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ABSTRACT
In A Mask Presented at Ludlow Castle (1634), John Milton depicts Comus “ripe and frolic of his full grown age, Roving the Celtic and Iberian fields.” While Milton’s complex engagement with Portugal and Spain has been the subject of some discussion by critics, few attempts have been made to place his writings on the Iberian Peninsula within the wider context of his theories of climatic influence and colonialism, beyond the “western design” against Spanish colonial possessions. Anti-Catholicism and anti-imperialism may be the key to Milton’s Cromwellian correspondence with Spain and Portugal on behalf of the English republic in the 1650s but his Iberian interests can be viewed too as part of a deeper excavation of British and Irish histories. The purpose of this article – its “roving commission” – is to explore the presence of the Peninsula in Milton’s work from “Lycidas” (1637) through to The History of Britain (1670) in relation to recent archipelagic readings of Milton, examining the ways in which Celtic and Iberian concerns are intertwined in Milton (as indeed they were for his predecessor, Edmund Spenser).
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* This essay was presented as a plenary paper at “Charting Early Modern Culture: Seascapes, Landscapes, Mindscapes, SEDERI XXIV,” the International Conference for the Spanish and Portuguese Society for English Renaissance Studies, in the historic port of Huelva, Spain, 13-15 March 2013. I am grateful to Clara Calvo and Zenón Luis Martínez for their kind invitation and generous hospitality on this occasion. I would also like to thank the two anonymous readers whose excellent suggestions I have tried to incorporate as far as I could, and which I will draw on again when I have an opportunity to explore this topic further.
This exploratory essay excavates key aspects of John Milton’s Iberian interests, examining the ways in which his knowledge of and dealings with Portugal and Spain impinged on his poetry and prose, and suggesting that English and British imperial aspirations, from Ireland to the “New World,” compromised and complicated the politics of the Commonwealth, making Cromwell’s colonial republicanism less distinct from the imperial monarchy of Charles I than Milton might have wished. At the same time the argument offered here, drawing on recent “Archipelagic” readings of Milton, suggests that his attitude to Empire is revealed not just in his writings on Portugal and Spain but also in his treatment of England’s most significant colonial project, the Plantation of Ulster, making Milton’s Irish *Observations* and the Spanish Treaty (1652) and Declaration (1655) documents deserving of a close comparative analysis such as is beyond the scope of the present intervention, although some intriguing advances have been made in that direction already (Lim 1998:196-204).

The entry under “Celtiberian” in the *Oxford English Dictionary* reads: “Of or pertaining to Celtiberia, an ancient province of Spain lying between the Tagus and the Ebro, or to its inhabitants the Celtiberi, a union of Celts with Iberians.” The term reappeared in English translations of Lucan and Livy around 1600 in reference to Rome’s Celtiberian Wars. While Milton’s complex engagement with Portugal and Spain has been the subject of some discussion by critics, few attempts have been made to place his writings on the Iberian Peninsula in the wider context of his theories of climatic influence and colonialism, beyond the “western design” against Spanish colonial possessions. Anti-Catholicism and anti-imperialism are key to Milton’s Cromwellian correspondence with Spain and Portugal on behalf of the English republic in the 1650s but his Iberian interests can be viewed too as part of an ongoing excavation of British and Irish histories. Milton’s interests in Spain and Portugal are bound up with his writings on Ireland, and future research ought to focus in a sustained manner on such links. What I aim to do here is more modest, an approach I hope is justified both by the relative novelty of the topic and by the specific context of a plenary paper written for a conference. The purpose of this essay – its “roving commission” – is to explore the presence of the Iberian Peninsula in Milton’s work from “Lycidas” (1637) to *The History of Britain* (1670), examining the ways in which Celtic and Iberian concerns are
intertwined for Milton, as they were for his predecessor, Edmund Spenser (Carroll 1996; Fuchs 2002; Herron 2002).

As John Shawcross acknowledges in his study of the poet’s influence or as he calls it “presence” in that region, “little has been written about Milton and Iberia” (1998:41). It is a skeleton topic, but not a ghost topic. References to Spain and Portugal in Milton’s work are few and fleeting, but have some significance in relation to his larger concerns. The earliest allusions are to be found in the poetry, in Comus (1634) and Lycidas (1637; published 1645), a lament for a loss of life on the Irish Seas, with its movement between the Hebrides and Anglesey and Namancos (Namancos) and Bayona, and its allusion to “Fountain Arthuse” (line 85) in the Sicilian city of Syracuse, “then ruled from Spanish Naples” (Campbell and Corns 2008:121). Lawrence Lipking has linked “Lycidas” to Os Lusiads, the imperial epic of Portuguese writer Vaz de Camões, first published in 1572 and translated into English in 1655 (Lipking 1996). Milton’s use of the word “Namancos” (line 162) has drawn puzzlement. In 1907, Albert Cook explained the reference as a misreading of “Nemancos,” an error that first appeared in a 1606 map (1907:124-128). Nemancos is “one of the 36 archpresbyteries – an Englishman might call them rural deaneries – into which the archbishopric of Santiago de Compostella is divided” (Cook 1907:126).

