


**BACON, ESSEX, !
AND DISCIPLINE**

**JOSÉ MARÍA RODRÍGUEZ GARCÍA
UNIVERSIDAD DE LA CORUÑA**

Francis Bacon (1561-1626) was the first English philosopher to envision and theorize a thorough reform of the institutions of learning according to a utilitarian design. This design, which remained a constant in his philosophical writing, appears in its clearest formulation in *Of the Advancement of Learning* (1605). During the years 1592-1601, Bacon served as secretary to the second Lord of Essex, Robert Devereux, to whom he also acted as unofficial tutor. In the latter capacity he wrote four letters of advice on the Irish affairs, in which he cautioned Lord Essex against letting his popular image of military emancipation undermine his courtly construction as Elizabeth's loving servant.¹ In this paper I compare the disciplinary strategies that Bacon devises for the statesman and the scientist, respectively. This comparison was prompted by Bacon's use of the phrase "blessed physician" to characterize his relationship to Essex, and of "the human medicine of the Mind" to characterize the preliminary preparation of the scientist's psyche.²

Robert Devereux's need of a censor who would counsel him at all times is specifically directed by Bacon towards the three main goals that the Earl set for himself: his courtly conquest of the Queen's heart, his epic conquest of alien territories (in Ireland, Spain, and Portugal), and his political conquest of absolute autonomy, i.e. his treasonous conduct.³ It should be emphasized in this connection that the Earl's potential for energetic movement, be it in the mind or in geographical space, is construed by Bacon as being unpredictable in its outcome. The need to channel this random movement through discipline appears all the more urgent in turn-of-the-century England, whose people were still coming to terms with the simultaneous events of having a female ruler to obey and a new continent to conquer.

Bacon wrote at a time when England first committed itself to creating, sustaining, and expanding a sea-borne empire. Along with Sir Walter Raleigh, Lord Essex is considered the proverbial exemplar of the scholar-navigator-courtier, and in fact the two became associated on different occasions with Bacon's projects of reform.⁴ By reason of his secretarial involvement with Essex, Bacon took on the roles of mentor, ghost writer, and client or suitor. He also attempted to fashion Essex as a patron of the sciences.⁵ The noted Bacon scholar, Benjamin Farrington, has remarked that the implicit contract between both men involved their mutual collaboration in the pursuit of their very different goals: Essex would repeatedly (and unsuccessfully) recommend Bacon for promotion to a high executive office, while Bacon would help Essex appear, both in his writing and in his conduct, as a more prudent and self-sacrificing subject than he actually was (1969: 47-49).⁶

In the first of the four advisory letters to his patron, Bacon argued that Elizabeth herself distrusted the professional soldier's popularity and "command of swords," and that the soldierly and the courtly aspects of Essex's career should be kept apart and exercised only under self-conscious scrutiny. I quote from this letter, written on 4 October 1596, shortly after a definite breach had appeared in the relationship between Essex and the Queen by their offending each other in public:

The impression of [the Queen's] greatest prejudice [against a subject] is that of military dependence. . . . Therefore, again, whereas I heard your Lordship designing to yourself the Earl Marshal's place, or place of the Master Ordinance, I did not, in my own mind, so well like of either, because of their affinity with a martial greatness.

. . . The only way ["to handle tenderly your popular reputation"] is to quench it *verbis* (in words), and not *rebus* (by deeds); and

therefore to take all occasions to the Queen to speak against popularity and popular courses vehemently, and to tax it in all others; but nevertheless, to go on in your honorable commonwealth courses as you do. (1861-74: 2.44)⁷

Martial greatness involves authority with the troops and popularity with the people. In Elizabeth's estimation, however, these otherwise favorable circumstances rendered a subject suspect of wanting to arrogate to himself her own unsurpassed authority and popularity in the realm. Essex in fact upheld, like Sidney before him, an outdated feudal ideology, which he invoked as his "native and legal freedom," and which reduced Elizabeth to the status of *prima inter pares*. This was tantamount to believing that the Queen could be publicly censured and legitimately deposed by her equals: "Cannot Princes erre? Can they not wrong their Subjects? Is any earthly power infinite? . . . I can never subscribe to these principles" (Robert Devereux, qtd. in McCoy 1989: 95-96). Bacon seemed more aware than Essex of Elizabeth's sensitivity to displays of feudal independence on the part of military (and therefore male) subjects: "I demand whether there can be a more dangerous image than this represented to any monarch living, much more to a lady, and of her Majesty's apprehensions?" (1861-74: 2.41).

