Elizabeth I is often thought of as the most English of monarchs and the very personification of an isolationist Protestant nationalism. In John Aylmer’s *Harborowe for faithfull and trewe subiectes* (1559), written to greet Elizabeth’s accession and to refute objections to female rule, Mother England acclaimed the new Queen, and a marginal note declared that ‘God is English’ (R1v-2v, P4v). Elizabeth’s pure indigenous descent was asserted to contrast her to her late sister Mary I, daughter and wife of Spaniards: in a speech of 1566 to a parliamentary delegation, Elizabeth refuted criticism that she was not acting to secure the succession by asking, ‘Was I not born in the realm? Were my parents born in any foreign country? Is there any cause I should alienate myself from being careful over this country? Is not my kingdom here?’ (Elizabeth I, *Collected Works* 95). Nearly thirty years later, as England faced possible invasion by Spain in 1588, the Queen famously (if the version that has come down to us is accurate) identified her intact virgin body with the security of her realm: ‘I know I have the body but of a weak and feeble woman, but I have the heart and stomach of a king and of a king of England too – and take foul scorn that Parma or any prince of Europe should dare to invade the borders of my realm’ (Elizabeth I, *Collected Works* 326). In the last phase of her reign she was apotheosised into Spenser’s Gloriana, ‘Great Ladie of the greatest Isle’, inspiring and presiding over the battles of her knights against Grantorto (Spain) and other foreign enemies (*Faerie Queene* I.proem 4, V.i.3, V.xii.14-24).

I am grateful to Brenda M. Hosington, Margaret M. McGowan, Gesine Manuwald, Alessandra Petrina, two anonymous readers for Ashgate, and especially Alexander Samson for their helpful comments on this Introduction.
Yet this was the same Queen who in 1564 appeared before the Scottish ambassador, Sir James Melville, dressed one day in the French style and the next in the Italian, and asked him which he preferred (Weir 149). In a period when most of the leading artists in England were of foreign birth or descent, her portrait was painted by painters such as the Netherlandish Hans Eworth or the Italian Federico Zuccaro (Christopher Brown, Carey-Thomas, Cooper 58-9, Hearn 27, 63, 73, 153). Marcus Gheeraerts the Younger was creator of the extraordinary, huge, mythologising Ditchley Portrait in which Elizabeth stands on the county of Oxfordshire in the map of England; he left the Netherlands as a child, yet after forty years in England added to his signature the Latin word ‘Brugiensis’ (‘from Bruges’) (Hearn 9, 89-90). Elizabeth herself was renowned then as now for her command of numerous languages, and practised translation from the age of 11 – when she presented her version of Marguerite de Navarre’s _Le Miroir de l’âme pêcheresse_ (The Mirror of the Sinful Soul) to her stepmother, Queen Katherine Parr – to her final years, when she translated Boethius’s vast _Consolation of Philosophy_ apparently just for fun.

As the distinguished translation expert Brenda M. Hosington shows in Chapter 1 of the present volume, translation was a central activity of early modern English culture, and ‘constituted an indispensable means of cultural exchange’. Alessandra Petrina in the following chapter discusses Elizabeth’s extensive activity as translator, focussing in particular on a version attributed to the Queen of the _Triumph of Eternity_ by Petrarch, arguably the most influential European author in Elizabethan England. Petrina notes that Elizabeth’s translations as a lifelong body of work ‘may be read as the attempt to set down in permanent form her intuition of a philosophical truth’, the need for a constant monarchical authority amidst the vicissitudes of fortune. Elizabeth also made original compositions in various languages, including prayers in French, Italian, Spanish, Latin, and Greek (Elizabeth I, _Autograph Compositions_ 129-49). In Chapter 4 below, Rayne Allinson and Geoffrey
Parker discuss her participation in a multilingual culture of diplomatic correspondence, writing letters to other monarchs in Latin, and, early in her reign when still on amicable terms with her former brother-in-law Philip II of Spain, receiving letters from him in Spanish which she may well have been able to read without the aid of a translator. Isolationist or internationalist? Clearly Elizabeth was both, and offers a case study in the complexities of cultural relations between England and other European countries in the early modern period. Foreign nations and their cultures were feared and admired, opposed and appropriated, rejected and absorbed.

Nearly twenty years after Elizabeth’s death, Lady Mary Wroth published *The Countess of Montgomery’s Urania* (1621), the first prose romance in English by a woman. It might appear in some ways a manifestation of a particularly English form of aristocratic authorship. The dedicatee, Susan de Vere Herbert, Countess of Montgomery, was daughter of the Earl of Oxford, and the title-page flaunts Wroth’s ancestry as niece to Sir Philip Sidney and Mary Sidney Herbert, Countess of Pembroke, making her a member of England’s leading aristocratic literary dynasty. Just as her uncle Philip’s *Arcadia*, on which the *Urania* was partly modelled, was identified with his pastoral retreat at his sister’s house at Wilton, so the realms of Wroth’s *Urania* – Morea, Pamphilia, and the Kingdom of the Romans – can be mapped onto the estates of Wroth and her relations at Penshurst, Loughton in Essex, and again Wilton (Hannay 110, 121, 136-8, 143-4, 148, 150, 176, 180, 305). Yet being born into the Sidney family brought Wroth not only personal connections with particular country houses and their tracts of land in English counties, but also a childhood partly spent in Flushing, in the Netherlands, where her father was governor (Hannay 29-30), and a strong interest in foreign affairs, especially the international cause of Protestantism. In her journal for 1617 Lady Anne Clifford recorded an afternoon spent at Penshurst with ‘my Lady Wroth who told me a great deal of news from beyond sea’ (Anne Clifford 145). It has been shown
that the fanciful-sounding locations of Wroth’s *Urania* were not only on one level fictional aliases for Sidney, Herbert, and Wroth estates; they were also identifiable on seventeenth-century maps of eastern Europe and the eastern Mediterranean, and were used by Wroth to develop plot-lines which formed a commentary on the contemporary events of the Bohemian crisis and the Thirty Years War (Wroth, *First Part* xxxix-liv; Cavanagh 24-25). Politically, then, Wroth’s *Urania* looks outwards towards topical European events; and in literary terms too, it absorbs and adapts elements from a range of European sources, including Ariosto’s *Orlando Furioso*, the Iberian chivalric romances (such as *Amadis de Gaule*, *Palmerin* and *The Mirror of Knighthood*), and perhaps *Don Quixote* (Hackett, *Women and Romance* 164; Wroth, *First Part* xxxviii; Carrell 100).