In A Mask Presented at Ludlow Castle (1634), Milton depicts Comus “ripe and frolic of his full grown age, Roving the Celtic and Iberian fields.” In his note on this line in his edition of The Complete Poems, Gordon Campbell glosses “Celtic and Iberian” as “French and Spanish” (1980:493), but for Philip Schwyzer, mindful that it was first performed at Ludlow Castle on the Anglo-Welsh border, the Celtiberian connection comes closer to home, so that “the background of Comus, who has retired to Britain after ‘Roving the Celtic, and Iberian fields’ [...] closely resembles Spenser’s genealogy of the Irish race. [...] Untamed, seductive, Ibero-Celtic in origin, Comus blends features of the wild Irishman with characteristics more specifically appropriate to the Welsh border” (1997:35). Likewise, for Achsah Guibbory “The references to the ‘Celtic and Iberian fields’ recall the common belief that many of the Irish had migrated from Spain, which explained their Catholicism and supposed barbarity,” as well as playing on the recurrent fear of a Spanish landing in Wales (2006:160).
The prose too contains passing allusions to Iberia. In *The Reason of Church Government* (1641c) Milton writes of the bishops: “if to bring a num and chil stupidity of soul, an unactive blindnesse of minde upon the people by their leaden doctrine, or no doctrine at all, if to persecute all knowing and zealous Christians by the violence of their courts, be to keep away schisme, they keep away schisme indeed; and by this kind of discipline all Italy and Spaine is as purely and politickly kept from schisme as England hath beene by them” (Milton 1641c:23). In *Areopagitica* (1644), Milton says of the proposed law on licensing: “If the amendment of manners be aym’d at, look into Italy and Spain, whether those places be one scruple the better, the honester, the wiser, the chaster, since all the inquisitionall rigor that hath bin executed upon books” (Milton 1644:19). In *Tetrachordon* (1645), Milton mentions that “the Counsel of Eliberis [Elvira] in Spain decreed the husband excommunicat, If he kept his wife being an adultress; but if he left her, he might after ten yeares be recev’d into communion, if he retain’d her any while in his house after the adultery known” (Milton 1645:83). In *Observations Upon the Articles of Peace made with the Irish Rebels* (1649), Milton says of the Belfast Presbytery, “we hold it no more to be the hedg and bulwark of Religion, than the Popish and Prelaticall Courts, or the Spanish Inquisition” (Milton 1649a:60).

This last reference is in line with Milton’s arguments in *The Tenure of Kings and Magistrates* (1649), where he attacks tyrants, “whether forren or native:”

For looke how much right the King of Spaine hath to govern us at all, so much right hath the King of England to govern us tyrannically. If he, though not bound to us by any league, comming from Spaine in person to subdue us or to destroy us, might lawfully by the people of England either bee slaine in fight, or put to death in captivity, what hath a native King to plead, bound by so many Covnants, benefits and honours to the welfare of his people. (Milton 1649b:19)

Here Milton adds: “Who knows not that there is a mutual bond of amity and brotherhood between man and man over all the World, neither is it the English Sea that can sever us from that duty and relation: a straier bond yet there is between fellow-subjects, neighbours, and friends” (Milton 1649b:19).
Also in *The Tenure*, Milton cites the example of the Dutch Republic as an instance of a nation that freed itself from the yoke of empire, as England had at the time of the Reformation, and again from “monarchical pride” (*PL. II.*428) in 1649: “In the yeare 1581. the States of Holland in a general Assembly at the Hague, abjur’d all obedience and subjection to Philip King of Spaine; […] From that time, to this no State or Kingdom in the World hath equally prosperd” (Milton 1649b:28). Milton made this point again in 1651 in *A defence of the people of England* (1651; trans. 1692), when he asked his royalist opponent Claudius Salmasius: “did you not remember, that the Commonwealth of the people of Rome flourished and became glorious when they had banished their Kings? Could you possibly forget that of the Low-Countries? which after it had shook off the yoke of the King of Spain, after long and tedious Wars, but Crown’d with success, obtained its Liberty” (Milton 1692:121).

In *Eikonoklastes* (1649; 1650), Milton accused the late king of a Celtiberian conspiracy at the time of the Ulster Rising of 1641, first by trying to rescue Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford and Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, “to that end expressly commanding the admittance of new Soldiers into the Tower […] under pretence for the Portugall; though that Embassador, beeing sent to, utterly deny’d to know of any such Commission from his Maister” (Milton 1650:81), and secondly, by refusing to disband “8000 Irish Papists […] under pretence of lending them to the Spaniard; and so kept them undisbanded till very neere the Mounth wherein that Rebellion broke forth. He was also raising Forces in London, pretendedly to serve the Portugall, but with intent to seise the Tower” (Milton 1650:90). Milton’s claim that Charles manipulated his Iberian and Hibernian interests, playing them off against one another “under pretence,” is further proof of the intertwined nature of those ideological investments.

In *The History of Britain* (1670), Milton records an intriguing moment in Archipelagic-Iberian relations, part of the myth of Spanish origins for Ireland (Carroll 1996). Of the ancient British king Gurguntius, Milton says that after subduing the Danes: “In his return finding about the Orkneys 30 Ships of Spain, or Biscay, fraught with Men and Women for a Plantation, whose Captain also Bartholinus wrongfully banish’t, as he pleaded, besought him that som part of his Territory might be assign’d them to dwell in, he sent
with them certain of his own men to Ireland, which then lay unpeopled; and gave them that Island to hold of him as in Homage” (Milton 1670:24).