Sensing this royal anxiety, Bacon offered himself as a surrogate conscience (in fact a physician of the mind) to counsel Essex in the latter's dealings with the Queen. Thus, in the fourth and last letter of advice, written in 1599 shortly before Essex's departure for Ireland, Bacon promulgated what was to become in *Of the Advancement* one of the cornerstones of his theory of subject formation, namely, the notion that volitional drives, like bodies and souls, need to be "doctored," either by self-discipline or by means of initiation, confession, and conversion. For the purpose of maintaining a measure of decorum in his exhortation to Essex to abandon the idea of the Irish campaign, Bacon explains to his disciple-patron that "being no man of war, and ignorant in the particulars of State," he only has "had the honour of knowing [his] Lordship inwardly," enough to understand Essex's need of "a waking censor . . . a blessed physician" (1861-74: 2.132).⁸

Bacon worried about Essex's inability to repress or at least conceal his desire for total autonomy from the Queen. This lack of self-restraint (Bacon calls him "a nature not to be ruled" [1861-74: 2.41]) can be best understood when contrasted with the sobriety and obedience that characterized the contemporary meritocratic ideal of a government career. A case in point is the philosophy of public service upheld by Bacon's own uncle, William Lord

Burghley, in the famous letter of advice to his son and future successor as Elizabeth's Principal Secretary, Robert Cecil.⁹ Around the time Robert was completing his formal education, his father outlined a set of golden precepts for him to follow at all times:

Towards thy superiors be humble yet generous; with thy equals familiar yet respectful; towards inferiors show much humility and some familiarity. . . . The first prepares a way to advancement; the second makes thee known for a man well-bred; the third gains a good report. . . . Yet do I advise thee not to affect nor neglect popularity too much. Seek not to be Essex and shun to be Raleigh.¹⁰

Burghley's unpretentious warning provides much more than an instance of the *aurea mediocritas* topos in the fashioning of a civil servant. It provides evidence that by the late 1580s (when this letter seems to have been written) Robert Devereux's and Walter Raleigh's cultivation of a quasi-feudal self-image of personal autonomy was considered dangerous, since it threatened Elizabeth's claim to absolute control over her courtiers.

Bacon's own criticism of the untrustworthy subject is found in the masque *Of Love and Self-Love* (1605), which he wrote precisely to flatter Essex and fashion him into a disciplined knight. *Of Love and Self-Love* was presented at court before Queen Elizabeth, and in it three characteristic figures—a soldier, a hermit, and a statesman—commend the excellence of their respective vocations in terms so cynical that they become an easy target for the criticisms of Bacon's mouthpiece, a wise and sensible squire. The latter can thus oppose his own master's true virtue to the false ones of his three interlocutors. His lord, the squire explains, is neither violent (like the mercenary soldier) nor solipsistic (like the contemplative hermit) nor self-seeking (like the "hollow" statesman). All three counter-exemplars "seek most [their] own happiness." On the contrary, the paragon of chivalry and virtue that is the squire's master is bent exclusively upon "mak[ing] the prince happy he serves" (1861-74: 8.382). The dignity of this noble knight, who is meant to be perceived as a stylized image of Essex, lies in

the truest and perfectest practice of all virtues . . . [namely, the exercise] of wisdom, in disposing those things which are most subject to confusion and accident . . . ; of temperance, in exercising of the strictest discipline; of fortitude in toleration of all labours and abstinence from effeminate delights; of constancy, in bearing and digesting the greatest variety of fortune. (8.380)

This enumeration echoes the general end of *The Faerie Queene* as stated in Spenser's prefatory letter, which is addressed to Sir Walter Raleigh:

The general end . . . of all the book is to fashion a gentleman or noble person in virtuous and gentle discipline. . . [T]hat I conceived should be most plausible and pleasing being colored with an historical fiction—the which the most part of men delight to read, rather for variety of matter than for profit of the example. (Spenser 1985: 74)

Bacon's invocation of "temperance," "constancy," and even "abstinence from effeminate delights" also provides an accurate description of the moral argument deployed in Book II of *The Faerie Queene*, whose chief protagonist, the knight Sir Guyon (also called Temperance), takes up the challenge of resisting precisely the "effeminate delights" offered to him by the sensuous Acrasia and remaining "constant" to his legitimate ruler, the Queene of Faery. In Bacon's and Spenser's formulations, then, "virtue," "discipline," and "temper-ance" can be considered as interchangeable concepts in the larger project of fashioning a gentleman and obedient subject.¹¹