A third example may serve to underline the point that the culture of early modern England combined local identity with a wide variety of European influences. In the mid 1630s a young woman in rural Staffordshire, Constance Aston Fowler, compiled a manuscript verse miscellany. Many of the poems she transcribed into it were by or about her family and friends; she included, for instance, a poem by her brother Herbert praising the poetry of her sister Gertrude (Fowler 155r-8r). Gertrude’s own poetry, recorded elsewhere, was mainly occasional, marking births, marriages and deaths in the family circle (Arthur Clifford 45-51, 90-2). It might be tempting to see the literary activities of Constance and Gertrude as domestic, parochial, and inward-looking. Yet like Mary Wroth, Constance and Gertrude spent part of their childhood abroad: their father, Sir Walter Aston, was an ambassador to Madrid in the 1620s, and took his young family with him. He was fluent in Castilian, and his library at home at Tixall in Staffordshire included a number of books in this language, and English books about Spain (Hackett, ‘Aston-Thimelby circle’ 133-4). When Constance was compiling her miscellany in the 1630s her father, now Lord Aston, was again in Madrid on an embassy, and contributed to his daughter’s anthology ‘A translation’ (*sic*)
of a Spanish poem (Fowler 188r). His son Herbert accompanied him on this second embassy, and exchanged poems and letters with Constance across the distance that parted them. The family were Catholic, and Constance’s miscellany also included a number of devotional poems by Robert Southwell and others transcribed by Father Thomas Smith (vere Southern), a Jesuit missioner who had trained at St Omer in France and Valladolid in Spain (Hackett, ‘Unlocking’). As for Gertrude, she would spend the latter part of her life, after marriage to Henry Thimelby and widowhood, as a prioress of the English convent at Louvain, alongside other family members who migrated there. As an ambassadorial family and as Catholics the Astons were part of several far-reaching trans-European networks, and the corner of Staffordshire which they called home was culturally connected to Madrid, Valladolid, and Louvain. These international connections had an influence on their writings, bringing a distinctively continental counter-Reformation aesthetic to the devotional poems in Constance’s miscellany (Hackett, ‘Aston-Thimelby circle’ 134-5).

Like Elizabeth I and Lady Mary Wroth, Constance Aston Fowler and Gertrude Aston Thimelby are instances of how an appearance of insular English identity almost invariably, in the early modern period, turns out to involve various kinds of influence from, connection with, or travel to other parts of Europe. Similarly Shakespeare’s plays, so often in later periods thought of as the epitome and apogee of Englishness, recreated far-flung lands and their denizens in a small space on the south bank of the Thames. Thomas Platter was a Swiss tourist in London in 1599, one of many foreign visitors, travelling for various reasons of business or pleasure, who contributed to the cosmopolitanism of early modern London. Platter spent an afternoon at the Globe playhouse, and observed that the English enjoy ‘learning at the play what is happening abroad; indeed men and womenfolk visit such places without scruple, since the English for the most part do not travel much, but prefer to learn foreign matters and take their pleasures at home’ (Bate and Thornton 49). However, it was
not just that Shakespeare recreated Verona, or Venice, or Elsinore on the London stage. The brothels in *Measure for Measure* are at once in Vienna, and recognisable recreations of the brothels that surrounded the playhouses in Southwark. The sheep-shearing feast in *The Winter’s Tale* takes place in Bohemia, but Perdita hands out very English herbs and flowers: ‘rosemary, and rue / ... / Hot lavender, mints, savory, marjoram, / The marigold’ (4.4.74, 104-05). Shakespeare’s places are both here and there, familiar and strange, melding and merging what he knows with distant lands he has heard or read of or imagines.

Undoubtedly the early modern period was a time of nation-formation, with new definitions of statehood and territory (Elden), the rise of vernacular literatures, and new assertions of national identities and cultures. Yet these emergent European nations defined themselves not only by difference from one another, but also through dialogue: borrowing motifs, imitating styles, and sharing knowledge to produce new images and ideas. Even as borders became more clearly defined, diplomats, artists, and scholars traversed them with increasing frequency, carrying with them cultural forms that took on new shapes in new contexts. And these early modern exchanges increasingly extended beyond Europe too.

*Europe and the wider world*

A young woman stands under a tree, her right hand resting on the head of a stag by her side (fig. 1; Reynolds 270-75). Her waistcoat and flowing mantle are lavishly decorated with a style of embroidery popular in England in the Elizabethan and Jacobean periods, with trailing spirals of vegetation framing vibrantly coloured flowers, insects, and birds (Reynolds 165-8, 189-90). The stag, the embroidery, the shady foliage of the nut-tree, and the English verses inscribed on a cartouche in the lower right hand corner of the painting all suggest an English pastoral scene. However the tree bears inscriptions on the theme of melancholy which are in Latin, reflecting the relationship of learned English culture with both the distant
classical past and recent European humanist innovations in scholarship. The maker of the painting was Marcus Gheeraerts the Younger, an ‘incomer’ artist who continued to identify himself as foreign after decades of residence in England, as noted above. Most strikingly, the lady’s high, pointed head-dress looks distinctly foreign, and her loosely draped robe and beaded slippers also diverge from standard English fashions of the time. The source for this unusual head-dress was an engraving of a Persian lady in a costume book of 1581, Jean Jacques Boissard’s *Habitus Variarum Orbis Gentium* (Reynolds 270-71; Gheeraerts, *Portrait*).²

[Insert figure 1.1 here – portrait]

Figure 1.1  Marcus Gheeraerts the Younger, Portrait of an Unknown Woman (c. 1590-1600), RCIN 406024, Royal Collection Trust/© Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II 2015

Again the hybridity of this artefact is paradoxically intrinsic to its Englishness, at a time when Europe was increasingly looking outwards to east and west to discover new images and ideas along with new lands and peoples; and once more Shakespeare offers further examples of such cultural hybridity. Puck, for instance, in *A Midsummer Night’s Dream* is a recognisable figure from English folklore, who ‘frights the maidens of the villagery, / Skim milk, and sometimes labour in the quern, / And bootless make the breathless housewife churn’ (2.1.35-7). However his master Oberon and his estranged queen Titania have come ‘from the farthest step of India’, and they fight over a boy whose mother used to join Titania ‘in the spiced Indian air, by night / ... / And sat with me on Neptune’s yellow sands, / Marking th’embarked traders on the flood’ (2.1.69, 124-7), personifying an exotic,

² For new research on the identity of the Persian Lady, see Laoutaris and Arshad.
sensual, Eastern femininity, and subversively mocking the endeavours of Western merchants and mariners. The wood where Oberon and Titania act out their conflict is at once an unmistakeably English wood populated by hedgehogs, newts, spiders, and beetles, and a wood just outside ancient Athens where snakes and bears might be found: a space where multiple localities are overlaid on one another, and where cultures meld and interfuse.

