smith has argued that the models of masculinity of the ‘chivalric knight’, the ‘merchant prince’, the ‘saucy Jack’, and the ‘Herculean hero’, competed with each other for cultural prominence, and, at times, they overlapped in qualities. In fact, early modern maritime culture adopted all these models on occasions with, for instance, the ‘saucy Jack’ evident in the Tudor ‘moral interlude’ Hick Scorner (c.1514) where the characters of Freewill and Hick Scorner have been to sea, and indeed Hick Scorner is himself referred to as ‘a ship on the sea’. In what is probably the earliest depiction of sailors in English drama, both sailors appear as immoral, carousing, and thoroughly disreputable. Importantly, and in contrast to other contemporary morality plays such as Wisdom (c.1460), Mankind (c.1465), and Youth (c.1513–14), and indeed other characters in this morality play, Hick Scorner does not repent his saucy behaviour. He disappears from the play’s action, presumably back to sea to resume the life of violence and sexual depravity he describes with such relish as the keeper of the ship’s ‘shop of bawdry’ of three ‘wenches […] full praty’.

However, from the variety of models of masculinity presented in Smith’s taxonomy, the types that feature particularly prominently in early modern maritime culture are the ‘chivalric knight’ and ‘merchant prince’, reflecting the dominance of these classes of maritime actors at the time, rather than common ‘saucy Jack’ sailors like Hick Scorner. Luís Vaz de Camões’ epic poem The Luciads (1572), which celebrates the discovery of a sea route to India by the Portuguese explorer Vasco da Gama (1469–1524), praises the prowess of, in particular, Portugal’s elite and chivalric barons and noblemen, for instance. By contrast, Thomas Heywood’s generically hybrid play If You Know Not Me, You Know Nobody, Part II (1605), which blends chronicle history with city-comedy, depicted the fabulously wealthy ‘merchant prince’ Sir Thomas Gresham, royal banker and founder of the Royal Exchange in the City of London. Engaged in international commerce on such a vast and lucrative scale, the shipwreck of a vessel and a major business deal gone awry merely prompts Gresham ostentatiously to ingest powdered in wine, a pearl he had bought for the immense sum of £1,500.

There were recognizable distinctions in ‘degree’ between the ‘chivalric knight’ and ‘merchant prince’ groups, which, in turn, shaped their behavioural models and how writers represented them: in simple terms, the mercantile class desired profit and the nobility sought glory. As a result, in accounts of maritime adventure or venture, the groups traditionally behaved differently, with the elite class group more likely to show
prowess through feats of bravery and swashbuckling, and to be lauded and celebrated in early modern maritime culture than their mercantile compatriots. Theodore K. Rabb, for instance, argues that the contrasting tenor between the meeting minutes of the merchant-dominated East India Company and the nobility-dominated Virginia Company is emblematic of this distinction. The former ‘pursued its profits singlemindedly’ and ‘[d]iscussions of national prestige were entirely absent’, while the considerations of the latter ‘was full of the most lofty and ambitious sentiments’ as ‘England’s fame was going to be spread abroad’.17 Certainly, Gresham’s destruction, and then consumption, of the exquisite and prized pearl because he can, emphasizes his wealth, but also hints that he might be a bad merchant, consuming the profits his ‘degree’ or station indicated he should pursue single-mindedly. Since early modern medical practice recommended powdered pearl for a variety of conditions that included insanity, Gresham’s apparent profligacy might have had a medicinal motive.18 Nevertheless, the contemporary cultural stigma surrounding insanity indicates that Heywood’s play is critical, at least in part, of Gresham and the values of the model of ‘heroism’ he embodies.19

More broadly, as Laura Stevenson recognized, the adoption of chivalric terms by the increasingly powerful mercantile classes as part of their self-definition represents an opportunistic appropriation of the values of the most highly regarded contemporary secular ideology. Describing mercantile behaviour in chivalric terms enabled a group not yet with their own ideological and conceptual framework to borrow from the most prestigious ethos available at the time.20 Discussing the maritime heroic, Richard Helgerson goes even further, arguing that Richard Hakluyt’s collection of exploration and voyaging, The Principal Navigations (1589; 2nd three-volume revised edition 1598–1600) offered a particularly significant intervention in early modern maritime culture by forging a new category of hero.21 The Principal Navigations included over 600 accounts of individual voyages in the expanded, second edition, ran to over 1.75 million words, and Hakluyt’s project is representative of the range and depth of England’s global ambitions in the late sixteenth century.22 Hakluyt’s maritime heroes appear to blend the characteristics of the mercantile and chivalric models, rather than just appropriating the values of the higher status group. The text’s merchants appear to perform as valiantly as the gentlemanly elite, but they also act as skilful and diplomatic English ambassadors before foreign princes: warrior–merchants thus successfully mix the best values of mercantile and aristocratic ideologies.