This Renaissance concept of discipline should perhaps be construed, as Michel Foucault does in *Discipline and Punishment*, as a way to bind together and to multiply the shifting and confused multitude of forces at work within an individual subject or an area of society.¹² In point of fact, in his philosophical treatises Bacon subjects all prospective scientists to a disciplinary process not unlike the one he recommended to Essex in the letter of advice of 1599. The "waking censor" and the "blessed physician" of that document resurface in *Of the Advancement* as the "human medicine of the Mind." If the scientist is not to suffer the same fate as the aristocratic warrior who turns successively into an explorer, a conqueror, and a self-destructive rebel, he must continually seek counsel and subject himself to disciplinary processes.

Bacon's most extended statement on philosophical "doctoring" occurs in the Second Book of *The Advancement*, in the context of an exposition of "the part of moral philosophy, concerning the Culture or Regiment of the Mind." After complaining that Aristotle said very little about psychology in the *Ethics*, Bacon undertakes to present a brief "inquiry touching the affections." Specifically, he offers a taxonomy of "receipts and regiments" that anyone can use "to recover or preserve the health and good estate of the mind." These "receipts," Bacon goes on, are "within our command," and include all

the progressive ways of exercising “force and operation upon the mind to affect the will and appetite and to alter manners,” such as “*custom, exercise, habit, education, example, imitation, emulation, company, friends, praise, reproof, exhortation, fame, laws, books, studies*” (1861: 6.238; emphasis in the original).

The “human medicine,” then, comprises a comprehensive set of strategies for social homogenization. In Bacon’s scientific writings, the quintessential disciplinary device is that of method, which he alternately refers to as “*modus*” and “*methodus*.” Generally speaking, a method is not only a normative way of ordering personal experiences, empirical phenomena, thoughts, and utterances, but just as important, a way of creating the illusion of causality and necessity where there is arbitrariness.

One of Bacon’s most revealing comments on the uses of method appears in his posthumously published treatise, *The Refutation of Philosophies* (*Redargutio Philosophiarum* [written 1608; publ. 1734]). There he makes the following statement:

My system and method of research is of such nature that it tends to equalise men’s wits and capacities, like the testaments of the Spartans [Lat. *haereditates Spartanas*]. . . . [I]n that kind of natural philosophy which rests solely on intellectual strength, one man may far outdistance another. In the kind I recommend intellectual differences between men count for little more than such differences as commonly exist in their senses. For my part I am emphatically of the opinion that men’s wits require not the addition of feathers and wings, but of leaden weights. Men are very far from realising how strict and disciplined a thing is research into truth and nature, and how little it leaves to the judgment of men. (Farrington 1966: 118-19; 1861: 7.77-78; English trans. emended)

The languages of politics and science contaminate each other in this passage through their attempt to reduce the other to a psychological process. “[R]esearch into truth and nature,” Bacon argues, is a “strict and disciplined thing,” and “leaves [little] to the judgment of men.” These men are like Spartan soldiers, and their minds are prepared and “equalise[d]” by banning from them whatever prejudicial and imaginative idiosyncrasies they may harbor, just as the bodies of the Spartans were subjected to enormous physical exertion to prepare them for the discipline of warfare.

The end of this Baconian discipline is the replacement of both personal initiative and random thinking with a concerted intellectual effort directed

from above. In *Thoughts and Conclusions (Cogitata et visa*, written 1607, pub. 1653) Bacon writes that “the action of chance is intermittent, undesigned, random.” By contrast, the human manipulation of phenomena should be guided by a method or “art” which itself “acts steadily, purposively, cooperatively” [Lat. *artem operari contantem, et compendio, et turmatim*] (Farrington 1966: 96; 1861: 7.134). “Art acts purposively” is also an obvious definition of the human capacity for exercising agency in a given field of ideas and actions.

To extend a little further the analogy between the scientist and the statesman who find themselves in serious need of “doctoring,” it can be argued that Bacon attempted to discipline Essex by turning his random actions into an methodical “art” not unlike that of the disciplined scientist. Such a doctoring would have demanded Essex’s “cooperation” with his blessed physician (Bacon); his “purposive” yielding to the all-encompassing designs of his legitimate monarch (Elizabeth); and his “steady” cultivation of an acceptable courtly self-image.