The lady in the Persian head-dress is perhaps in costume for a masque. English ladies of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries often dressed as exotic non-European others for dramatic performances. Queen Anne of Denmark and her attendants wore black make-up to play the Daughters of Niger in the Masque of Blackness, performed at court in 1605. Then for the Masque of Queens of 1609 they dressed as figures including Berenice, Queen of Egypt, Penthesilea, Queen of the Amazons, and Zenobia, Queen of Syria, in costumes designed by Inigo Jones. In neoclassical dramas produced in the country houses of aristocratic families, women either read aloud or acted out roles such as Cleopatra (in Mary Sidney’s Antonius and its sequel Samuel Daniel’s Cleopatra), or Mariam, Queen of Jewry (in Elizabeth Cary’s tragedy). One Jacobean lady chose to have her portrait painted in costume as Cleopatra, accompanied by lines from the Egyptian Queen’s dying speech in Daniel’s play (Arshad).

In the commercial playhouses of London, audiences were fascinated by figures such as Tamburlaine, the Scythian shepherd, and Othello, the Moor of Venice. Numerous playwrights brought Turks on stage, reflecting anxiety about their power in the Eastern Mediterranean: Turk plays of the Elizabethan and Jacobean period include George Peele’s Battle of Alcazar (1588) and Soliman and Perseda (1590) and Thomas Dekker’s Lust’s Dominion (1600). Prose fiction, too, was enriched by knowledge of and interest in lands and peoples beyond Europe, as discussed in a recent special issue of the Yearbook of English Studies on Travel and Prose Fiction in Early Modern England (Das). Wroth’s Urania
presents an especially intriguing example: its central heroine, Pamphilia – who shares many characteristics with Wroth and seems in many ways to be a fictional persona for her – marries Rodomandro, King of Tartaria (generally understood in the early modern period as a vast Asian realm). He is described as ‘A brave and Comly Gentleman ... his face of curious and exact features, butt for the couler of itt, itt plainly shewed the sunn had either like itt to much, and soe had too hard kissed itt, ore in fury of his delicasy, had made his beames to strongly to burne him, yett cowlde nott take away the perfect sweetnes of his lovelines’ (Wroth, Second Part 42). Later in the seventeenth century, Aphra Behn created another handsome and noble dark-skinned character, the African prince Oroonoko, who is sold into slavery and whose tragic end in the English colony in Surinam is deplored.

In recent decades we have come to a fuller understanding of the significance of relations with the wider world for early modern Europe’s developing sense of itself, and for the enrichment of its culture. Ground-breaking contributions to the field were made by Peter Hulme (Colonial Encounters), Lisa Jardine, Jerry Brotton (Trading Territories), Andrew Hadfield (Literature, Travel), and Barbara Fuchs. Recent studies have particularly emphasised interactions between the local and the global, and the fruitfulness of shifts of perspective in offering fresh insights into the period. Exciting contributions include the Companion to the Global Renaissance edited by Jyotsna G. Singh, whose essays advance a view of the Renaissance as ‘more multidimensional and culturally fluid than the one traditionally centered in Italy’, and relocate European Renaissance man ‘within the historical phenomenon of an expanding global world’ (5). Meanwhile Ulinka Rublack in Dressing Up has shown how the particular medium of clothing could ‘render societies legible’ (13): costume was used to define and express a national identity, but also inspired cross-cultural imitation as travel, print, and pictures spread information about fashion from one culture to another (as we have seen here in the portrait of the Persian Lady). The methodology of Three
Ways to be Alien by Sanjay Subrahmanyam, however, is the personal case study, ‘bridging as it were the gap between microhistory and world history’ (173) through the stories of three geographically and culturally mobile individuals: ‘Ali bin Yusuf ‘Adil Khan, a Muslim prince from Bijapur dwelling in Counter-Reformation Portuguese Goa; Anthony Sherley, an English traveller whose accumulated expertise in international politics gave him marketable professional value but also incurred suspicion; and Nicolò Manuzzi, a Venetian in Mughal India. Extending this combination of broad international scope with new attention to hitherto less familiar territories, Geoffrey Parker’s important book Global Crisis demonstrates that the turbulences and calamities of the mid seventeenth century were far from a merely English phenomenon, extending rather across continents, from Japan to Africa to the Russian Empire to the Americas. Parker also gains new insights by integrating the history of science with political, economic, and social history to show how climate change was an essential factor in this global crisis. These important books, and the intellectual movement to which they belong, have made us all aware that the early modern – encompassing the early modern world-view, the early modern state, and early modern subjectivity – was largely formed in encounters and dialogues between diverse cultures.

A number of essays in the present volume develop these investigations of the formative relations between early modern Europe and the wider world. Brenda Hosington in Chapter 1 emphasises the importance of translators in the exploration and colonisation of the New World, and their mediating role as cultural go-betweens. She also highlights the fact that travel-writing, especially about the New World, was one of the most popular genres for translation, disseminating knowledge of newly discovered lands and cultures to a diverse range of ‘Old World’ language communities. In Chapter 5, Tracey A. Sowerby discusses the use of portraits in diplomatic gift-exchanges, including English relations with the Moghul Emperor Jahangir, the Ottoman Sultan, and the rulers of Persia and China. Eavan O’Brien
fascinatingly explores responses to and adaptation of European literary influence by Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz, an author born to a *criolla* mother and a Basque father in the Mexican part of the Viceroyalty of New Spain (a territory which also encompassed parts of North, Central, and South America and the Caribbean). Meanwhile Eva Johanna Holmberg’s essay discusses some examples of English travellers in the Ottoman east, a space where multiple cultures had contact through trade, curiosity, and being ‘thrown together’ by travel. Holmberg explores the neglected topic of encounters not only with indigenous peoples, but also with travelling companions of diverse origins. These various contributors apply diverse methodologies to diverse settings and forms of cultural encounter to demonstrate the productiveness and significance of interactions between Europeans and the wider world in the early modern period.