Francis Drake has a particularly prominent role in Hakluyt’s collection,23 and his depiction provides a useful test case for examining arguments concerning The Principal Navigations’ role in developing the maritime hero. Drake’s epic achievement of the first circumnavigation by an Englishman in 1577–80, a navigational success of considerable national prestige as well as a source of substantial income from piracy, gave him a particularly high profile in England and across Europe.24 Though Drake never wrote an account of his circumnavigation, a handful of versions authored by his crewmembers survive.25 Both editions of The Principal Navigations include an account, The Famous Voyage of Sir Francis Drake.26 Hakluyt’s version emphasizes and exaggerates Drake’s mercantile sagacity and wealth accumulation at every stage of the journey. For example, in The Famous Voyage, Drake achieves a considerable mercantile coup by securing a trade agreement for highly prized spices with the king of Ternate in the
Moluccas. ‘[T]he King was mooved with great liking towards us […] that hee would yield himselfe, and the right of his Island to bee at the pleasure and commandment of so famous a Prince as we served’.27 However, William A. Lessa suggests that there was more conflict with King Babullah than Hakluyt’s version depicts. Drake had attempted to avoid the 10 per cent export tax the king wanted to impose, and then had to appease him with gifts in order to reestablish trade.26 East India Company meeting minutes prominently show the role of Drake’s treaty in English imperial history by establishing the ‘first real toehold for a share in the profits of Eastern trade’.29 Though other accounts of the same transaction contradict Hakluyt’s version of Drake’s peaceful mercantile diplomacy in his encounter with Babullah, indicating an altogether tenser atmosphere, they nevertheless support Helgerson’s assessment of this new type of maritime hero’s combination of elite chivalric with sagacious mercantile behaviour. The narratives Hakluyt included across the collection repeatedly show his protagonists’ actions fostering Elizabethan expansionism abroad, defending the nation in times of war, and in general terms providing a model of patriotic manhood for the collection’s readers.30

However, contra Helgerson’s analysis, Hakluyt’s ‘heroes’ also behave less than heroically just as often. Both editions of The Principal Navigations frequently include accounts of bitter disputes between leading participants for control over the direction of a voyage. Rarely are these arguments resolved amicably: instead, there are numerous descriptions of fierce debates between comrades, and of desertion, mutiny, execution, violence, and even murder. It is therefore essential to query whether, in terms of the development of the role and characteristics of early modern maritime heroes, and the ideological factors that shape these representations, Hakluyt’s repeated articulation of violence turned-inward, as men from the same country confront each other rather than national rivals, simultaneously points to the breakdown of the ideal? Whether, in fact, the values the maritime hero embodies are so overextended and, at times, contradictory, that Hakluyt’s model of blended mercantile sagacity and chivalric prowess threatens to implode or breakdown? In addition, if so, what are the meanings in terms of ideology and values, which these tensions and pressures on the maritime heroic express?

Returning to the example of the first English circumnavigation, Drake notoriously executed his sometime friend and fellow commander Thomas Doughty for mutiny and treason in 1578. Doughty was a nobleman and was, as the influential courtier Sir Christopher Hatton’s private secretary, well connected in court, with Hatton a principal investor in the voyage.31 Hakluyt had been the first to publish a detailed account of the circumnavigation in the 1589 edition of The Principal Navigations, having had to edit and redact his sources quickly, most likely the journal of the chaplain Francis Fletcher, who was hostile to Drake (Fletcher had been ‘excommunicated’ for criticizing Drake in the wake of Doughty’s execution).32 Indeed, the justice of the execution and Drake’s authority to carry it out were widely questioned both at the time of Doughty’s trial and on the Golden Hind’s return to England, with the execution casting a long shadow over Drake’s subsequent career.33 In terms of the incident’s larger significance, the execution of Doughty by Drake is a watershed moment in maritime history: Drake’s killing of his one-time friend explicitly imposed the absolute authority of a sole individual as master of the ship.34
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John Cooke commented in his ‘Narrative’ of events on the voyage that when the fleet left England ‘Francys Drake, John Winter and Thomas Doughtie’ were ‘eqwall companions and frindly gentlemen’. Yet by executing Doughty so ruthlessly, Drake, the upwardly mobile ‘tarpaulin’ officer (i.e. a sea-bred superior officer) categorically established his chain of command over his social superiors, the ‘gentlemen’ officers (i.e. elite military officers appointed to command). This was a significant shift, revising the established seafaring custom that masters should consult their elite officers at sea. According to medieval maritime law, such as the twelfth-century compilation Rôles d’Oléron, masters expected to refer to their companies, with vestiges of the custom surviving in English ships into the sixteenth century. Winter and Doughty, and the other ‘gentlemen’ officers onboard, expected to be part of Drake’s council as a matter of course, rather than treated as his subordinates. Drake’s execution of Doughty established a precedent for the idea that the captain is sole master on a voyage, and Cooke’s account of Drake’s speech concerning leadership in the execution’s aftermath reveals Drake’s rhetorical skill in manipulating the situation to consolidate his command.

Here is suche controversye betwene the saylars and the gentlemen, and suche stomackyngye betwene the gentlemen and the saylars, that it dothe even make me madd to here it. But, my mastars, I must have it lefte, for I must have the gentleman hayle and draw with the mariner, and the maryner with the gentleman. What, let us show owr selvs all to be of a company.