In Elizabethan works that mirror, however indirectly, the Irish campaigns, we find other physicians and other patients who also face the challenge of remaining faithful to their culture when immersed in an alien environment. To give an example, in *Antony and Cleopatra* (c. 1607) the experienced Enobarbus unsuccessfully tries to counsel Antony as the latter penetrates deeper and deeper in his own Egyptian heart of darkness. As Enobarbus puts it, the Egyptian environment of unchecked human passions, which appears paradoxically embodied in the protean yet calculating character of Cleopatra, succeeds in “subdu[ing]” Antony’s “judgement” (3.13.36-37). Refusing to listen to Enobarbus’ dispassionate and sensible advice, Antony “make[s] his will/ Lord of his reason” (3.13.3-4), and lets his “heart” rule his “brain” (3.13.198-99). In other words, as Antony begins to listen less to his “waking censor”—Enobarbus—and more to the call of his own untutored instincts, he not only loses his self-command, but begins to be perceived by others (e.g. Enobarbus, Caesar) as a dangerous image of absolute autonomy.

In Book II of *The Faerie Queene* Spenser features two characters, Guyon and the Palmer, in a situation reminiscent of the Baconian interaction between physician and patient. Being older and holier, the Palmer plays the part of restraining conscience to the more impetuous Guyon, whose appointed mission in Book II is to search out the evil yet almost irresistible Acrasia and her abode of sensuous pleasures. Guyon’s challenge is twofold, for his attempts to achieve self-control engage him in a defence of his hierarchical

superior's interests. As in Bacon's advisory letters, in Book II of the *Faerie Queene* the subject being disciplined has a legitimate queen to serve (Elizabeth / the Queene of Faery) and an enemy to subject (the Irish rebel Tyrone/ Acrasia).¹³ And as in *Antony and Cleopatra*, he must defeat a female ruler (Cleopatra / Acrasia) who interferes with the interests of a centralized political power (the Roman triumvirate as it regresses into a dictatorship / Elizabeth's quasi-absolutist regime), and who embodies a characteristically non-Western form of sexual power.

The notion that Guyon's valour and the Palmer's judgment complement each other is highlighted in the episode in which they encounter a seemingly defenceless maid crying for help. While Guyon all too hastily offers to deviate from the appointed course of his quest in order to help this maid, the Palmer reacts differently.¹⁴

Which Guyon hearing, straight his palmer bade
To steer the boat towards the doleful maid,
That he might know and ease her sorrow sad.
Who him advising better, to him said,
"Fair sir, be not displeas'd if disobey'd;
For ill it were to hearken to her cry.
For she is inly nothing ill apaid,
But only womanish fine forgery,
Your stubborn heart t' affect with frail infirmity" (2.12.28)

In all three authors—Bacon, Shakespeare, and Spenser—we find an older and wiser character "better advising" a younger and more precipitate one. What Bacon does with Essex, Enobarbus with Antony, and the Palmer with Guyon is not unlike Bacon's fashioning of his "sons of science." The ideal Baconian scientist, like the ideal subject of a commonwealth, must willingly submit himself to a disciplinary process whereby he internalizes a series of assumptions about how knowledge is structured. This order is in turn an index of larger social distinctions or hierarchizations.¹⁵ Such a correlation becomes nowhere clearer than in Bacon's last work, *New Atlantis* (1623), where the scientists of Solomon's House are called Fathers by analogy with the heads of each extended patriarchal family in the kingdom of Bensalem—the Tirsans. When the European narrator is chosen by a Father of Solomon's House to become the propagandist of their ideas on science and reform among a European audience, he is immediately called "Son" and required to undergo a rite of investiture that amounts to acknowledging his subordinate position in this curious scientific family. The presentation of relations of

power in the form of filial relationships is indeed a pervasive feature of Bacon's rhetoric, appearing most prominently in *The Masculine Birth of Time* (*Temporis partus masculus*, written 1603, publ. 1653), *The Refutation of Philosophies*, and *New Atlantis*. In sum, as the scientist produces scientific works, and through them his own identity, he also contributes to reproducing a preexistent ideology.