*Shifting Perspectives: The Example of ‘The Tempest’*

As our understanding of early modern exchanges develops, it enables us to look afresh at some familiar works. For instance, what was the language that Miranda taught Caliban? What was the language in which he learned to curse? Caliban’s exchange with Prospero and Miranda, his master and mistress, in Shakespeare’s *Tempest* has for some time been a *locus classicus* for discussion of cross-cultural encounters in the early modern period, especially for historians and critics of colonialism. Caliban complains that Prospero has taken from him the island that is rightfully his; Prospero rejoins that Caliban is unregenerate, and tried to rape his daughter. Miranda adds that she taught Caliban to speak, and he retorts:

You taught me language, and my profit on’t

Is I know how to curse. The red plague rid you

For learning me your language. (1.2.366)
Rob Nixon has shown how in the period of twentieth-century ‘decolonisation’ of nations in Africa and the Caribbean, from the late 1950s to the early 1970s, ‘dissenting intellectuals’ in those cultures mounted ‘adversarial interpretations of the play which rehabilitated Caliban into a heroic figure, inspired by noble rage to oust the interloping Prospero from his island’ (557, 564). Many postcolonial writers have identified empoweringly and productively with the idea of ‘learning to curse’, of deploying enforced fluency in the coloniser’s language in order to ‘talk back’ at him. Meanwhile for Stephen Greenblatt in his influential book *Learning to Curse* the exchange between Prospero, Miranda and Caliban was a prime example of ‘linguistic colonialism’, to be placed alongside Samuel Daniel’s vision in *Musophilus* (1599) of the ‘strange shores’ to which the English will bear ‘the treasure of our tongue’ (Greenblatt 16-39).

Many postcolonial accounts of *The Tempest* have thus taken it as a founding text of British imperialism, and imply that Prospero is an incipient type of the British colonial governor (see for instance Barker and Hulme; Paul Brown; Hawkes). Although the explicit terms of such readings of the play may configure it as an encounter between Europeans and the non-European, embedded within them is often an implication or assumption that the language which Miranda teaches Caliban is English. But can this be so? Miranda’s father is the exiled Duke of Milan, all the non-native characters in the play are Italian, and it is to Italy that they return at the end of the play. Caliban, then, has presumably learned Italian; although for the purposes of an English play he and his master and mistress speak English. He is speaking in translation, and so are all the characters of the play.

This tells us much about early modern England’s sense of itself in the world, especially when placed alongside the numerous other works by Shakespeare and his contemporaries that are set in Italy or use Italian sources. Italy was the home of classical learning and art, the cradle of the Renaissance, and the nation which led the world in courtly
values and civility, as exemplified by Castiglione’s *Il Cortegiano* (1528). By contrast, according to Sir Philip Sidney writing in the 1580s, literature found ‘a hard welcome’ in ‘idle England, which now can scarce endure the pain of a pen’ (Sidney 241). By the date of *The Tempest* in 1610-11 England had done more to assert itself as a literary nation, but its authors were still, as Jeffrey Knapp puts it, ‘intimidated by classical and modern Italy’, a relation which expressed itself in mingled deference, emulation, and competition (64). It was articulated as suspicion and antagonism too, as seen in Roger Ascham’s xenophobic assertions that Italy was the source of ‘plentie of new mischieves never knowne in England before ... varietie of vanities, and chaunge of filthy lyving’ (22), and as seen in Jacobean tragedy’s presentation of Italian courts as the abodes of sexual perversion and murderous ingenuity. This hostility of course derived force from religious division and Protestant nationalism, and may be traced in the characterisation of Antonio and Sebastian in *The Tempest* as Machiavellian villains. Such mingled awe and contempt towards Italy betoken the fact that early modern England was by no means culturally predominant, but on the contrary acutely conscious – sometimes admiringly, sometimes resentfully – of Italian and other continental European cultures as more ancient, influential, and illustrious than its own. England was not at the centre of early modern culture, but at the margins.

Thinking about *The Tempest* like this, in terms of the early modern European contexts of the play, rather than in terms of modern postcolonial interests, is a salutary reminder that cultural exchanges in Shakespeare’s time reflected complex international relations and took many different forms. Contributors to Peter Hulme and William H. Sherman’s volume ‘*The Tempest* and Its Travels’ demonstrated that this immensely rich play draws on numerous contexts, including not only new geographical discoveries in the western Atlantic, but also

---

3 For an argument that *The Tempest* should be understood in relation to the early modern Mediterranean world, see Brotton, ‘This Tunis’. 
the multiculturalism of early modern London, the literary influence of the classical past, and
the Mediterranean politics of the early seventeenth century. They helped us towards
distinguishing between *The Tempest*'s undeniable relevance to later times, and its relation to
the world of its own time. All the same, it takes effort to attempt to read early modern cultural
exchanges on their own terms without distortion by hindsight. One aspect of so doing is the
realisation that the Italian rulers of *The Tempest* did not, in literal terms, have a home to go
to: since the early sixteenth century, the titles ‘King of Naples’ and ‘Duke of Milan’ had
belonged to the Spanish throne (see Kirkpatrick). William Warner, for instance, wrote in
*Albion’s England* (1596) of ‘the free-Italian States, of which the Spaniards part have won: /
As Naples, Milan, royal That, and Duchy this’ (Knapp 233, 334 n. 22). There was no
dukedom of Milan to resume, no throne of Naples to be secured for Prospero’s descendants.
Viewed from this perspective, Prospero and Alonzo are as lacking in territory and title as
Caliban. Cultural myths often differ from political realities; and if England was culturally
deferential to Italy in cultural terms, large parts of early modern Italy were politically subject
to Spain.

Spanish dominion had direct and important implications for England itself, and for
any reading of *The Tempest* as reflecting English imperialism. In the 1570s and ’80s Dr John
Dee had coined the term ‘British Empire’, asserting ancient Arthurian claims to vast tracts of
both the New World and Europe, and from his prophetic and apocalyptic ideas a rich
iconography of imperialism had developed (Strong, *Gloriana*, 90-107; Parry). However, even
by 1610 England’s imperial ambitions were more of a dream than a reality, and were far
exceeded by the achievements of Spain. It was not until 1607 that England established its first
permanent settlement in the New World, somewhat precariously, at Jamestown in Virginia;
an earlier attempt to establish a settlement at Roanoke in the 1580s, sponsored by Sir Walter
Raleigh, had been a dismal failure. By contrast Spanish expansionism had been actively
pursued ever since Columbus’s voyage of discovery in 1492, and by 1610 encompassed extensive territories in the West and East Indies and Central and South America (Barraclough 158-9). Spain, then, was the leading imperial power of the early seventeenth-century world that produced The Tempest, and once again we might think of England as not central to the early modern world picture, but marginal.

