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EVEN THOUGH PETER Heylyn’s Cosmographie (1652) is better organized and larger in scope than similar works, it has received little attention from scholars of the seventeenth century.\(^1\) While the names of other

\(^1\) Research for this essay was conducted with the generous support of a Summer Research Stipend from Felician College. The librarians at Felician College, Harvard University, and the University of Illinois were especially helpful, and I am indebted to the National Portrait Gallery for permission to reproduce the Francis Hayman painting. I would also like to thank Robert Markley, Anthony Pollock, and the editor and anonymous readers at Studies in Medieval and Renaissance History for helpful comments on earlier versions of this essay.

There were eight editions of Microcosmus between 1621 and 1639, and Cosmographie went through nine editions between 1652 and 1703. Heylyn significantly expanded Microcosmus between the first and second editions, from 417 pages in 1621 to 812 pages in 1625. The remaining editions of Microcosmus remained fairly consistent lengthwise, ranging from 807 to 808 pages. Heylyn had expanded Microcosmus into Cosmographie by 1652, and by 1703 the work had reached 1,132 pages. The first edition of Microcosmus in 1621 had Latin characters in the title, whereas subsequent editions in the seventeenth century had the title spelled with Greek letters. Different combinations of these languages, in addition to the generally nonstandardized spelling practices in England prior to the publication.
voyage collection editors such as Richard Hakluyt and Samuel Purchas remain well known, Heylyn has slipped through the cracks of history, despite his being one of the best-selling authors of the seventeenth century. In this essay I should like to recur to the *Cosmographie* and explore its depiction of non-European cultures. I suggest that the depiction is central to Heylyn’s conception of England’s place in the world during the 1640s and 1650s.

Moreover, the large gap between the desperate circumstances that Heylyn as an English Royalist found himself in during this period and the consolatory, self-aggrandizing rhetoric that he employed in reaction to these conditions makes him a kind of paradigm for the understanding of English ideas of warfare, trade, and “Indians” in the second half of the seventeenth century. Whereas Purchas edited Hakluyt’s voyage collection, Heylyn rewrote it and provided a comprehensive description of the “entire” world. In other words, Heylyn offered general, authoritative principles based on specific voyage accounts and observations. By sifting through, categorizing, and summarizing Hakluyt and Purchas’s massive tomes, Heylyn prioritized those elements of each country’s descriptions that merited the attention of his English readers and, to a greater extent than his predecessors, contextualized voyage narratives in relation to contemporary concerns about military might, wealth, and trade.

While publication records reveal the popularity of voyage collections with English readers, it is more difficult to gauge who exactly purchased these works. Sailors and merchants would certainly have been a primary audience, since the commodities and geographic descriptions of various countries in voyage collections were highly relevant to international trade. Common sailors and especially officers had both the money and

---

of Samuel Johnson's *A Dictionary of the English Language* in 1755, account for the many variant spellings one finds in articles, books, and bibliographic records of this work today: *Microcosmus, Microcosmos, Mikrocosmos, Mikròkosmos, and Microcosmos*. For a chart that displays the publication history of Heylyn’s geographies, see Adrian Johns, “Natural History as Print Culture,” in *Cultures of Natural History*, ed. N. Jardine, J. A. Secord, and E. C. Spary (Cambridge, 1996), 109. This chart is a helpful starting point for determining the number of editions of Heylyn’s works. With help from the former senior bibliographer of the ESTC, I compared the chart to the ESTC’s records and the original manuscripts to weed out imprint variants, ghosts, bad records, reissues, and stop-press alterations. My calculations therefore differ from both the ESTC’s data and Johns’ chart.
the reading skills to buy and consume these volumes. Money was one of the few perks of the grim life at sea. A sailor or merchant could save by engaging for long voyages on which room and board (hard, sometimes weevil-filled biscuits) were included, and the outlets for spending wages were few. If the seaman finally did reach land, he generally had sufficient funds to purchase books for the next journey. The length of voyages, which could span months or even years, provided men at sea with time for reading, and an impressive number of them were literate. Estimates are that between 1700 and 1750, eighty percent or more of the highest ranking officers (captains; first, second, and third mates; and surgeons) could read. Even among the unskilled common seamen, apprentices, and quartermasters, the literacy rate ranged between 62.5 and 100 percent, with a total merchant shipping industry average of 75.4 percent. These numbers suggest why merchants appear to have been the primary targets for the consumption of secondhand voyage collections such as Heylyn’s *Cosmographie*. Even though voyage collections were primarily by, for, and about sailors and merchants, a relatively larger audience must have included the general reading public for a work such as Heylyn’s *Cosmographie* to have gone through eight editions in half a century.