Not even Queen Elizabeth, who alone of all the members of the realm could lay claim to absolute autonomy, can escape the ubiquity of the Baconian disciplinary process. This is evinced in the following passage from Bacon's posthumous eulogy, *On the Fortunate Memory of Elizabeth* (*In Felicem Memoriam Elizabethae* [1608]):

For Elizabeth at her birth was destined to the succession, then disinherited, afterwards superseded. . . . And yet she did not pass suddenly from the prison to the throne, with a mind embittered and swelling with the sense of misfortune, but was first restored to liberty and comforted with expectation; and so came to her kingdom at last quietly and prosperously, without tumult or competitor. All which I mention to show how Divine providence, meaning to produce an excellent Queen, passed her by way of preparation through these several stages of discipline [Lat. *disciplinae gradus*]. (1861-74: 6.306; 292)

The historical situation that Bacon is recalling here is Elizabeth's final accession to the throne in 1558 after the successive deaths of her two half-siblings: King Edward VI and Queen Mary. In his extraordinarily rich evocation of Elizabeth's early years, in which she suffered various forms of seclusion and denigration, Bacon makes three points regarding disciplinary processes: first, Elizabeth herself is the end product of a *method* implemented by Divine Providence in order to "produce an excellent Queen"; second, this process of production must be timed so that it does not induce a trauma in the subject being doctored—Elizabeth's mind is not "embittered and swelling with the sense of misfortune";¹⁶ and third, "discipline" consists in a series of "stages" (involving practices, discourses, deprivations, renunciations, and so forth) designed to humble the spirit of the disciplined person. When Bacon applies his medicine of the mind to the highest-ranking person in England, then, he transforms an ostensibly human design into a transcendent one.

Disciplinary processes are to be found wherever there are social interactions, even if they are often not recognized as forms of social constraint. For Foucault, discipline differs from other kinds of punishment such as state-

sponsored repression and physical violence in that it seeks to organize and redirect the forces of an antagonistic power rather than simply reduce them to powerlessness. The strict discipline of the early seventeenth century, Foucault adds, is

an art of correct training. . . . Discipline ‘makes’ individuals; it is the specific technique of a power that regards individuals both as objects and as instruments of its exercise. It is not a triumphant power, which because of its own excess can pride itself on its omnipotence; it is a modest, suspicious power, which functions as a calculated economy. (1984a: 188)

To continue with Foucault’s metaphor, Bacon attempted to reduce and redirect the inflation of images of emancipation and autonomy generated by Essex. His letters of advice read like a plan to supervise the economy of his emotions and actions, and above all, that of his self-representations. If Essex had been adequately disciplined as an obedient military leader, assuming a corresponding subordinate position in all his public appearances with the Queen, his popularity could have contributed to the success of Elizabeth’s foreign policy and to the advancement of Bacon’s own career at court.

Bacon’s initial confidence in the power of education and surveillance foreshadows the ethical optimism characteristic of the Enlightenment, but is at odds with the skeptical ethos of post-Enlightenment critical thinking. In fact, Essex’s resistance to being fashioned into an enthusiastic patron of the sciences, into a self-restrained soldier and courtier, and into a prudent statesman amply illustrates the well-known New-Historicist principle of reciprocity. According to this principle, the power to discipline and the contrary impulse to resist more often than not enter into an open-ended dialectic.¹⁷ In Essex’s case, this process found no closure other than the ultimate pacification of his rebellious nature by the institutional technique of the execution.^a

NOTES

1. Bacon's Victorian editor and biographer, James Spedding, conveniently titled and dated these four important letters as follows: (1) "Letter to the Earl of Essex, 4 October 1596"; (2) "A Letter of Advice to the Earl of Essex, to Take upon Him the Care of Irish Causes, When Mr. Secretary Cecil Was in France" (1597-98); (3) "A Letter of Advice to the Earl of Essex, upon the First Treaty with Tyrone, 1598, Before the Earl Was Nominated for the Charge of Ireland"; and (4) "A Letter of Advice to My Lord of Essex, Immediately Before His Going into Ireland" (1599).

2. Stanley Fish (1972) defines the concept of the "good physician" as the hypostatization in discourse of a set of strategies aimed to dislodge the reader's liking for abstract logic. For Fish, Bacon is one of six seventeenth-century authors (the other five being Donne, Milton, Herbert, Burton, and Browne) who present their arguments in such a way as to debunk the expectations of their reader, who in his experience of reception moves from one pole of the argument to the other and back following the dialectical unfolding of the text. Yet Fish overlooks both Bacon's use of the expressions "blessed physician" and "human medicine of the mind," and his straightforward argumentation in works other than *The Essays*, which is the only one studied by Fish.