Finally, in the posthumously published A brief history of Moscovia (1682), Milton wrote: “1584. At the Coronation of Pheodor the Emperour, Ierom Horsey being then Agent in Russia, and call’d for to court with one Iohn de Wale a Merchant of the Netherlands and a Subject of Spain, some of the Nobles would have preferr’d the Fleming before the English. But to that our Agent would in no case agree, saying he would rather have his Leggs cut off by the Knees, then bring his present in course after a Subject of Spain. The Emperour and Prince Boris perceiving the controversy, gave order to admit Horsey first” (Milton 1682:99-100). A free Englishman was above a Spanish colonial subject in the pecking order.

As well as the allusions to Spain and Portugal in his poetry and prose, we have Milton’s involvement in documents drawn up by the Cromwellian regime regarding those two countries in his capacity as Secretary for Foreign Tongues to the Commonwealth Council of State, a post to which he was appointed on 15 March 1649, just as Cromwell was preparing to lead the English army into Ireland. According to Gordon Campbell, “Milton had a modest competence in the Spanish language, sufficient at least to translate from the Spanish and hold his own in a conversation, but [...] his command of Spanish literature was slight” (1996:131). Most of Milton’s work for the Council of State apparently involved rendering English drafts into Latin. Two key documents are the Spanish Treaty of 12 November 1652, entitled ARTICLES for the Renewing of a Peace and Friendship between the Parliament of the Commonwealth of England, and his most Serene Majesty the King of Spain; offered by the Council of State to the Ambassador of the said King, and the 1655 text that supplanted it, A Declaration of His Highness, by the Advice of His Council; setting forth, on the behalf of this Commonwealth, the Justice of their Cause against Spain. According to Robert Fallon, the early attribution of the 1655 Declaration to Milton is doubtful, whereas the Spanish Treaty of 12 November 1652 is more certainly Milton’s work, albeit administrative rather than authorial (Fallon 1993:99-100).

If Milton appears to have relatively little to say on Iberian issues, then Milton critics are also largely silent on the topic. Recent biographies barely touch on Spain or Portugal. Any mention made is
likely to allude simply to Milton’s anti-Catholicism, and the 1655 Cromwellian Declaration once ascribed to Milton—though now cast into doubt—has reinforced that sense of anti-Spanish feeling. Fallon’s case for seeing Milton as a key figure in the composition of the draft Spanish treaty of 1652 suggests Milton’s main involvement with Spain lay in brokering a peace rather than declaring war.

If Milton’s relations with Spain and Portugal are complex, so too are Anglo-Iberian relations in the period as a whole, and indeed Brito-Celtiberian or Archipelagic-Peninsular relations. One focal point of Anglo-Spanish tension in the late sixteenth century was Ireland. England’s enlargement into Britain was part of an imperial project—the Western Design—that threatened Iberian domination of the New World. According to Marx, the Cromwellian republic was shipwrecked on Ireland (Marx and Engels 1986:378-379). This claim can be extended: the republic was shipwrecked on Empire.

Two years after the Treaty of Granada, which saw the curtailment of Moorish power in the south of Spain, Spanish-born Pope Alexander VI divided the “New World” between Spain and Portugal in 1493, reinforced by the treaties of Tordesillas and Saragossa in 1494 and 1529. England’s Reformation and accompanying declaration of itself as an empire challenged that division. The 1533 Act in Restraint of Appeals to Rome asserted England’s independence from papal jurisdiction: “Where by divers sundry old authentic histories and chronicles it is manifestly declared and expressed that this realm of England is an empire, so hath been accepted in the world” (MacLachlan 1990:66). From the moment it established itself as a separate nation independent of empire—Rome—England simultaneously declared itself an Empire, albeit one consisting of various Tudor “borderlands”—the English Pale in Ireland, the Marches of Wales, and the Pale around Calais. Between the defeat of the Armada in 1588 and the Spanish treaties drawn up by James VI and I in 1604 and Charles I in November 1630, called a “Plenopotentia,” Anglo-Spanish or Brito-Iberian relations were uneasy (Fallon 1993:95).

In a 1926 essay entitled “Milton in Spain,” Edgar Allison Peers wrote, “The history, such as it is, of the vogue of Milton in Spain, is strikingly different from that of the influence of every other Englishman of letters who has up to the present been studied in his relations with Spanish literature,” which Peers found unsurprising.
since Spain is, he said, “a country which has so little sympathy with the England of the Commonwealth” (1926:169, 183). Yet after Charles I was executed in January 1649, Spain was the first European state to recognise the new republic, “the first European nation to appoint a minister of ambassadorial rank [the experienced diplomat, Alphonso de Cardenas] to the Republic as well as the first to acknowledge Parliament as the sovereign power in England,” and as Robert Fallon observes, “Anglo-Spanish relations were quite cordial during the early years of the Republic” (1993:93; 88-89). At that time, Britain and Spain shared a common enemy in Portugal, which asserted its independence in 1640 after 60 years as part of the Iberian Union established by Philip II in 1581.

The new English Republic certainly had hostile relations with Portugal. King John IV supported exiled English royalists (Fallon 1993:43). Behind and between all the negotiations with Spain and arguably Portugal too loomed the spectre of the so-called “New World.” As Fallon observes: “Cromwell’s vision of a Western Design soon overshadowed all other considerations of peace and war with Spain” (1993:96). Milton was intensely involved in the Spanish negotiations in the early 1650s, but less so after 1654 and he was allegedly not directly involved in relation to Cromwell’s declaration of war, which was in fact a public admission that an Anglo-Spanish colonial conflict was already underway. Fallon takes the view that Milton’s contribution to the Declaration is rendered doubtful in part because the document itself is a compendium of Spanish abuses against the English and the Indians in the New World, a subject that had no apparent impact upon his imagination” (1993:99-100). This is a debatable point. In both his drafting of the Spanish treaty and in his Irish Observations of 1649 Milton could be said to have been preoccupied with precisely such colonial concerns, and David Armitage has shown just how embroiled in Empire Milton was, albeit in Armitage’s view as an opponent (1992; 1995). Rodger Martin has traced Milton’s interest in the New World from the allusions to Brazil and Peru in Animadversions (1641) through to the references to the Incan and Mexican Emperors Atabalipa and Montezuma in Paradise Lost (11.407-409) (1998:328; Milton 1641c:29).