Another shift in topographies, power relations, and centres of consciousness is created within the play when Miranda gains her first sight of the Italian lords en masse, and exclaims: ‘O brave new world / That has such people in’t’. From her innocent, uncivilised perspective, the old world of Europe looks like a new world. However, Prospero wearily intones ‘’Tis new to thee’ (Tempest 5.1.184-5), and the play has made us very much aware that its denizens include usurpers, traitors, assassins, and drunkards. In a similar moment of literary disorientation, Edmund Spenser, in Colin Clovts Come Home Againe (1595), vividly describes how for an English poet returning from exile in Ireland it is England that is a foreign shore, a land of discovery, a brave new world. As Colin/Spenser tells his rustic Irish companions the story of his voyage to England, Cuddy asks him, ‘What land is that thou meanst ... / And is there other, then whereon we stand?’ (lines 290-91). Colin’s affirmative reply describes England as a golden world in terms very like those used by travellers to the New World:

that same land much larger is then this,

And other men and beasts and birds doth feed:

There fruitfull corne, faire trees, fresh herbage is

And all things else that liuинг creatures need. (lines 296-9)

Travel not only broadens the mind, these works suggest, but creates new points of view, displaces and even inverts concepts of ‘home’ and ‘away’, and enables the familiar to be re-encountered and re-evaluated as fresh and exotic. Yet for Colin, just as we fear Miranda will
learn, innocent admiration is soon eclipsed by disillusionment and cynicism: the English court, he finds, is a place ‘Where each one seeks with malice and with strife, / To thrust downe other into foule disgrace, / Himselfe to raise’, a place of ‘deceitfull wit, ...subtil shifts, ... leasings lewd, and fained forgerie’ (lines 690-96). The clear-eyed vision of the outsider may reveal faults and expose uncomfortable truths, whether that outsider is a stranger coming to European shores for the first time, or an exile whose travels have estranged him from his erstwhile home.

Like the wood of *A Midsummer Night’s Dream*, Prospero’s island occupies a highly ambiguous topographical space, as has been widely acknowledged. The characters shipwrecked there are Italian lords making their way home from a wedding in Tunis, placing the island presumably in the Mediterranean; yet the play also includes allusions to William Strachey’s 1610 account of an English ship bound to the Virginia Company’s colony at Jamestown that was shipwrecked in the Bermudas. Clearly this is also a space where multiple cultures meet and intersect; and compounding this, it also draws on Michel de Montaigne’s 1580 essay ‘Of the Cannibals’, which is about the Brazilian ‘Indians’. Gonzalo’s disquisition about the ideal commonwealth that he would create if he had plantation of the isle (*Tempest* 2.1.141-66) echoes the 1603 English translation of Montaigne’s *Essais* by John Florio, an Anglo-Italian writer otherwise known for his Italian dictionaries and language manuals. Thus here we have an Italian lord on a Mediterranean/Caribbean island in an English play echoing an English translation by an Anglo-Italian writer of a French work about South America, a work which itself draws heavily on a classical Latin text, Ovid’s description of the golden age in his *Metamorphoses*. As Hulme and Sherman aptly write, criticism of the play needs ‘to be (like the play itself) in many places at once’ (Hulme and Sherman xi). *The Tempest* is an instance which distils several aspects of cultural exchange in the early modern world: translation, multilingualism, and dialogue not only between different language communities
but also between the early modern present and its classical heritage (the play of course includes allusion to Virgil as well as Ovid). Thus although it may seem like an almost over-familiar text in discussion of early modern cross-cultural exchanges, if we look at it again with fresh eyes, and especially with an awareness of its contemporary European contexts, we may question some of our previous assumptions, and find that the play offers even more complex meditations on political and cultural hierarchies and linguistic exchanges than previously noticed.

**Places and processes of exchange**

The collection of essays presented here tries accordingly to understand early modern Europe as a complex and mobile set of concepts and relationships, not merely as a block of imperial powers. After all, as we have seen, in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries some European empires were well established, like the Spanish; others were aspiring but merely nascent, like the English or British empire; but other parts of Europe were in a state of fragmentation and were in no position to pursue overseas imperial ambitions. Much of Italy was dominated by Spain but was also on the front-line of conflict with the Turks to the east. The Holy Roman Empire too was threatened by the Turks, but also became increasingly fractured from within by religious divisions and the ambitions of local princes, and was finally fatally weakened by the Thirty Years War (1618–48). The story of cross-cultural exchange in early modern Europe is thus not only one of Europe looking outside itself in encounters with non-European others, but also one of nations and communities within Europe looking admiringly, competitively, or anxiously at one another.

Some early modern cross-cultural encounters took place in locations far from Europe to which travellers and settlers came in search of territory and wealth. However familiar locations within England were also places where international and cross-cultural encounters
and dialogues took place. The city of London is one obvious example: here the Royal Exchange (opened in 1571) drew merchants from France, the Netherlands, Italy, and Spain; here too a delegation of Moors from Barbary in northern Africa caused a stir in 1600-01; and here the playhouse stage took audiences to Persepolis, Malta, Ephesus, Cyprus, Venice, Egypt, and innumerable other exotic locations (Bate and Thornton 16-17, 34-6; Howard). Meanwhile Andrew Hadfield’s essay in the present volume shows how even that apparently most English of locations, the provincial country house – in this case, the home at Hill Hall in Essex of the diplomat, scholar, and patron Sir Thomas Smith – could function as a kind of academy where international influences were imported and disseminated, and thus as a place of cultural interaction. We should also consider such spaces as a study or a bookseller’s shop, where translations and travel narratives created cross-cultural encounters in the mind of the reader (see Hadfield, ‘Benefits’). Even if not geographical locations of person-to-person contact, these were undeniably spaces where boundaries between individuals and cultures were crossed, and where ongoing intellectual and cultural dialogues were generated.