3. Essex's seizure of the ports of Cadiz and Faro in 1596 (he was in charge of the famous 'Cadiz Expedition') did not yield the expected profits in the form of Spanish gold. In 1587 Cadiz had already been captured and plundered by Sir Francis Drake, who also attacked Corunna in the same year (Hibbert 1991: 230-31, 220).

4. Given Elizabeth's distrust of martial prowess, under her rule the qualities of the courtier-poet-suitor became a *sine qua non* for anyone aspiring to royal favour amidst an ever more gregarious and theatrical English court. Being older and brighter than Essex, Raleigh occupied a place of privilege in the Queen's fancy that Essex wished for himself. In a justly famous letter to Edward Dyer dated 21 July 1587 (included in e.g. Devereux 1853: 1.188; Starkey 1990: 273) Essex asked his friend rhetorically "whether [he] could have comfort to give [him]self over to the service of a Mistress that was in Awe of . . . such a wretch as Raleigh."

5. Bacon wrote three "conceits" or masques for Essex to stage before Elizabeth, respectively in the years 1592, 1594, and 1595. Along with the conventional disguised figures enacting a dramatic action interspersed with dance and song, Bacon's masques typically feature an appended analytical speech, such as "In Praise of Knowledge" (1594) and the "Device of the Indian Prince" (1595), in which his ideas for reforming learning are advanced in a more resolute manner.

6. Bacon summarized his commitment to fashioning Essex as a perfect statesman in his declaration during Essex's trial for treason: "he had spent more time in vain in studying to make the Earl a good servant to the Queen and state, than he had done in anything else" (qtd. in Farrington 1961: 49).

7. On the so-called "Elizabethan cult of popularity," and how it affected the shifting fortunes of the Earl of Essex, see Starkey 1990: 263, 270-83.

8. In the "Letter of Advice to the Earl of Essex, to Take upon Him the Care of Irish Causes," Bacon cynically laments the indifference with which his counsel is often met by the

Earl: “Thus have I played the ignorant statesman; which I do to nobody but your Lordship: except to the Queen sometimes when she trains me on. But your Lordship will accept my duty and good meaning, and secure me touching the privateness of that I write” (1861-74: 2.96).

9. Essex detested Robert Cecil because he was the Queen’s right-hand man in civil affairs and epitomized the class of plebeian *apparatchiks* whose elevation to the aristocracy clashed with his own notion of feudal privileges (McCoy 1989: 101).

10. Letter reproduced in Starkey 1990: 262. Burghley’s advice to his son foreshadows Polonius’ words to Laertes on the occasion of the latter’s departure from Denmark: “There, my blessing with thee. / And these few precepts in thy memory / Look thou character. Give thy thoughts no tongue, / Nor any unproportion’d thought his act. / Be thou familiar, but by no means vulgar” (*Hamlet* 1.3.57-61).

11. The key work for understanding early modern self-fashioning, and specifically Spenser’s disciplinary project, is of course Stephen Greenblatt’s *Renaissance Self-Fashioning* (1980). For more on Spenser and Greenblatt see Rodríguez García (1996).

12. An important clarification is in order at this point. After Essex’s fall from royal favour Bacon was appointed to prosecute him. As he exchanged the role of mentor for that of attorney of the Crown, he also altered in retrospect the nature of his attempt to control Essex, emphasizing alternately the repressive and the formative aspects of his mentorship. See in this connection Bacon’s two judicial reports, *A Declaration of the Practices and Treasons Attempted and Committed by Robert Late Earl of Essex* [1601] (1861-74: 2.245-74) and *His Apology Concerning the Late Earl of Essex* [1603] (1861-74: 3.139-62).

13. In the two-page “Proclamation on the Seizure of the Earls of Essex, Rutland, and Others for Their Rebellion” (1601), Elizabeth highlighted the accused’s unpardonable crime of “lay[ing] plots with the traitor Tirone” (Kinney 1975: 325).

14. In the Preface to *The History of World*, Raleigh argues that departing from one’s usual course of action entails a corresponding separation from truth and certainty. What is more, since “we digress in all the ways of our lives,” our explanations of how our “lives and actions” deviate from their intended courses add further “to the heap of human error” (1972: 148).