Conveniently coinciding with Cromwell’s turn against Spain, Milton’s nephew John Phillips published in 1656
an English translation of Bartolome de las Casas’s *The Tears of the Indians*, a devastating condemnation of Spanish atrocities in America. Estimates of how many Indians died in the years after Cortez’s conquest of Mexico vary; Casas’s subtitle reads “an historical […] account of the cruel massacres and slaughter of above twenty-millions of innocent people.” (Fallon 1993:399)

Fallon states: “I can bring to mind no reference in Milton’s poetry or prose to this barbarous destruction of an entire race. Were the Spanish Declaration his work, the passage on the genocide […] would constitute his sole allusion to it” (Fallon 1993:99, n.65). But is this true? Milton’s preoccupation with the “Black Legend” suggests otherwise (Hodgkins 2002). Milton’s *Observations* also offers counter-evidence. There his estimate of 200,000 Protestants slain in the Ulster Rising outstrips most contemporary figures and is the kind of claim that “made atrocities against Irish Catholics more likely” (Kerrigan 2008a:227). Milton had also written about an atrocity in “On the Late Massacre at Piedmont” (1655), and the final massacre alluded to on the last page of Cromwell’s *Declaration* is “that sad tragedy which was lately acted upon our Brethren in the Valleys of Piedmont” (142).

The 1655 *Declaration* was, as Fallon points out, “in effect a declaration of war […] a statement condemning the Spanish for crimes against the English stretching back to the year of the Armada, and accusing them of treacherously planning to renew the war against England” (1993:88). The murder of Cromwell’s Commonwealth ambassador Anthony Ascham in Madrid on 6 June 1650 tainted the peace negotiations (Baldwin 2004; Fallon 1993:391). These negotiations were also tainted by the fact that England/Britain wanted access to the Iberian empire. The *Declaration* is a fascinating text, a rich and complex work, and one that needs to be read alongside the 1649 *Observations* on Ireland, as does the Spanish Treaty, for obvious reasons, since both texts contain detailed comments on disputed articles of negotiation. 1649 was not the absolute break it seemed at first sight. Killing the king did not kill expansionist ambitions. Rather, an imperial monarchy was merely replaced by a colonial republic.

Evidence of continuity within discontinuity occurs in the negotiation of the treaty. As Fallon explains, the 1652 draft was “based largely in wording and particulars on the 1630 document. Some inapplicable articles of the old treaty are omitted and others brought up to date, e.g., in those provisions that require the English
to impose sanctions of one kind or another against a third power, Cardenas simply changed the name of the country from ‘Holland,’ Spain’s old enemy, to ‘Portugal’ its new one” (1993:95-96). Article 8 of the Spanish Treaty is interesting, as it shows that Empire was a major stumbling block. The draft proposed article reads:

That the People of the Common-Wealth of England, and the Subjects of the King of Spain, may freely without any Licence or Safe Conduct, General or Special, Sail into each others Islands, Countries, Ports, Towns, or Villages, and Places possessed by either of them respectively and other Parts, as well in America, as Asia or Africa, and there to Traffick, Remain and Trade with all sorts of Wares and Merchandizes, and them at their pleasure, in their own Ships, to Transport to any other Place or Country, any Law made and published by either part to the contrary thereof notwithstanding. (Fallon 1993:235)

The Spanish revision of this article reads: “The Ambassador propounds instead of this the following Article, That the Subjects of Spain, and the People of England respectively, may freely without any Licence or Safe Conduct, General or Special, Sail into the Kingdoms, Dominions, Ports, Havens, Towns, and Villages of each other, and that there be free Comerce, except, as hitherto, in the Kingdoms, Provinces, Islands, Ports and Places strengthened with Forts, Lodges, or Castles, and all other possessed by the one or the other Party in the East or West Indies, or other Parts as well in America, as in Asia or Africa, so as the Subjects of Spain shall not Sail nor Trade into the Ports, Islands, Dominions and Plantations which England possesses in the said Parts, nor the People of England into the Kingdoms, Islands and Dominions which in all the aforesaid Parts are possessed by and belong to Spain” (Fallon 1993:235). Spain clearly wished to retain the Pope’s donation and its grip on the “New World.”