Interest in other cultures was provoked not merely by imperial ambitions, but also by a desire for knowledge, and as such was intrinsically related to the print revolution and the new abilities that it created to disseminate information rapidly and widely. Knowledge became a commodity to be bought and sold, and the book trade developed extensive networks of transmission and circulation. Indeed, in conceptualising early modern cultural exchanges in general it is often appropriate to think of networks, rather than just binary exchanges between two partners or communities. One nexus of the international book trade was the Frankfurt Book Fair, already flourishing by the late sixteenth century. This was an especially intense and active arena of exchange: not only a place where books from all over Europe were exchanged, but also a place where local censorship (such as the Index of
prohibited books in Catholic countries, or the regulations of the Stationers’ Company in England) did not apply, creating a free space for multiple intellectual and cultural dialogues.4

Both people and goods circulated via networks of cultural exchange. People in motion included explorers, seafarers, merchants, diplomats, wandering scholars, spies, religious exiles, missionaries, economic migrants, and more. Brinda Charry and Gitanjali Shahani have written of the importance of ‘ambassadors, envoys, message-bearers, and other emissaries’ in negotiations between cultures; their missions might be to new potential allies and trading-partners in distant parts of the globe, or they might be to friends, rivals, potential enemies, or potential customers closer to home (3). The pursuit of material gain was an important engine of cultural exchange, and representatives were sent across borders and across oceans not only by nation-states, but also by the emergent joint-stock companies (see Barbour). In these new global trading networks travellers crossed long distances, as did goods, across Europe, and to and from east and west. Traffic in foodstuffs, clothing, furnishings, books and pictures transmitted practices, fashions, and ideas across borders. Some objects, such as letters, portraits, and gifts, were especially meaning-laden, bearing textual or symbolic messages and participating in specific cross-cultural dialogues. Within this volume Tracey A. Sowerby explores how portrait-exchanges functioned in diplomatic practice, while Rayne Allinson and Geoffrey Parker discuss the role in ‘executive diplomacy’ of holograph (personally hand-written) letters by monarchs, and their special symbolic value as representatives of their authors.

Discussion of cultural exchange naturally depends upon a concept of ‘culture’ as a source of communal identity and outlook. Yet ‘culture’ is itself a broad and flexible term that may be defined in different ways. A sense of cultural identity may be defined by nationhood – by geographical borders and allegiance to a particular ruler or government – yet many such

4 I am indebted to Alessandra Petrina for pointing this out.
borders and allegiances were unstable in the early modern period. It might also be defined by race, language, or shared customs, but such factors did not necessarily cohere to give a strong sense of communality; in many circumstances they might be in tension with one another. Religion was a particular factor that was sometimes congruent with national identity – as when English Protestants asserted that they were God’s chosen people – and sometimes in conflict with it, as when English Catholic exiles asserted a vision of true Englishness as located in a lost past, or displaced to safe havens beyond England’s shores (such as the convents in exile discussed in Caroline Bowden’s essay in this volume). Hosington notes in Chapter 1 below that the vast majority of works in the Renaissance Cultural Crossroads online catalogue of early modern translations, of which she is editor-in-chief, are of a religious nature: religious reform and schism generated a plethora of translations, whether vernacular Bibles translated by Protestants, or works produced at Douai or St Omer to support and promote Catholicism in England. Cultural exchanges between England and the rest of Europe were inevitably inflected by the Protestant-Catholic divide; while beyond the borders of Europe, travellers in non-Christian territories, like those discussed in Holmberg’s essay below, were compelled to engage with and negotiate issues of religious difference, and to consider the relations between religious difference and racial difference. Meanwhile, even writers and artists who stayed at home had to traverse a gulf between the Christianity of their present-day Europe and the paganism of the classical sources that were so important to them; and in so doing sometimes found opportunities in that paganism to evade the religious conflicts of the present.

This reminds us that cultural exchange includes not only synchronic exchanges across geographical or linguistic borders, but also diachronic exchanges, as the early modern present entered into dialogues with its past. We have seen that Elizabeth I engaged in translations from Latin and composition in Latin; that the portrait of the Persian Lady included Latin
inscriptions; that Shakespeare looked back via Montaigne to Ovid in imagining the earliest Golden Age of humanity and its recreation in the supposedly innocent societies of the New World. For the early modern period Latin was at once a language of the past, asserting continuities and revivals of classical culture, and a language of now, identified with Renaissance humanist scholarship, a medium for literary and intellectual innovation. Gesine Manuwald explores the phenomenon of neo-Latin poetry in Chapter 3 of the present volume. Its context was an early modern international res publica litterarum in which authors of many nations composed and corresponded in Latin, and in which many individuals were fluent in at least two languages: Latin and their vernacular (see Binns, Latin Poetry and Intellectual Culture).

As writers and artists looked back to ancient Rome for literary and aesthetic models they drew on a culture which had itself been formed through cultural exchange, as classical Roman culture appropriated and adapted models from ancient Greece. Some recent work by classical scholars sees this as more complex than just a one-way process of imitation or borrowing, and adopts the term ‘contact zone’ from post-colonial scholarship to describe relations between ancient Greek and Rome. As Denis Feeney describes, in the contact zone ‘competing cultures ... oscillate between concentrating on otherness, by focusing on what is different about their rivals, and concentrating on similarity, by the imitative process which best enables them to define and master what makes up that otherness’. As a classicist he finds ‘dynamic, interactive models of this kind’ valuable for understanding ‘the mobility of myth between cultures’ (Feeney 67-9, and see Manuwald, Roman Republican Theatre, esp. 7, 16-17). Awareness of this deep history of cross-cultural conversations reminds us of several important facts: that cultural exchange was not unprecedented in the early modern period, even if new geographical discoveries, commercial endeavours, and technologies made it
more prevalent; that innovation often takes force from a remembered or recovered past; and that interaction with the past is itself a significant and productive form of cultural exchange.

The present volume also considers the role of social class in various kinds of cultural border-crossings. Chapters by Allinson and Parker, Sowerby, and Noah Millstone demonstrate that it was often those in political and social elites who were most able to engage in international dialogue and cross-cultural exchange, and had much to gain from it. However, chapters in the third section, ‘Communities of exchange, agents of exchange’ show how various different social contexts could generate cultural exchange, and how particular influential individuals – such as Sir Thomas Smith forming a community of internationally-minded scholars in England, or Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz adapting European dramatic influences to her circumstances in New Spain – could be the engines of cultural exchange. O’Brien’s essay on Sor Juana also exemplifies an interest running through all sections of the volume in the diverse and distinctive ways in which gender was a factor in cross-cultural dialogues. This is especially prominent in the chapters by Alessandra Petrina on translations by Elizabeth I, by Allinson and Parker on letters by Elizabeth and her sister Mary, and by Bowden on the continental English convents.

*Investigating Early Modern Exchanges*

The purpose of the present volume is to advance analysis and understanding of the cross-border encounters and dialogues that were crucial to the formation and development of early modern culture. The contributors are outstanding scholars who were brought together by the Centre for Early Modern Exchanges at University College London, and exemplify the interdisciplinary diversity and debate that it fosters. Fields of expertise represented here include translation studies, classical studies, archival research, manuscript studies, art history, political history, biography, travel-writing, literary criticism, and expertise in various
European languages. Some contributors are established leaders in their fields, others are exciting new voices, and we are delighted that between them they represent seven different nationalities.