15. On how the organization of a field of knowledge contributes to establishing both divisions of labour and social distinctions, see ch. 7 of Bourdieu’s *Language and Symbolic Power* (1991), especially 165-167.

16. In the *Letter of Advice to Queen Elizabeth* (1585), written to impress her with his precocious political wisdom, Bacon argues for a peaceful solution to the problem of the dissenters who questioned Elizabeth’s legitimacy on religious grounds. He specifically calls for an inculcation in their children of notions of political obedience “under the colour of education” rather than using physical violence against them (1861-74: 1.50).

17. The sociological formulation of this dialectic is clearly stated in Foucault 1984b: 428. The best application of the same principle of reciprocity to Renaissance culture is to be found in Montrose 1986: 317-18.

WORKS CITED

- BACON, Francis. 1861. *The Works of Francis Bacon*. 15 vols. Ed. James Spedding, Robert Leslie Ellis, and Douglas Denon Heath. Boston: Brown.
- - -. 1861-74. *The Letters and the Life of Francis Bacon Including All His Occasional Works*. 7 vols. Ed. James Spedding. London: Longmans.
- BOURDIEU, Pierre. 1991. *Language and Symbolic Power*. Trans. Gino Raymond and Matthew Adamson. Ed. John B. Thompson. Cambridge (MA): Harvard UP.
- DEVEREUX, Walter Bourchier. 1853. *Lives and Letters of the Devereux, Earls of Essex in the Reigns of Elizabeth, James I, and Charles I, 1540-1646*. 2 vols. London: Murray.
- FARRINGTON, Benjamin. 1961. *Francis Bacon: Philosopher of Industrial Science*. New York: Collier.
- - -. 1969. *Francis Bacon: Pioneer of Planned Science*. New York: Praeger.
- - -. 1966. *The Philosophy of Francis Bacon: An Essay on Its Development from 1603 to 1609 with New Translations of Fundamental Texts*. Chicago: U of Chicago P.
- FISH, Stanley E. 1972. *Self-Consuming Artifacts: The Experience of Seventeenth-Century Literature*. Berkeley: U of California P.
- FOUCAULT, Michel. 1984a. "The Means of Correct Training (from *Discipline and Punish*)." Trans. Alan Sheridan. In *The Foucault Reader*. Ed. Paul Rabinow. New York: Pantheon. 188-205.
- - -. 1984b. "The Subject and Power." In *Art After Modernism: Rethinking Representation*. Ed. Brian Wallis. New York: New Museum of Contemporary Art. 417-432.
- GREENBLATT, Stephen. 1980. *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare*. Chicago: U of Chicago P.
- HIBBERT, Christopher. 1991. *The Virgin Queen: Elizabeth I, Genius of the Golden Age*. Reading (MA): Addison-Wesley.
- KINNEY, Arthur F. 1975. *Elizabethan Backgrounds: Historical Documents of the Age of Elizabeth I, Newly Edited, with Introductions*. Hamden (CT): Archon.
- MCCOY, Richard C. 1989. *The Rites of Knighthood: The Literature and Politics of Elizabethan Chivalry*. Berkeley: U of California P.
- MONTROSE, Louis Adrian. 1986. "The Elizabethan Subject and the Spenserian Text." In *Literary Theory / Renaissance Texts*. Ed. Patricia Parker and David Quint. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP. 303-40.
- RALEGH, Walter (Sir). 1972. Preface to *The History of the World*. In *Selected Writings*. Ed. Gerald Hammond. Harmondsworth: Penguin. 124-50.

- RODRÍGUEZ GARCÍA, José María. 1996. "De Guyon a Greenblatt: travesías y moder-nismos de la cultura." In *Os estudos ingleses no contexto das novas tendencias*. Ed. M. Teresa Caneda Cabrera and Javier Pérez Guerra. Vigo: Universidade de Vigo. 163-94.
- SHAKESPEARE, William. 1954. *Antony and Cleopatra*. Ed. M. R. Ridley. Cambridge (MA): Harvard UP.
- . 1982. *Hamlet*. Ed. Harold Jenkins. London: Methuen.
- SPENSER, Edmund. 1985. *Books I and II of The Faerie Queene, "The Mutability Cantos," and Selections from the Minor Poetry*. Ed. Robert Kellogg and Oliver Steele. London: Collier Macmillan.
- STARKEY, David, ed. 1990. *Rivals in Power: Lives and Letters of the Great Tudor Dynasties*. London: Macmillan.