Thomas Birch attributed the Declaration to Milton in his 1738 edition of the prose works (Shawcross 1998:42-43). The War of Jenkins’ Ear, or Guerra del Asiento, that broke out in 1739, took its name from Robert Jenkins, who had his ear cut off by the Spanish Coast Guard in the Caribbean in 1731. Shawcross thinks the 1738 “publication of Milton’s Spanish Treaty was clearly for immediate political reasons,” but it was the 1655 Declaration that was published, not the 1652 treaty, and as Fallon argued, Milton had no hand in the latter (1998:43). The Declaration, in which Cromwell challenges the “Pope’s Donation” of the New World to Portugal and Spain (116),
was dislodged from Milton’s works in the Yale edition of the prose, but my own reading of Milton’s works from this period makes me wonder how secure that revision is. In any case, the Declaration is a fascinating document. It claims that English colonial possessions were “devoid of people” prior to settlement, and the reference throughout is to “England” and “English” (not “Commonwealth”). It speaks of James I’s attempts to “slubber up a peace with Spain” (121). That word “slubber” is used by Shakespeare in Othello (1.3.225) and The Merchant of Venice (2.8.39), but more to the point Milton uses it in Of Reformation (1641b), when speaking of “the art of policie […] in Christian Common-wealths:”

It is a work good, and prudent to be able to guide one man; of larger extended vertue to order wel one house; but to govern a Nation piously, and justly, which only is to say happily, is for a spirit of the greatest size, and divinest mettle. And certainly of no lesse a mind, nor of lesse excellence in another way, were they who by writing layd the solid, and true foundations of this Science, which being of greatest importance to the life of man, yet there is no art that hath bin more canker’d in her principles, more soyl’d, and sluber’d with aforismatic pedantry then the art of policie; and that most, where a man would thinke should least be, in Christian Common-wealths. They teach not that to govern well is to train up a Nation in true wisdom and vertue, and that which springs from thence magnanimity, (take heed of that) and that which is our beginning, regeneration, and happiest end, likenes to God, which in one word we call godliness, & that this is the true flourishing of a Land, other things follow as the shadow does the substance: to teach thus were meer pulpitry to them. (Milton 1641b:42-43)

The use of one word does not prove Milton’s authorship but I have yet to see the incontrovertible argument for the Declaration not having Milton’s stamp on it. Cromwell speaks of “the common Brotherhood between all Mankind” when he allies the English colonists and natives of that region as victims of Spanish atrocities. This recalls Milton’s allusion to “a mutual bond of amity and brotherhood between man and man over all the World” (Milton 1649b:19).

John Thurloe, Secretary to the Council of State under Cromwell, certainly believed that British-Spanish relations were wrecked by imperial ambitions and, from Spain’s perspective, the competing claims of the Cromwellian Commonwealth to colonial possessions.
Thurloe informed the earl of Clarendon: “Don Alonso [Cardenas, the Spanish ambassador] was pleased to answere: that to ask a liberty from the inquisition and free sayling in the West Indies, was to ask his master’s two eyes” (Cited Armitage 1992:536). This echoes the 1655 Declaration, where Cromwell denies demanding of the King of Spain “his right Eye, much less (as hath been said) both his eyes,” and makes it clear that those two eyes are the Inquisition and exclusive rights to the New World, Spanish spheres of influence that the Commonwealth intended to go eyeball-to-eyeball on (Cromwell 1655:122-123).

Cromwell early in 1655 had launched an audacious expedition to Hispaniola (known in Spanish as La Espanola or locally as Ispayola, and consisting of the Dominican Republic and Haiti) and Cuba (Armitage 1992:538). The April 1655 landing by Cromwellian forces on Hispaniola was a failure. Supplied with “six black clerical coats” and “two thousand Bibles,” the English troops’ greatest achievement in the words of General Robert Venables, who served in Ireland from 1649-1654 and presided over the massacre at Drogheda, occurred when the “soldiers brought forth a large statue of the Virgin Mary, well accoutered, and palted her to death with oranges” (Cited Armitage 1992:539-540). Venables was joint commander with William Penn, another colonist for whom Ireland was a staging post to the so-called New World. Jamaica was attacked next by the same expeditionary force on 10 May 1655 (Armitage 1992:540).

One Portuguese angle on Milton mentioned already is his awareness and indeed use of Camoens’ Lusiads, translated into English in 1655 by Sir Richard Fanshawe, British ambassador to Portugal and later Spain under Charles II. As John Shawcross notes, “Fanshawe’s ten-book structure in his version of the epic about Vasco da Gama was influential in Milton’s structuring Paradise Lost originally in ten books” (1992:42). Shawcross notes another English translation of the Lusiads in 1776 by William Julius Mickle, which draws its “language, diction, and images […] from Paradise Lost […] and [in its] notes [discusses] Milton in relation to epic theory and practice or in relation to Camões” (1998:48). Portugal became important again after the Restoration when on 23rd October 1662 Charles II married by proxy the Portuguese princess the Infanta Catherine of Braganza, the daughter of John IV, who allegedly popularised the taking of tea in England, an Eastern import already
established in Portugal. She was reportedly offered a glass of ale on 13 May 1662 on landing at Portsmouth in lieu of the tea she had asked for. Catherine’s dowry included Bombay and Tangier. The latter proved a costly gift, because between 1662 and 1684 the British garrison there cost £75,000 a year, a two million pounds drain on the treasury over the period.

As Barbara Fuchs and others have noted, connections between Ireland, Spain and Morocco in the early modern period are complex (Fuchs 2002; Stradling 1994). Comparisons were made between Spanish treatment of natives in the New World and English treatment of the Irish. The Irish enlisted the aid of the Spanish to expel the English while the Spanish used the Irish to help in the struggle against the Moors. Sir John Davies compared the transplantation of the Irish in Ulster to the Spanish expulsion of the Moors. Writing to the Earl of Salisbury on 8 November 1610, Davies declared: “this transplantation of the natives is made by his Majesty rather like a father than like a lord or monarch. The Romans transplanted whole nations out of Germany into France; the Spaniards lately removed all the Moors out of Granada into Barbary, without providing them any new seats there” (Cited Fuchs 2002:50). One of the final twists in the tail of Hiberno-Spanish-Moorish relations came when Irish troops served (on both sides) at the Siege of Tangier in 1680, where William O’Brien, Earl of Inchiquin, who subsequently served as Governor of Jamaica, commanded English/British forces. Tangier was a costly disaster, abandoned by Britain in 1684.