The essays in Part I, ‘Linguistic exchanges: translation and imitation’, illuminate our understanding of dialogues between different language communities, the transmission of literary and intellectual innovations via translation, and the role of Latin as an international language and a mediator between past and present. In Part II, ‘International dialogues between cultural elites’, we gain understanding of how those in positions of power and influence in a sense formed an international community in which dialogue was possible across national and religious boundaries, yet in the process national and religious identities were maintained and indeed asserted. In Part III, ‘Communities of exchange, agents of exchange’, we learn how mobile individuals or groups could be ‘carriers’ of international and interlinguistic influence, and how such exchanges operated in various different circumstances.

Part I, then, addresses linguistic exchanges in the forms of translation and imitation. This is a highly appropriate starting point since in a broad sense the concept of translation, or translatio, sums up what the whole book is about: the ‘carrying over’ of a person, object, or concept from one place to another, involving transformation and a transfer of ownership (see ‘translation, n.’, Oxford English Dictionary Online; and Hollengreen). Robert Cawdrey in A Table Alphabeticall (1604) defined ‘translation’ as ‘altering, changing’ (F2v). For Edward Phillips in his New World of English Words (1658) the primary meaning of ‘translation’ was ‘a changing from one thing, or place to another’; it was only secondarily ‘a turning out of one language into another’ (Pp3v). Even if we think about translation in this more specific sense as the conversion of words and works between different languages, it was a central phenomenon of the early modern period. Much of the momentum behind early humanism
came from a desire to attain a more accurate Latin translation of the Bible, while translation of the Bible into contemporary European vernaculars was a crucial project of the Protestant Reformation (Rhodes 6-30, 73-212). Translation was the medium of the Word of God, and carried heavy theological and ideological freight; it could stir debates which led beyond intellectual controversy to violence, martyrdom, and war. Translation also served many other purposes in the early modern world, as evidenced by the diverse range of volumes currently being produced in the MHRA series *Tudor and Stuart Translations*, and by the examples of English Renaissance Translation Theory gathered in volume 9 of that series (Rhodes). As mentioned above, Brenda Hosington, author of the opening essay here, is director of the important Renaissance Cultural Crossroads project at the University of Warwick whose achievements have included an online catalogue of early modern translations. This has established that over the period 1473 to 1640 over 6,000 translations were printed in Britain, involving almost 30 languages, over 1,000 translators, and roughly 1,200 authors (Hosington, *Renaissance Cultural Crossroads*): forceful evidence of the polyglot nature of early modern culture, and of its hungry appetite for new learning and information from far-flung sources. New print technology, the rise of the international book trade, and the talents of translators combined to disseminate knowledge and language skills far and wide, as also highlighted by the landmark special issue of *Renaissance Studies on Translation and Print Culture in Early Modern Europe* recently guest edited by Hosington.

Hosington’s contribution to the present volume is a substantial essay which lays essential foundations for the chapters that follow. Here she draws on both current translation theory and early modern conceptualisations of translation to offer a productive and fascinating analysis of what she calls the ‘translative discourse’ of the period. After demonstrating the affinity between translation and metaphor as forms of ‘carrying over’ and transference, she explores how the metaphors used for translation in the early modern period
illuminate how it was practised and understood, including the relative status of source text and translation, the power-relations between them, and ideas of gain and loss. Some of the most frequent metaphors were economic: translated works were represented as traded goods, discovered treasure, or coins for circulation (see also Rhodes 44-5, 51-3). Thus translations were produced for financial profit, while presenting intellectual profit as their selling-point. Hosington also identifies ‘cultural go-betweens’ as essential to the production and promotion of translations: both those who directly encountered other language communities in their own territories, such as explorers, merchants, ambassadors, and travelling scholars, and those for whom translation was a more stay-at-home activity, such as teachers, scribes, printers, booksellers, and book purchasers (see also Höfele and von Koppenfels). Translation was crucial to early modern culture in bridging geographical travel and the travels of the mind.

Alessandra Petrina follows Hosington’s essay with a probing analysis and productive contextualisation of one specific translation: an English version of Petrarch’s *Triumph of Eternity* sometimes attributed to Elizabeth I. While acknowledging that its authorship remains uncertain, Petrina explores why this might have been thought a suitable work to be associated with the Queen, locating it in relation to her many other translations. She also sets it in the context of Elizabethan Petrarchism, and develops the discussion initiated by Hosington of translation as a means of acquiring and polishing language skills while also accumulating knowledge and enhancing the intellectual capital of English culture.

Gesine Manuwald then takes us from translation to other forms of literary hybridity and linguistic exchange: imitation, and composition in more than one tongue, as exemplified by an English practitioner of neo-Latin poetry. Her study of Thomas Campion (1567-1620) demonstrates complex triangular relationships among his ancient Latin sources and his neo-Latin and English compositions. In both languages he draws upon classical models with detailed knowledge, but also adapts forms and motifs for his own time and circumstances.
His poems thus combine tradition and innovation, looking backwards in order to make new artefacts from creative dialogue with the ancient past, while also demonstrating his skill and fluency in working in two languages.

Part II of the volume concerns international dialogues between cultural elites, with several contributors exploring courts as locations and generators of cultural exchange. Rayne Allinson and Geoffrey Parker present exciting fruits of new archival research, offering transcriptions and analysis of hitherto neglected or misidentified holograph letters from Mary I of England to Philip II of Spain, and from Philip to Elizabeth I. These documents demonstrate the multilingual nature of early modern ‘executive diplomacy’: while Latin was used for most formal international communications, these letters concerning various kinds of marriage negotiation are in more ‘intimate’ languages, with Mary writing to Philip in French (probably because of a lack of confidence in her Spanish), and Philip writing to Elizabeth in his native Spanish. The letters also illustrate the intersection of the personal and political in a world where a marriage was also an international treaty, and reveal the special value of letters in a monarch’s own hand, rather than that of a secretary or scribe. A holograph letter conveyed a powerful sense of presence and a wish for direct communication, and was reserved for occasions of particular significance, when unusual force or delicacy or both were required. They were totemic objects as well as textual communications, representing a particularly highly charged form of early modern exchange.