Couched in terms of plea for unity and cohesion, Drake’s speech in fact undermines traditional social hierarchies based on rank, instead placing ‘gentleman’ and ‘mariner’ side by side under his leadership. Ideologically, Drake’s speech is radical; the maritime hero is no longer simply aristocratic or mercantile, or even, pace Stevenson and Helgerson, a hybrid model of mercantile sagacity and chivalric prowess. Instead, in Cooke’s version, Drake’s personal authority is supreme ‘I must’ have it so, he says twice as he threatens that resistance to his viewpoint will ‘make me madd’. Of course, the sailors and gentlemen onboard have just graphically witnessed in Doughty’s execution exactly what happens when this occurs. Stevenson’s and Helgerson’s progressive models of harmoniously blended mercantile and chivalric values evolving to produce a warrior-merchant or an economically-sagacious-gentleman-swashbuckler, are shattered by Cooke’s account of Drake’s voicing of his personal will-to-power.

The established, apparently natural connection between maritime command and ‘degree’ only broke down slowly on English ships, but Drake’s profound and drastic action certainly loosened its bonds. In 1609, the experienced Jamestown explorer and colonist Captain John Smith contemplated breaking ties with the Virginia Company’s London headquarters when new officers of higher social standing than himself were appointed over him, despite their inexperience, leading to repeated arguments over policy, with Smith desiring instead to be ‘for ever abandoned and left to our fortunes’. John Fletcher and Philip Massinger’s The Sea Voyage (1622) expressed similar meritocratic sentiments. The Master of the ship and the Boatswain appear superior in quality to the gallants and merchants of higher social standing and wealth: the play’s
common seamen help to rescue the female shipwreck victim, Aminta, from fetishistic and cannibalistic murder by men of higher degree.\textsuperscript{42}

The ideological debate Drake's circumnavigation presents about heroism, maritime leadership, and individual authority is present elsewhere in \textit{The Principal Navigations}. Hakluyt's account of Thomas Cavendish's last voyage expresses a similar debate but does so in somewhat different terms when infighting between maritime commanders is associated with the mission's failure and the protagonists' despair. Cavendish, England's second circumnavigator (1586–8), died in mysterious and disputed circumstances on his own attempted second circumnavigation, which departed from Plymouth in August 1591. \textit{The Principal Navigations} (second edition) included an account by John Jane, an experienced sailor and close associate of the voyage's rear admiral, John Davis, the expert Arctic navigator and explorer, who joined the voyage to facilitate his continuing the search for the Northwest Passage. It was by any standards a tragic and unsuccessful voyage: at least two-thirds of the 350 or so men who departed in Cavendish's fleet in 1591 died.\textsuperscript{43} Yet in written accounts and in personal testimony, the principals and their supporters fiercely contested what happened at sea, and why, as well as where the blame lay for the voyage's failure – in Cavendish's case in the form of a last testament and will written shortly before death. On this voyage, the maritime heroic appears under such extreme tension that Hakluyt's ideal model of blended mercantile sagacity and chivalric prowess breaks down into violent arguments between men who were expected to be united in purpose, and results in (or perhaps in fact constitutes) mental illness and physical disorder.

Cavendish's fleet had aimed to reach China and Japan via Cape Horn and its overall ambition was to better the success of his highly profitable earlier circumnavigation, when lack of space for cargo in the fleet's small ships had resulted in leaving behind large portions of the captured treasure.\textsuperscript{44} The bigger ships in the 1591 expedition led to a crucial, and fatal, inflexibility, however, since they were too large to enter hostile ports with barred harbours on America's Western and Eastern seaboards. When the fleet dispersed without reaching the Pacific, having failed to pass through the Magellan Strait, and following a bitter dispute between the principal commanders concerning authority over course and direction, Cavendish had only large ships left, the \textit{Galleon Leicester} and the \textit{Roebuck}. Davis made it back to England in the small vessel, the \textit{Desire}, a ship essential to the success of the overall mission, and he suffered for the rest of his career from the charge that he had deliberately deserted Cavendish. 'Davys in the Desier and my Pinnis loste me in the night after which tyme I never hard of theme but as I synce understode Davis his intention was ever to rune awaye', wrote Cavendish in his testament of events.\textsuperscript{45} Davis and Jane refuted the allegation, with Jane indicating that Cavendish established no point of rendezvous for the fleet if it became dispersed: 'our captain' says Jane, meaning Davis, 'could never get any direction what course to take in any such extremeties, though many times he had entreated for it'.\textsuperscript{46}