Because some voyage collections such as *Cosmographie* stretched to over a thousand pages, it is more likely that they were read sporadically rather than cover to cover. Heylyn’s *Microcosmus* (1621) and *Cosmographie*, unlike Hakluyt’s *Principal Navigations, Voyages and Discoveries of the English Nation* (1589) or Purchas’s *Hakluytus Posthumus* (1625), facilitated this approach by providing synopses of countries that authors of fiction and others could refer to with relative ease. Heylyn’s cosmographies were not the first to provide concise summaries of the cultures, resources, history, inhabitants, wildlife, wealth, religious practices, and armies of various countries. Other roughly contemporaneous books similarly organized through the use of country names for their category headings, such as Botero’s *Travellers Breviat* and d’Avity’s *Estates, Empires, and Principallities of the World*, were only translated once into English, which suggests that they were less popular and less widely consulted in England than Heylyn’s work. Heylyn’s works not only reached the public at large, but they also found their way into the hands of at least

---

three English monarchs. Heylyn presented Prince Charles with a copy of *Microcosmus* in person in 1621, and Robert Markley argues that a 1657 edition of *Cosmographie* with hand-colored maps in the British Library may have been a presentation copy that Heylyn gave to Charles II during his Restoration. Markley’s theory seems especially plausible considering the fact that Heylyn carried the scepter to the altar during the coronation ceremony. Gilbert Burnet has stated that Heylyn’s *Ecclesia Restaurata* converted James II to Roman Catholicism, a claim that makes sense when one considers that Heylyn’s Laudian beliefs were envisioned in such a way that he once referred to himself as a Catholic.³ With a combined total of sixteen editions between 1621 and 1700, Heylyn’s two major works were virtually ubiquitous both at court and beyond.

As a result, when writers such as Richard Head or John Dryden needed information on India or the Americas for their prose fiction and plays, they would have naturally turned to Heylyn’s *Microcosmus* or *Cosmographie*. However, even if such authors did not directly consult Heylyn’s work, the ideas about “Indians,” warfare, and trade in the Americas and India helped to form the popular conceptions that inspired fictional representations. Heylyn therefore not only reflected but also shaped and refined seventeenth-century English literary tastes. In the pages that follow, I argue that the commercial success of Heylyn’s *Cosmographie* was partially the result of specific historical circumstances and his corresponding interpretation of them. He included potentially unsettling

---

contemporary information within his book, such as the inferiority of England’s military in relation to India’s, within not only a cyclical view of history, but also a spiritual and nationalistic rhetoric that later English authors would borrow and adapt.

In order to gain a sense of Heylyn’s intention in expanding his *Microcosmos* (1621) into the *Cosmographie* (1652) and a contemporary audience’s reactions to the revised work, it is helpful to recall the historical context. Heylyn’s early associations were more with Puritanism than the Laudian movement, but by 1629 he actively sought William Laud’s patronage. Laud strengthened Heylyn’s ties with Charles I by presenting Heylyn’s *The History of Saint George* (1631) to the king. In the 1630s Heylyn dedicated his poems to both Charles I and Laud. Since Laud firmly supported Charles I and opposed Puritanism, which led to the former’s execution in 1645, Heylyn’s Royalist politics and Laudian theology complemented and reinforced one another. These values also led to Heylyn’s sequestration in 1644. Although no source appears to exist for the exact dates when Heylyn began and finished *Cosmographie*, a seventeenth-century biographer, John Barnard, claims that the book was begun around 1648 and was finished by its date of publication in 1652. Barnard was in a position to make such a claim with some accuracy since he was married to Heylyn’s daughter. Evidently Heylyn was working on the “General Introduction” in 1648, since he includes that date in a discussion of the age of the earth. While he wrote *Cosmographie*, the House of Commons tried and executed his patron Charles I, to whom he dedicated *Microcosmus*. For Heylyn, this was yet another tragic incident in a long string of misfortunes. A few years earlier, Heylyn joined Charles at Oxford and acted as his “historian of the war,” which led to Parliament’s decision to strip Heylyn’s house at Alresford of its contents and reduce him to destitution.¹⁵


¹⁵ Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, s.v. “Heylyn, Peter.” Heylyn envisioned his role as Charles’s “historian of war” as a corrector of misleading or inaccurate information that previous historians had published. Royce MacGillivray argues that Heylyn had a “formidable talent for proving a set historical thesis,” a “wide knowledge of contemporary English history,” and a “more realistic” view than most of his fellow Royalist historians. According to MacGillivray, Heylyn’s perspective
Indeed, Heylyn refers to his bleak situation in the preface to *Cosmographie*:

> For being, by the unhappiness of my Destiny, or the infelicity of the Times, deprived of my Preferments, and divested of my Ministerial Function, (as to the ordinary and public exercise thereof) I cannot chuse but say, I have leisure enough; the opportunity of spending more idle hours (if I were so minded) than I ever expected or desired.⁶

No immediate relief appeared within view. The New Model Army, led by Cromwell, was the biggest and most expensive in English history up to that point. If viewed from an Old Testament perspective in which God rewarded His “chosen people” with military victories and economic prosperity, Heylyn seemed to be on the losing, punished, or “sinful” side. One way around this conclusion, as Heylyn realized, was to regard the apparent wrath of God at the English Royalist party in terms of a Job-like test. In the Old Testament, Job’s divinely approved behavior in the midst of afflictions eventually restores him to even greater wealth and prosperity than he had before, which in turn signifies an even higher degree of favor with God.⁷

In the “To The Reader” section that prefaces *Cosmographie*, Heylyn casts himself in this Job-like role and explains the “wants and difficulties” that he “struggle[d]” with while composing this work. He advertises his own learning by posing the following indirect question: “Books I had few to help my self with of mine own” and “it rather may be wondered at by an equall Reader, how I could write so much, with so little help?” The reason Heylyn lacked books was that Parliament confiscated his possessions in his Alresford home. While he does not denounce Parliament in so many words, which would have been dangerous, he implicitly casts its members in the role of Satan. After all, Satan, like the Puritans in Heylyn’s life, was the agent of deprivation in Job’s trials.⁸

---

⁷ Job 42:10–12 (AV).
⁸ Job 2:6-7 (AV).

---

on ecclesiastical history is strictly Laudian and Heylyn’s vision of political history is Royalist extremist, though he occasionally critiques individual monarchs for displays of weakness. See Royce MacGillivray, *Restoration Historians and the English Civil War* (The Hague, 1974), 30, 32–35, 39.
Moreover, just as Job’s suffering forged a closer bond between himself and God, Heylyn claims the same process took place during the writing of *Cosmographie*: “And to say truth, the work so prospered in my hand, and swelled so much above my thought and expectation, that I hope I may with modesty enough [say that] . . . The Lord God brought it to me.” Far from being forsaken, Heylyn claims to be the medium through which God speaks. By making this claim, Heylyn defines himself, his work, and the destiny of the English nation in terms of Old Testament typology.

With a need to reaffirm his place in the cosmos and with time on his hands because he had lost his “Ministerial Function,” Heylyn decided to revise and expand one of his earlier works. The prospect of successful publication promised much-needed money. But also the decision to enlarge *Microcosmus* into his *Cosmographie* appears to have been motivated by a desire to place recent events in England within a larger biblical narrative of providential history and cast himself and his fellow Royalists in the role of God’s chosen people in the midst of a temporarily painful test that would eventually lead them to unprecedented prosperity. The example of India was especially relevant since its vast military forces dwarfed the Commonwealth government’s seemingly unlimited power and revealed the New Model Army’s relative vulnerability. In fact, India’s armies serve as a kind of metaphor for nearly absolute power that Heylyn believed he and his loyal English followers would attain once they passed their divine test and the cycle of history put them in a position appropriate to their supposed merits in the eyes of the Judeo-Christian God. Shah Jahan (ruled 1628-1658) and the Indian emperors who preceded him served as apt models for the type of power and wealth that Heylyn and other Englishmen aspired to.

Given the near constant war-footing condition of England during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, it is not surprising that Heylyn should devote a significant portion of his *Cosmographie* to the relative military strengths of other countries. His assessment of Mughal India, however, is far more thorough and respectful than his discussion of the Americas. If a relatively well-informed English reader of the mid-seventeenth century were to peruse this work, he or she would be struck by Heylyn’s repeated emphasis on the enormous size of India’s armies.

---

9 This section of Heylyn’s *Cosmographie* is not paginated.
Heylyn concerned himself with this aspect of India in his *Microcosmus*, but it loomed far larger in *Cosmographie*. Whereas *Microcosmus* contains six references to the size of armies, *Cosmographie* has twenty-seven.\(^{10}\) One might assume that he simply followed Purchas’s lead. After all, five of the six references to the size of Indian armies in *Microcosmus* come from *Purchas his Pilgrimage*, and many of the military statistics in *Cosmographie* are also taken directly from that work. Of Purchas’s collections, *his Pilgrimage* (1613) would have been a most convenient source for India’s army counts because it is organized by country and contains summaries of voyagers’ letters rather than the actual letters. Yet *Purchas his Pilgrimage* only has twelve references to India’s troops, which leaves fifteen unaccounted for in Heylyn’s *Cosmographie*. Heylyn therefore must have drawn the remaining figures from other sources.