Following on from this, Tracey A. Sowerby discusses another form of symbolic object used in international diplomatic exchanges: the royal portrait. These artefacts too stood proxy for the rulers they represented, and gifting them was another way of configuring political alliance in terms of personal esteem and affection. Portrait gifts created and embodied various kinds of reciprocity and goodwill, serving to promote national interests, to encourage trade, and to confirm peace treaties. However they could also be used
competitively, to assert a ruler’s wealth and magnificence, or in subtly nuanced exchanges, for instance as a means of professing ongoing friendship while discreetly withholding practical support. Moreover, not only sending a gift but also the manner of its reception contributed to its meaning. Sowerby analyses the complex processes of negotiation, ritual, and mutual obligation involved in portrait exchanges, and shows how these extended across Europe and beyond to include exchanges with the Ottoman Sultan, the Moghul Emperor Jahangir, and the rulers of Persia and China.

Considering political exchanges closer to home, Noah Millstone discusses how the English looked across the Channel to glean lessons from the development of public politics in France in the 1620s and ’30s. As the science of ‘reason of state’ developed and took hold, Millstone emphasises that statecraft was learned not just from study of the past, as has been much discussed by historians of the early modern period, but also from experience of the contemporary conduct of politics in foreign nations. Indeed gaining political wisdom by means of comparison was one of the chief motivations of much travel and travel-writing. Millstone asserts the importance to early modern political thought of ‘emulation’, which he defines as ‘a form of imitation driven by watchful competition’. In particular, in a crucial period for the state-formation of each nation, English diplomats, advisers, political observers, writers, and booksellers looked to France for examples of the dissemination of political information and management of political debate. At a time of insecurity and unrest, early French newspapers such as the Gazette de France transmitted and controlled information on behalf of Cardinal Richelieu and the Bourbon regime and thereby ‘created an industry of cultural production meant to help mobilize cooperation with its ambitions’. Millstone analyses the reasons why, despite the urgings of advisers, the Stuart regime in practice resisted engagement in news management and publicity on the French model, but
demonstrates nevertheless that international comparison and emulation shaped a strenuous
debate on how best to conduct public politics.

The third and final section of the volume looks at diverse communities as settings for
cultural exchange, and at the roles of particular key individuals in initiating and developing
international dialogues. Andrew Hadfield’s recent acclaimed biography of Edmund Spenser
broke new ground in discovering the European connections and interests of this great writer,
previously represented as narrowly and even paranoiacally nationalistic. Hadfield’s essay
here foregrounds one of Spenser’s contacts, Sir Thomas Smith, described by Hadfield as a
public intellectual and ‘probably the closest candidate there is for an English Renaissance
man’. As author, diplomat, connoisseur, and patron, Smith was instrumental in importing and
disseminating many continental influences. He participated in the material culture of the
Renaissance, rebuilding Hill Hall in Essex as a classically styled palace on French and Italian
models and decorating it with emblematic designs which may well have influenced Spenser’s
artistic innovations. Smith’s library at Hill Hall was designed to foster and inspire a
community of scholars with an international outlook, and to be a centre for intellectual
debates and for Greek scholarship. He was also an important practitioner of contemporary
political analysis based in classical learning. As Hadfield shows, ‘no discussion of the
development of Renaissance thinking in England and Anglophone culture can afford to
ignore Smith’s crucial role’.

Where Hadfield focuses on an English traveller bringing foreign knowledge home,
Eva Johanna Holmberg considers the practices of travellers when abroad. She examines the
hitherto overlooked figure of the travelling companion in narratives of journeys through the
Ottoman Empire by Fynes Moryson and John Sanderson. A number of studies of early
modern cultural exchanges have focused on this region (see for instance Vitkus; Dimmock;
MacLean), but Holmberg’s ‘semantics of companionship’ offers a fresh angle. She places the
choice of travel companion in the context of *ars apodemica* (art of travel) advice literature, and of traditions and definitions of friendship. Moryson recommended travelling with natives rather than one’s own countrymen, while Sanderson travelled with a group of Jews; travel thereby involved cultural exchange not only through encounters with new places, but also through the developing relationship with the companion as simultaneously friend and alien stranger. The figure of the companion, especially when of a different nationality, race, or religion, bore a range of different meanings, and had an effect on the traveller and his writing. Factual details about the companion were significant in affirming the travel-writer’s reputation as a both judicious traveller and a reliable author.

Eavan O’Brien discusses a play by Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz, in many ways an iconic figure of early modern cultural exchange: born near Mexico City in New Spain, illegitimate and of mixed parentage, she became a scholar, a nun, and a prolific author. O’Brien uses her play *Los empeños de una casa* (*The Trials of a Noble House*) to demonstrate how Sor Juana synthesised literary influences from Old Spain, including allusion and homage to Calderón and other Spanish authors, with distinctive New Spain ingredients, such as a reference to Aztec sacrifice, and a song and dance uniting Mexico’s main ethnic groups, Spaniards, Africans, Italians, and Mexicans. Sor Juana is shown to be particularly original in the prominence she gives to female characters by foregrounding themes of love and marriage in a domestic setting and depicting the erotic and intellectual agency of women. Rather than the more usual cross-dressing figure of a woman dressed as a man, she includes a man dressed as a woman. O’Brien concludes that her play represents a fascinating case of cultural exchange between a New World female author and a European, male-authored dramatic tradition.

Finally, Caroline Bowden’s essay explores the cross-cultural dialogues of other nuns in a European setting: the members of the English convents in exile in Flanders and northern France. As director of the important and ground-breaking *Who Were the Nuns?* research
project at Queen Mary, University of London, Bowden is well placed to show how these convents operated as islands of Englishness outside England, and as enclosed communities which nevertheless could not avoid involvement with their indigenous neighbours in diverse practical, social, and spiritual ways. Although their mission was to preserve a vision of ‘true’ Catholic Englishness until such time as the faith should be restored in the home country, at the same time they inevitably interacted with and to some extent became integrated into surrounding French or Flemish communities. Their convent churches in particular were ‘liminal spaces, built to allow visitors to attend divine office without seeing the choir nuns who sat in a section of the chapel that was constructed at an angle or at an upper level’. This is a striking visual and physical emblem of the nuns’ simultaneous segregation and integration: separated from their surrounding communities by their holy orders and their Englishness; united however with these neighbours by the shared Catholic faith that had exiled the nuns from England; and audible but invisible in communal acts of worship.

Some of these essays consider broad themes while others carefully analyse, explicate, and contextualise selected examples of cultural exchange in particular times and places. They mobilise shifts of perspective and develop useful new vocabularies and conceptual tools for understanding cross-cultural encounters. The essays also speak to one another about the motivations, circumstances, agents, and processes of early modern cross-border dialogues, and about their political, artistic, and literary consequences. As a collection they forcefully demonstrate how communications and negotiations between nations and language-communities generated much of the vigour, vitality, and intellectual innovation of early modern culture. We hope readers will find that they offer inspiration for further exchanges.
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