The argument over direction between Cavendish and Davis focused on whether to continue to attempt to pass from the Atlantic to Pacific Ocean through the Magellan Strait, and it hinged on the protagonists' respective claims to authority based on experience. By only leaving England at the end of August, the fleet had missed the southern summer, the best time to clear the Magellan Strait, and beset by storms, frost,
and high mortality on the biggest ships, Cavendish gave up the attempt, planning instead to take the Good Hope route to the East Indies. Davis, accustomed to Arctic weather, was undeterred by ‘great extremities of snow and cold’ and wanted to press on since changing course east to reach China would scupper his search for the North-west Passage: ‘our captain’ says Jane ‘because he was a man that had good experience […] told him [Cavendish] that this snow was a matter of no long continuance’.47 Put another way, the veteran, professional Arctic mariner ‘Captain’ Davis tells the less-experienced amateur, but superior officer, in rank and ‘degree’, ‘General’ Cavendish that conditions at sea were likely to improve. Davis’s advice, despite having been requested, Cavendish then ignores ‘by the authority of his command’, as Davis put it in his 1595 account, suggesting that ‘being half-way through the straits of Magellan’ ‘with a leading wind we might have passed the same’.48 Of course, since Cavendish had passed through the Strait of Magellan on his earlier circumnavigation, and Davis had never successfully navigated it, Jane’s description of Davis as the man with the only authority of experience is disingenuous. Implicit in Jane’s and Davis’ accounts is the struggle for authority between ‘tarpaulin’ and socially elite officers. Davis’ social background is obscure since, connected to the Devon-based maritime Gilbert family, he ‘reputedly spent his youth in maritime pursuits, the necessary training for a professional seaman, almost certainly in subordinate and unrecorded capacities on the Gilberts’ major voyages’, while Cavendish, ten years younger, was richer, of higher ‘degree’ and much better connected at court.49 Like Cooke’s account of Drake’s speech quoted above, Davis here reports Cavendish voicing his sole authority to command, through the crucial action of decision-making concerning the fleet’s route. In contrast to the will-to-power of Drake’s upward mobility, however, Cavendish bases his authority in part at least on ‘degree’ rather than ability.

After further arguments, and against Davis’ additional advice, Cavendish withdrew his ships north, while Davis remained at Port Desire apparently waiting for Cavendish, perhaps because of a misunderstanding between them or possibly, as Cavendish claimed, from self-interested betrayal, ‘only [Davis’] treacherie hath beene the utter ruine of all’.50 In fact, contrary to Davis’ later testimony and Jane’s account, Cavendish may have specified a rendezvous, since a further account of the voyage by Anthony Knyvett recounts: ‘till midnight they should keep their course with him [Cavendish], and that when he should show them two lights, then they should cast about and bear in with the shore’.51 Knyvett was a socially elite officer on the Galleon Leicester and was no particular supporter of Cavendish since, due to frostbite in which he lost his toes, Cavendish had wanted to put Knyvett ashore to take his chances in the freezing conditions of the Magellan Strait. Davis was of course aware that Cavendish needed smaller vessels to be able to enter shallow waters to get close enough to land in order to resupply. Without that flexibility, Cavendish’s voyage was destined to fail. Evidently, Davis’ crew, many of whom had sailed with Cavendish before, also appreciated the significance of the Desire for the mission’s success: only a little over half of them backed Davis’ decision when he asked them for support. Alone in a ship in need of repair and bereft of stores, Davis’ outlook on the Desire was as poor as Cavendish’s with the Galleon Leicester and Roebuck; nevertheless, Davis made three further efforts to pass the Strait since he thought it was ‘the best mean to gain relief’, but storms beat him back each time.52
The accounts of life onboard both Cavendish’s and Davis’ ships after they lost contact, describe harrowing privations, disease, mental and physical breakdown. Continual arguments between crewmembers over direction and course, threats, the fear of violence, as well as actual violence, pepper both journeys. It is unknown whether Cavendish died from illness, suicide, or if his crew murdered him, but it is clear that he intended his version of events to mitigate his personal culpability for the voyage’s failure. Indeed, the language of his account, with its rambling, unpunctuated, and incomplete sentences, which evaluate propositions rather than record decisions, mirrors the disorder of the situation onboard the ship, and, perhaps, reflects his imbalance of mind.53 For instance, after repeated bitter arguments, and under a persistent fear of mutiny, when Cavendish fails by ‘peaceable meanes to perswade’ the crew to attempt the Magellan Strait again, he attacks ‘the Chiefest of their faction’ who ‘proudelie and stubbornelie uttered Theise wordes [of resistance] to my face in presence of all the reste’.

I toke this boulde Companion by the bosome & with my one handes put a Rope abowt his necke meaneinge resolutelie to strangle him for weapon abowt me I had none his Companions seinge one of their Chief Champions in this case & perceiveinge me to roundelie to worke with him they all Came to the master & desired him to speake, affirminge they would be Redye to take anye course that I should thincke goode of.54

Cavendish’s account of the argument indicates that he only ceases strangling the leader of his adversaries when the rest of them capitulate completely to his will, ‘they would be Redye to take any course that I should thincke goode of’. His ruthless insistence on the public acknowledgement that his word should be law emphasizes his despotism and will-to-power, just as the tyrant Tamburlaine, in a blockbuster two-part play of the same name from just a few years previously (performed c.1587, published 1590), justified the arbitrary imposition of his will on the world around him, and all those in it. The tone of Cavendish’s account recalls in particular Tamburlaine’s assertion of his strength of will, and brutality, in bending others to it after stabbing his son for failing to live up to his expectations of martial prowess.