Iberian works translated in Milton’s day included “Francisco de Quintana’s (called Francisco de las Coveras) The History of Don Fenise (1651), The Novels of Dom Francisco de Quevedo Villegas (1671), and Bartolomé de las Casas’ The Tears of the Indians being An Historical and true Account Of the Cruel Massacres and Slaughters […] Committed by the Spaniards (1656)” (Shawcross 1992:41). Las Casas’ work is especially significant for having been translated by John Phillips, Milton’s nephew. As Shawcross notes, “Phillips cites the very recent wars between Spain and England, the treaty enacted under Oliver Cromwell […] and Spanish cruelties.” More Milton Iberian connections emerge when we recall that “Phillips also translated The History of the Most Renowned Don Quixote (1687), and his older brother Edward produced The Illustrious Shepherdess (with The
Imperial Brother) in 1656, translated from Juan Pérez de Montalván’s Sucesos y prodigios de amor (‘La villana de Pinto’ and ‘El envidioso castigado’)" (Shawcross 1992:42).

Shawcross lists all the known Spanish and Portuguese translations of Milton, including lost versions of Paradise Lost. The earliest known translation of Milton’s epic into Spanish as El Paraíso perdido “was allegedly undertaken in 1747, in prose, by Ignacio de Luzán; no full translation was published and none has been discovered” (Shawcross 1998:44). Shawcross also lists the Portuguese translations of Paradise Lost, beginning with the prose version by José Amaro da Silva published in Lisbon in the revolutionary year of 1789, alongside Paradiso Restaurado. Shawcross concludes: “In all, in the last couple of decades of the eighteenth century and then throughout the nineteenth century Spanish and Portuguese versions of Paradise Lost were available, as well as Paradise Regain’d in Portuguese, and influence or presence can be seen in works and criticism thereafter” (1998:46).


Later poets responded to Milton in their Iberian interventions. Robert Southey visited Portugal and Spain in 1795, and in Letters Written during a Short Residence in Spain and Portugal. With Some
Account of Spanish and Portuguese Poetry (1797) Shawcross notes “Miltonic influence [...] arising during (and because of?) his Iberian residence” (1998:48). In an excellent essay that appeared in 2012, “The People and the Poet Redeemed: William Wordsworth and the Peninsular Uprising,” Georgina Green reminds us that Wordsworth, in The Convention of Cintra (1809), drew on Milton in his defence of Spain and Portugal at the time of the Peninsular Uprising against Napoleon and French rule in 1808. Like his contemporaries, Henry Brougham and Francis Jeffrey, writing in the Edinburgh Review, Wordsworth was inspired by “Spain’s embodiment of the principles of popular sovereignty” (Green 2012:936). Brougham and Jeffrey declared “the plain and broad fact is this – that every Englishman who has, for the last six months, heartily wished that the Spaniards should succeed, has knowingly and wilfully wished for a radical reform” (Cited Green 2012:936). Green observes that “For Robert Southey,” who travelled to Spain and Portugal in the 1790s and translated poetry in the style of Milton, “the British generals betrayed the cause of Spain and Portugal [...] by degrading into a common and petty war between soldier and soldier, that which is the struggle of a nation against a foreign usurper, a business of natural life and death, a war of virtue against vice, light against darkness, the good principle against the evil one” (2012:938). For Green, “Wordsworth’s 1809 tract on the Peninsular Uprising represents his most successful and unequivocal commitment to ‘the people’ and their sovereignty” (2012:939).

According to Green: “Wordsworth interprets the Peninsular Uprising as an emanation of constituent power [...] The people of the peninsula are imagined as Milton’s Lycidas, whom nature would not harm, but who dies at sea thanks to the manmade ‘fatal and perfidious bark’ which, like the Convention of Cintra was ‘Built in th’eclipse, and rigg’d with curses dark’ [...] By associating the Spanish people with Milton’s Lycidas, Wordsworth imagines this conflict through the politics of pastoral poetry, just as he had in the Lyrical Ballads” (2012:951-952). Another chance of liberty shipwrecked by empire. According to Wordsworth:

It was not for the soil, or for the cities and forts, that Portugal was valued, but for the human feeling which was there; for the rights of human nature which might be there conspicuously asserted; for a triumph over injustice and oppression there to be achieved, which could neither be concealed nor disguised, and which
should penetrate the darkest corner of the dark Continent of Europe by its splendour. We combated for victory in the empire of reason, for strong-holds in the imagination. Lisbon and Portugal, as city and soil, were chiefly prized by us as a language; but our Generals mistook the counters of the game for the stake played for. (Cited Green 2012:952)

Approaching the Peninsular Uprising from a different perspective, in “From Spain to New Spain: Revisiting the Potestas Populi in Hispanic Political Thought,” Mónica Quijada traces the development of radical republican and anti-colonial thought in early modern Spain, and “studies the configuration in Hispanic political thought of the principle that true legitimacy is based on the consent of the community and on the contractual nature of the origin of political power” (2008:185). According to Quijada, the 1812 Constitution of Cadiz, the exiled government’s defiant issuing of a liberal constitution, has to be read in the context of a long struggle. Quijada comments:

Perhaps it is not completely coincidental that Bartolomé de las Casas’ De rege potestate, published in 1571 in Germany after being banned in Spain, was enthusiastically embraced by liberals who republished it in 1822 in Paris and in 1843 in Spain. The introduction of the latter edition stated that the treatise “could serve as a solid foundation for the most splendid democratic constitution of a modern republic [...] nothing [it went on to say] more liberal, more democratic, more essentially popular and equitable, nor more coercive in principle to the power of princes and rulers, has been written and established in modern constitutions.” (2008:218-219)

For Quijada, “these ideas [...] form part of a political imaginaire, created throughout the centuries, an imaginaire that contributed to defining the patterns of participation in the Hispanic world during the age of the Great Atlantic Revolutions, in expanding electoral practices associated with the adaptation and reconfiguration of the municipal tradition, and in shaping a constitution such as the one of Cadiz” (2008:218-219). A Spanish version of Paradise Lost, produced in 1868 by Colombian translator Aníbal Galindo, was seen by A. C. Howell “as inspiration in the struggle of Latin-American nations to attain liberty;” evidence, John Shawcross argues, that “Paradise Lost has frequently been the source of thought countering oppression as in the American colonies just before and just after the founding government came into existence and as in the French experience of
those same times” (Shawcross 1998:41-42). And indeed Milton’s influence on anti-colonial and revolutionary struggles for independence is more marked and remarked upon than his more problematic legacy as an advocate of the subjection of Ireland (Davies 1995; Fenton 2005).

“A little onward lend thy guiding hand | To these dark steps, a little furder on” (Samson Agonistes, 1-2). Another key aspect of Milton’s Iberian politics can be seen in his complex relationship with the Spanish viceroyalty of Naples, a hugely significant European centre (Naddeo 2004). Indeed, the title of “Spanish Naples” could be broadened to “Iberian Italy,” because as Peter Mazur’s recent research reveals, there was a potent Portuguese presence there too (Mazur 2013:81-99). Milton visited Naples in 1638 and became acquainted with the poet Giambattista Manso, “an habitué of the vice-regal court” (Campbell and Corns 2008:119-121). In Comus, when Milton speaks of “the Songs of Sirens sweet, | By dead Parthenope’s dear tomb” (878), he alludes to the ancient name of Naples (Campbell 1980:496). In The Tenure, Milton warns against complacency or compromise in the face of tyranny and cites as evidence contemporary experience, including the April 1648 suppression of the Neapolitan revolt that broke out in October 1647:

How the massacre at Paris was the effect of that credulous peace which the French Protestants made with Charles the ninth thir King: and that the main visible cause which to this day hath sav’d the Netherlands from utter ruine, was thir finall not beleiving the perfidious cruelty which as a constant maxim of State hath bin us’d by the Spanish Kings on thir Subjects that have tak’n armes and after trusted them; as no later age but can testi’fie, heretofore in Belgia it self, and this very yeare in Naples. (Milton 1649b:40)

Peter Burke has noted the way in which the rising in Naples was represented, taking its place in a pattern of similar revolts (2009:252). Three aspects of the Neapolitan rebellion are worth noting in relation to Milton. The first is that contemporaries drew analogies between England’s grip on Ireland and Spain’s on Naples. Joad Raymond observes that a contemporary of Milton’s, writing in the The Moderate Intelligencer in May 1649 “compared England’s problem in Ireland with Spain’s problem in Naples” (2004:321). This is not an analogy that Milton would have cared for, since it likened two states that he wanted to see as distinct in their actions. Here, quite apart from the competition for colonies in the “New World” we have a form of
internal colonialism, internal to Europe, whereby Spain and England are competing for territories. The second feature of the Neapolitan situation that should catch our eye is that a contemporary account of it judged it to be a “revolution” (Giraffi 1647; Rachum 1995:197-199, 207). The third aspect is the fact that “In October 1647, rebel leaders proclaimed a ‘Royal Neapolitan Republic’ under the protection of Louis XIV of France” (Musi 2013:143). A rising in a colony and the proclamation of a republic in the context of what was referred to as a revolution: what more evocative example could there be for a writer engaged precisely in defending a republic and a revolution against a “complication of interests” that revolved around three kingdoms (Raymond 2004).

Neapolitan experience impinged on Milton in other ways. Before he settled on the theme of the loss of Eden, Milton had famously planned an Arthurian epic, and it was an epic inspired by his visit to Naples, for in his Epistle to Manto Milton declared:

If ever I shall summon back our native kings into our songs, and Arthur waging his wars beneath the earth, or if ever I shall proclaim the magnanimous heroes of the table which their mutual fidelity made invincible, and (if only the spirit be with me) shall shatter the Saxon phalanxes under the British Mars!
(Cited Landon 1965:60)

It was thus in Italy, on Spanish colonial territory, that Milton hatched the plan for a patriotic poem he would never write, perhaps because the complex interplay of ethnicities that he later mapped out in his History of Britain (1670) did not lend itself to the simplistic taking of sides that he envisaged in that Latin epistle. Indeed, when Milton critics conflate “English” and “British” – as when in a recent essay we are told how “Milton confides to Manso his plans to compose an English epic, praising the deeds of King Arthur” (Revard 2013:215) – they not only overlook the fact that Milton’s proposed epic was to relate the story of how British Arthur smashed the Saxons, but underplay the extent to which it was precisely Milton’s complex sense of European and Archipelagic ethnicities that made both the History of Britain and his lifelong engagement with Iberian issues so varied, vexed and volatile.