Villains, these terrors and these tyrannies […]
I execute, enjoined me from above,
To scourge the pride of such as Heaven abhors –
Nor am I made arch-monarch of the world,
Crowned and invested by the hand of Jove,
For deeds of bounty or nobility:
But since I exercise a greater name,
The scourge of God and terror of the world,
I must apply myself to fit those terms,
In war, in blood, in death, in cruelty,
And plague such peasants as resist in me
The power of heaven’s eternal majesty.55
Cavendish’s own account of onboard events emphasizes his personal honour, bravery, and determination in the face of adversity in melodramatic style: ‘but in truth I desired nothing more then to attempte that course rather desiringe to dye in goinge forwarde then baselie in Returneinge backward againe’. Indeed, his lines are reminiscent in tenor of the will-to-power laid bare in Tamburlaine’s famous dying request ‘Give me a map, then let me see how much/Is left for me to conquer all the world’. Such sentiments are equally apparent in the bold swashbuckler and notorious mercenary Thomas Stukley’s desire to be ‘King of a mole-hill’ rather ‘Than the richest subject of a monarchie’ in another contemporaneous adventure play The Battle of Alcazar (c. 1588/9). Cavendish’s words, perhaps, also echo in Macbeth’s stark realization in Shakespeare’s play of 1606 of the horror and hollowness of where his murderous ambition has led him, ‘I am in blood stepped in so far, that should I wade no more, returning were as tedious as go o’er’, he says as he continues relentlessly on his journey to destruction. It is certainly possible that Cavendish attended performances of Tamburlaine in the late 1580s, and even perhaps The Battle of Acazar, and remembered their charismatic over-reaching protagonists, perhaps admiring their restless energy, ambition, and ambiguous anti-heroism. Whether, of course, Shakespeare had knowledge of Cavendish’s account is even more speculative; but what is beyond doubt is that each real or imagined adventurer’s narrative is a story of ambition gone wrong. In all cases, there is a glaring gulf between each individual man’s self-belief in terms of his personal heroic qualities and abilities, as well as what he considers these gifts should deliver for him in terms of worldly success and power, with the painful reality and consequences each ‘hero’ ultimately experiences as a result of his rampant individualism.

Davis’ journey too, Jane recounts, was equally hazardous. Some of Davis’ crew apparently believed him to be unnatural so that when they plotted mutiny, they thought he required a supernatural force to kill: ‘There were markes taken in his caben howe to kill him with muskets through the shippes side, and bullets made of silver for the execution, if their other purposes should faile’. Clearly a belief was in circulation on board that Davis was ‘monstrous’ so that magical silver bullets were needed to kill him, referring to the folk tradition that only such bullets can harm a werewolf (or other supernatural being) as ordinary bullets would fail. Indeed, Jane’s account then links the mutineers’ fear-inducing stories about Davis with racially charged Eurocentric beliefs about the monstrosity of native peoples: the mutineers ‘vehemently persuading them [the crew] that our captain and master would leave them in the country to be devoured of the Canibals, and that they were merciless and without charity’. Jane’s report describes how the mutineers told stories of both their captain and ‘Canibals’ as aberrantly monstrous and unchristian. Jane’s own voice in the narrative, however, repeatedly emphasizes Davis’ personal Christian fortitude. In what appears to be a Christian rewriting of Cavendish’s will-to-power statement (‘desireinge to dye in goinge forwarde then baselie in Returneinge backward againe’), Jane casts Davis’ desire to progress forward as the penitent sinner’s subservience to God’s sole authority to determine the sinner’s course.

But now being thus intangled by the providence of God for my former offences (no doubt) I desire, that it may please his divine Majestie to show us such
mercifull favour, that we may rather proceed, then otherwise: or if it be his wil, that our mortall being shal now take an ende, I rather desire that it may bee in proceeding then in returning.63

Davis is content for God to decide the voyage's fate. Cavendish's and Davis' matching desires for progress onwards in the accounts of their respective voyages thus represent sharply contrasting ideologies.

Finally, after returning to Port Desire on 27 October 1592, Davis provisioned the ship with approximately 14,000 dried penguins to victual the journey home. However, Davis' most harrowing difficulties were ahead, as described by Jane:

But after we came neere unto the sun, our dried Penguins began to corrupt, & there bred in them a most lothsome & ugly worme of an inch long. This worme did so mightily increase, and devoure our victuals, that there was in reason no hope how we should avoide famine, but be devoured of these wicked creatures: there was nothing that they did not devoure, only yron excepted: our clothes, bots, shooes, hats, shirts, stockings: and for the ship they did so eat the timbers, as that we greatly feared they would undoe us, by gnawing through the ships side. Great was the care and diligence of our captaine, master, and company to consume these vermine, but the more we laboured to kill them, the more they increased; so that at the last we could not sleepe for them, but they would eate our flesh, and bite like Mosquitos. In this wofull case, after we had passed the Equinoctiall toward the North, our men began to fall sick of such a monstrous disease, as I thinke the like was never heard of: for in their ankles it began to swell; from thence in two daies it would be in their breasts, so that they could not draw their breath, and then fell into their cods; and their cods and yardes did swell most grievously, and most dreadfully to behold, so that they could neither stand, lie, nor goe. Whereupon our men grew mad with griece. Our captain with extreme anguish of his soule, was in such wofull case, that he desired only a speedie end, and though he were scarce able to speake for sorrow, yet he perswaded them to patience, and to give God thanks, & like dutifull children to accept of his chastisement. For all this divers grew raging mad, & some died in most lothsome & furious paine.64

I have quoted at length this extraordinary account of misery, rotting bodies, and ships, as well as mental breakdown, which, as Jonathan Lamb outlines, demonstrate many of the characteristic symptoms of scurvy.65 Jane's account also appears to be highly symbolic, since the crew's genitals appear particularly affected by disease. Maleness, and masculine identity, are under specific attack and the severity of the crew's symptoms leads to mental breakdown ('men grew mad with griece'). Moreover, the disease is also shown attacking the fabric of the ship as the effluvia of scorbutic bodies caused its disintegration, with the voracious and forever multiplying 'ugly worme' (its phallic shape is noteworthy) consuming the vessel's timbers, threatening to eat the ship (the ship's name, Desire, also has symbolic resonance) from under the crew. Jane's account again emphasizes Davis' Christian fortitude and compassion in both enduring extreme personal pain, and offering comfort and guidance to his suffering crew. Finally, Davis'
vessel, a near ghost-ship, made it back to England in June 1593 with just 14 survivors of the original complement of 75. Davis was subjected to an inquiry ordered by the privy council into his conduct on the evidence of Cavendish’s last letter, and defended himself against the charges though, like Drake after the Doughty affair, his reputation suffered in the wake of the attempted circumnavigation.66

In these accounts from Hakluyt and elsewhere, supposedly outward-facing early modern English maritime heroic values implode into inward-facing violence. Instead of being the tool of colonial and imperial expansion through the external projection of ‘heroic’ behaviour, adventurers from the same nation unleash violence on each other in a frenzy of destruction. If the desire to go ever forward on a voyage, as Cavendish’s and Davis’, and indeed, Tamburlaine’s and Macbeth’s accounts each insistently demonstrate, is frustrated, then the maritime hero is vulnerable to breakdown, physically and emotionally. The restless energy of maritime heroic values dovetails well with colonial ideology, since continuous expansion and forward movement are the assumptions upon which both are predicated. It is conspicuous that Cavendish and Davis fell out irrevocably when they could not proceed on their agreed onward course, the Magellan Strait, to the Pacific Ocean, and the deviation proved terminal for the mission. Stasis or worse, going backwards, appear the most damaging varieties of tension and pressure that can be placed on the maritime heroic, as they destroy its raison d’être and essential central principle of forward movement. Only the Christian maritime hero endures, it seems, who accepts God’s authority rather than privileging his own will.

The ship as hero

For my concluding discussion, I turn to a consideration of the ship in order to sketch its cultural utility and contribution to debates about the development of the early modern maritime heroic, and to provide a brief assessment of some of the ideological and emotional functions ships served. In so doing, my larger point is that non-human actors begin in this period increasingly to contribute to conceptions of the maritime heroic, especially as violence between men ostensibly on the same side threatened to undermine completely the cultural and practical utility of the human maritime hero in furthering national interests. Jane’s description of the perilous threat to the voyage that the phallic worms’ attack on the Desire embodied, powerfully underlines the crucial role of ships as a type of maritime hero, as the ship seemed to suffer just as much as its crew. Likewise, on its triumphant return to Deptford in 1580, Elizabeth I ordered that Drake’s ship, the Golden Hind, should be preserved, and it became a tourist attraction and banqueting house for the next 80 years or so, before finally breaking up.67 Perceived as a national hero, even the ship’s fragments received hyperbolic treatment. In ‘Ode. Sitting and Drinking in the Chair, made out of the Reliques of Sir Francis Drake’s Ship’ (1662), for instance, Abraham Cowley imagined himself armchair-travelling around the world, drunkenly, in ‘the only Universal Chair’ made from the salvaged timbers of the ship that had ‘compas’d all the Earth’.68 Ships – the wood, metal, canvas, and rope that mediated between crew and sea, and undertook the same journey as the sailors – were simultaneously utilitarian objects and became icons in the early modern imaginary.
For the Spanish, Ferdinand Magellan’s ship the *Victoria* served a similar heroic function as the *Golden Hind* fulfilled for the English nation. In 1559, a full-size model of the *Victoria* featured prominently in the Funeral Procession of Charles V of Spain. Buried in Spain, Charles’ funeral procession took place on the streets of Brussels on 29 and 30 September 1558, since his son Philip II resided in the Spanish Netherlands. The Antwerp printer Cristóbal Plantin published an album of the funeral procession as his first major work, selling it as a 12-metre roll or book in the five languages of the Spanish Empire of Dutch, French, German, Spanish, and Italian. The float of the ship showed female figures of Hope, Faith, and Love as seated figures and flags representing the territories Charles had controlled. Fantastical seahorses, or hippocampus, appeared to pull the ship, and at the rear sea-elephants seemed to draw the Pillars of Hercules, the markers of the extent of the known world, which were inscribed with ‘Plus oltre’, the insignia and motto of Charles V (see Figure 23.1). The ship’s placement beyond the pillars complemented the power and achievements in exploration and colonialism of Charles’ Empire on which, it was frequently asserted, the sun never set.69

The choice of the 85-ton carrack the *Victoria* for a float in Charles’ funeral procession signalled the ship’s reputational importance for celebrating the maritime achievements that Spain had realized under Charles’ leadership. The *Victoria* was the only ship in Magellan’s five-strong fleet to return from circumnavigating the globe between 1519 and 1522. Crewed by 265 men at the start of the voyage, only 18 returned in the spice-laden *Victoria, Figure 23.1 Hieronimus Cock (drawing) and Nicolas Hogenberg (engraver), *Funeral Procession in Brussels on the Occasion of the Death of Emperor Charles V*. Sheet 5, Flanders, 1559. The State Hermitage Museum, St. Petersburg. Photograph © The State Hermitage Museum/photo by Natalia Antonova, Inna Regentova.
now commanded by Juan Sebastián Elcano, since Magellan died in the Philippines killed by the Lapu-Lapu people.\textsuperscript{70} The ship, then, was a triumphant survivor and a heroic object, having sailed in total approximately 68,000 kilometres, 35,000 kilometres of which were in areas uncharted by Europeans, beyond the Pillars of Hercules.

By 1570, after a 50-year career as a merchantman, the \textit{Victoria} was lost at sea \textit{en route} from the Antilles to Seville, but the glory of the ship and its status as ‘hero’ endured.\textsuperscript{71} The float of the \textit{Victoria}, for instance, was recycled in 1615 for an especially magnificent \textit{Ommegang}, a mixture of religious parade, courtly celebration, guild procession, and carnival entertainment (see Figures 23.2 and 23.3). Dedicated to Archduchess Isabella and her husband Albert, the Governor of the Spanish Netherlands, Isabella took the role of queen of the Crossbowmen’s Guild, with the procession representing the alliance between Habsburg rulers and Brussels civic authorities.\textsuperscript{72}

The last car, the tenth in the procession, was the ‘ship of Charles V’ recycled to contain the Virgin and Child surrounded by a court of ladies, instead of the allegorical figures of Faith, Hope, and Charity. The hippocampi, sea-elephants, and Pillars of Hercules remained in place. In 1615, the Habsburg patriciate and the so-called nations, the nine civic bodies representing the city’s 48 craft guilds, once again co-ruled Brussels – the city had been the capital of the Calvinist United Provinces during their revolt from Spanish rule in the sixteenth century. By re-using the model of this illustrious ship, which was associated with the pinnacle of Habsburg maritime achievement, the city’s pageant was appropriating past glories for present political purposes. The different women in the re-modelled float united the Catholic religion (the Virgin) with temporal female rule (the courtly group), emphasizing concepts of

\begin{center}
\textbf{Figure 23.2} Denys van Alsloot, \textit{The Ommegang in Brussels on 31 May 1615: The Triumph of Archduchess Isabella (1616).}
\end{center}
© Victoria and Albert Museum, London.
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religious and political harmony, peace, and good government, while establishing an alliance with the current Brussels patriciate.

The utility of the heroic ship in performing cultural work for European nations and polities is also apparent at the other end of the scale in terms of size, with an early modern fashion, even passion, for miniaturized jewellery and small decorative items with marine and maritime themes. Jewels of marine creatures were particularly popular, with strangely shaped baroque pearls and gems ingeniously fashioned into intricate and colourful hippocampi, sea-dragons, dolphins, sea-serpents, and hybrid creatures such as mermaids, mermen, and sirens, all familiar from the classical and medieval bestiary tradition. Such jewels also express the wonder, awe, and excitement of encounter with new animals and ideas, but simultaneously show anxieties about control and mastery, and humans’ place in the order of nature. These ‘seafever’ creatures are, for example, often hybrid or grotesque, or shown with fierce teeth or claws, or, though appearing in miniature form, are intended to be imagined as enormous by the viewer, shown by the inclusion of a tiny human figure or figures to give scale. A number of jewels, for instance, show a human figure riding the animal, attempting to dominate and control the monstrous sea creature beneath her/him. These monstrous and hybrid marine animals fall outside early modern European ontological categories and epistemological structures, but by rendering them as tiny but magnificent jewels, they appear domesticated without losing their alterity.

Figure 23.3 Detail from Denys van Alsloot, The Ommegang in Brussels on 31 May 1615: The Triumph of Archduchess Isabella (1616).