Milton’s History of Britain (1670) stands in lieu of the Arthurian epic he left unwritten (Cooper 2013). Michael Landon has mapped out the ways in which Milton searched for patterns and precedents,
looking to the past but also to other nations for lessons in liberty and examples of servitude:

If Milton began his *History of Britain* merely to provide old plots for contemporary writers, that was not his aim at the end. He found in the events of English history from 45 A.D. to 1066 a series of salutary lessons for mid-seventeenth century Englishmen. What was to be feared was the spiritual and moral decay of society, which would, inevitably, ultimately lead to disaster. This could be clearly seen, Milton felt, in the conquest of the ancient Britons by the Romans, the conquest of the Romano-Britons by the Anglo-Saxons, and the conquest of the Anglo-Saxons firstly by the Danes and finally by the Normans. (Landon 1965:72-73)

The visit to Spanish Naples, the jewel in the crown of Iberian Italy, prompted Milton’s promise to tackle Arthur, but it also gave him a close look at the operations of empire within Europe and, through the subsequent Neapolitan revolt, an insight into what a rebellion against empire might look like. The fact that his argument in the *Observations*, particularly the description of the Irish rebellion as threatening “to disalliege a whole Feudary Kingdome from the ancient Dominion of England?” echo Spanish claims to Naples is an irony Milton appears to have missed (Milton 1649a:49). In comparing the Belfast Presbytery with the Spanish Inquisition he overlooked another potential comparison that would have been far less convenient (Lim 1998:196-204; Milton 1649a:60).

Future directions for research might include a more detailed comparison between Milton’s writings on Spain and Portugal and his engagement with Ireland than has hitherto been effected. John Kerrigan (2008b:230), David Loewenstein (1992:310) and Catherine Canino (1998) have argued that Milton’s writings on Ireland fed and led into *Paradise Lost*. Might an argument be made that his engagement with the politics of Spain and Portugal also form part of the allegory of his epic poem? Fallon develops ideas along these lines in *Divided Empire* (1995). Certainly from *Comus* (1634) through to *The History of Britain* (1670) Spain and Portugal were on Milton’s radar. There is also the question of the Iberian afterlife of Milton. John Shawcross has traced Milton’s impact on Spanish and Portuguese writers up to the middle of the twentieth century. Milton’s Celtiberian concerns, connections and complications are fascinating as part of a wider preoccupation with the ways in which
early modern writers engaged with “Celtic” themes and issues around nation, state and empire (Maley and Loughnane 2013; Pittock 1999). More interestingly, as I have indicated, Georgina Green and Mónica Quijada have shown Milton’s influence on the ways in which, respectively, writers like Wordsworth and Southey responded to the Peninsular Uprising, also known as the Spanish War of Independence, and the ways in which Milton’s writings impacted upon liberation struggles in the Americas in the nineteenth century and after.

Having turned his back on the Iberian Peninsula – “look homeward Angel” (“Lycidas” 163) – after his brief period engaged in treaty negotiations with Portugal and Spain in the early 1650s, Milton might have been pleased to see his own work contribute to the quest for liberty in those competing kingdoms and in their colonies. If Milton really was, as David Armitage insists, a poet against empire – a claim that has to be qualified by his position on Ireland – then he may have found some consolation in the fact that his writings, and in particular Paradise Lost, became touchstone texts in anti-colonial struggles, and this despite the dissolution of Cromwell’s Commonwealth through costly colonial ventures, and the subsequent restoration of the monarchy and consolidation of the British Empire. What Milton would have made of the translation of Samson Agonistes by José García Nieto and Charles David Ley into Spanish in 1949 in the context of Franco’s Spain, we will never know (Shawcross 1998:46); or what he might have thought of Salvador Dali’s 1974 illustrations to Paradise Lost.

While I was writing this paper and thinking about those Irish men who went to Spain in the sixteenth century to help expel the Moors from the south, and those who travelled to Tangier in the 1660s, I thought of my father, who went to Spain in 1936 as a “brigadista,” a volunteer for liberty, to Albacete, then to Jarama, where he was captured in February 1937 and sent to prison first in Talavera de la Reina then to Salamanca before being released in May of that year in exchange for Italian Black Arrows detained at Guadalajara. When his machine gun company was surrounded on Suicide Hill on 15th February 1937 at Jarama by Moorish cavalry, there was an echo of a long history. In 1990, I spoke to a Moroccan student, whose father fought for Franco, about the wider implications of that conflict. According to Paul Preston, in his latest
book about Spain, *The Spanish Holocaust* (2012), the Civil War/Revolution was a colonial war. Here, Preston develops a thesis first aired in an earlier essay, where he had argued that “the right coped with the loss of a ‘real’ overseas empire by internalizing the empire […] by regarding metropolitan Spain as the empire and the proletariat as the subject colonial race” (2004:281). Milton, in *The Tenure of Kings and Magistrates*, declared: “Who knows not that there is a mutual bond of amity and brotherhood between man and man over all the World, neither is it the English Sea that can sever us from that duty and relation” (Milton 1649b:19). Southey and Wordsworth knew this too. Yet the after-effects of Empire ripple on, disturbing that bond and bringing with it bondage, a bondage that has deep roots and complex, twisted strands.
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