© Victoria and Albert Museum, London.
Nefs (French for ‘carrack’ or ‘ship’) were extravagant table ornaments, popular in the courts of medieval and early modern Europe and used as saltcellars or for storing eating utensils or linen, and navicula (Latin for ‘small ships’) were incense holders. Akin to marine jewels, these maritime objects also performed cultural work in the early modern period. Some nefs, such as the Burghley Nef (1527/28) incorporated rare and exotic marine flora and fauna into their design, such as nautilus shells from the Western Pacific used as their precious metalwork carcasses. Others, such as Hans Schlottheim’s ‘The Mechanical Galleon’ (c.1580–90) included timepieces and other mechanisms that enabled movement across a dinner table, music to play, and/or the firing of tiny cannon or other extravagant display. ‘The Mechanical Galleon’ is an exceptional example of an ingenious and prestigious automaton, designed to announce the start of a banquet by ‘sailing’ independently across the table, thus impressing and delighting the owner’s dinner guests. As European nations competed for imperial and colonial territory, this elite object signalled both the wealth and sophistication of its possessor (it was most probably made for the Holy Roman Emperor Rudolf II), but also his (occasionally her) expansionist temperament.

One, two, and three masted miniature pendant-nefs made of precious stones, gold, and enamel were popular jewels in Spain, Portugal, Venice, Italy, Malta, Crete, and other Mediterranean maritime nations with a large number extant in museum collections, as well as in private hands. Some pendant-nefs paid attention to nautical design, such as the Hunsdon jewel (c.1580) shown in Figure 23.4, by family tradition a gift from

*Figure 23.4* Hunsdon jewel, pendant in the shape of a ship; wooden hull mounted in enamelled gold, the rigging strung with pearls; Europe, about 1580. Berkeley Castle, Gloucestershire.
Elizabeth I to her cousin Henry Carey, first Baron Hunsdon. The identity of the jewel’s maker, or even the country of its origin, are unknown. Yet the inclusion on the hull of a winged figure of Victory, sounding a trumpet, and the presence of a large number of cannon, strike an amphibiously expansionist and celebratory tenor for a jewel thought to date to the year when Drake returned from the circumnavigation, or thereabouts. Just as the *Golden Hind* carried a pinnace for use as a tender ship in the Pacific, here too below the hull a small boat with oars forms a small pendant. The popularity of pendant-nefs in England more generally is apparent in records showing that Elizabeth I received a number of jewelled ships among the New Year gifts presented by courtiers, though the court practice of resetting gems to make new jewellery means that few of the queen’s jewels survive. Other nef-pendants were much more symbolic in design, such as the cut-crystal hulled nef shown in Figure 23.5, which may have originated in Venice, where there was a long tradition of crystal cutting. Information on how owners used nef-pendants is also limited, and appears to vary between countries. Though in England, as we have seen, nef-pendants were part of a gift-giving courtly exchange culture, Yvonne Hackenbroch in *Renaissance Jewellery* argues that in Italy for instance, nef-pendants were not considered personal ornaments, since no portrait from the sixteenth or seventeenth century survives that depicts a sitter wearing them.

*Figure 23.5* Pendant symbolizing a ship, rock crystal hull mounted in gold with enamel decoration, c.1620–30, Western Europe, possibly Venetian. © Victoria and Albert Museum, London.
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She suggests instead that they served different ideological and emotional functions for Italians, used as a votive to hang in churches and shrines in thanks for a traveller’s safe return. The contrasting meanings and significances these jewels possess suggest that the ship as hero is capable of operating in different emotional and ideological registers to those we have seen at work in the human male maritime heroic.

Conclusion

As we have seen, in the early modern period, the maritime heroic was both an esteemed and unstable vehicle to address issues of command and authority, and the type of characteristics that were necessary for successful leadership. As European nations competed to establish themselves as key players on a global stage, determining what qualities were required to inform and underpin the maritime heroic became increasingly central, and this is reflected both in real and imaginary accounts of exploration, and in material culture from the period. In English culture, maritime heroism focalizes narratives on an individual’s or a ship’s abilities to deliver results in the service of national ambitions, bordering on obsession, for territorial expansion and glory.

Simultaneously, however, accounts of human maritime heroism reveal the darker depths of individualism and personal will-to-power, of physical and mental breakdown, as well as the consequences of the kinds of restless, often-uncontrollable energy male maritime ‘heroes’ concurrently demonstrate. Against this context, the ship itself starts to emerge as a more reliable heroic model. Individuals and objects, humans and non-humans, and their stories, unite in posing, explicitly or implicitly, questions of what sort of maritime nation England, later Britain, could, or should, become, and what types of leader and leadership, as well as what type of vessels, were required for the nation’s voyage forward. The ship as hero is, in some ways, proleptic of current posthumanist debates, offering a critical distance on the standard masculinist early modern maritime heroic that enables its re-conception by analysing the toxicity of the extremism and violence central to its human incarnation. The very idea of the ship as hero – with its ability to carry varied emotional and ideological meanings – perhaps, then, offers a counterpoised site from where some of the consequences of ‘Great Man’ history can fruitfully be explored, and indeed challenged.
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