Heylyn’s use of *Purchas his Pilgrimes* (1625), which is more than four thousand pages and fills twenty volumes in the 1905 edition, reveals a significant degree of selectivity and prioritizing. While *his Pilgrimes*, much longer than *Purchas his Pilgrimage*, had not been published when Heylyn wrote the first edition of *Microcosmus* (1621), it had been in print for decades by the time he composed *Cosmographie* (1652). Moreover, none of Purchas’s indices and prefaces contain easy reference points such as “Indian Armies” or “Military Statistics” which might have facilitated Heylyn’s intensive labor.

The figures Heylyn records can scarcely be accurate since the sheer task of counting troops in that quantity would be difficult, especially under the duress of an impending battle. Moreover, the rounded sums, usually to the hundred or even thousand, which Heylyn consistently gives, suggest estimation rather than exact counts. The few precise numbers that Heylyn gives tend to be smaller than one thousand and easily countable. For instance, at one point Heylyn mentions that an army had 537 elephants, animals whose size would make them readily distinguishable from the rest of the troops with little difficulty.\(^{11}\) By uncharacteristically using a nonrounded number for elephants, Heylyn also draws his English readers’ attention to this part of the military description and so strengthens its rhetorical power.

---


Heylyn’s source for this unusually precise number appears to be Giovanni Botero. Although Heylyn does not cite sources frequently in Cosmographie, the 1621 edition of Microcosmus features extensive marginal citations. In one of them, Heylyn cites Boterus, the Latinized name, Botero’s, as the source for the number of elephants that an army brought to battle against Prince Idalcan in the Narsinga province of India. Interestingly, the number changes between Botero’s Traveller’s Breviat, Heylyn’s Microcosmus, and again in Cosmographie: 557, 558, and 537, respectively. Botero lists the numbers of foot soldiers, cavalry, and elephants in nine separate battalions of troops, but he does not provide a total for the entire army. One can only assume that Heylyn added these figures. The one-elephant discrepancy between Botero’s Breviat and Heylyn’s Microcosmus was most likely a typographical or mathematical error. Heylyn does not list his sources in Cosmographie, however, and it is possible that he found the 537 figure from someone other than Botero. Yet Botero lists two battalions that contain twenty elephants so another possibility is that Heylyn forgot to add in the second regiment. Thus the figures Heylyn listed were not perfectly consistent with either his sources or his own later work, but they nonetheless gave readers a general idea about the huge forces India was capable of fielding.

The fact that Heylyn counted Botero’s nine separate battalions (with three different troop subdivisions and hundreds of thousands of foot soldiers) reveals the importance that he attached to sum totals for Indian armies. Heylyn combined these numbers and, in doing so, presented an overwhelming integrated force rather than individual regiments. The rhetorical effect that the idea of over 500 elephants in one place had on a reader’s mind would be far greater than listing twenty or so at a time as Botero does. Cromwell’s entire army, by contrast, enlisted roughly 34,000 soldiers in England alone in 1652 and 70,000 troops in England, Ireland, and Scotland combined that same year.12

Even if numbers had been painstakingly counted, the temptation to exaggerate would have been great. From a victorious army’s standpoint, a greater number of enemy troops meant more glory for those who won and, from a voyage writer’s perspective, larger armies created a more wondrous, unusual, and therefore marketable work. Daniel Defoe

emphasizes this idea in his *New Voyage Round the World* by saying that an account of a routine voyage “in itself” has “no Value,” but that the story of an unusual journey “may be worth publishing.”

Even with exaggerations taken into consideration, numeric trends are fairly consistent by country in Heylyn’s work. Of his twenty-seven references to India’s army sizes, only eight have fewer than 100,000 troops. The largest of these armies exceeds 3,000,000 troops. In all of the Americas, however, the biggest army had 300,000 troops, and that was before the Spanish invaded and diseases decimated the population. Moreover, this army of 300,000 is the only one of the five references in all of the sections on the Americas to exceed 100,000 troops, and that army had been disbanded well before the arrival of the Spanish conquistadors. The oral nature of much pre-European American history and the inherent possibility of miscommunication that translation presents further cast doubt on the accuracy of this number. In spite of these potential inaccuracies, Heylyn’s *Cosmographie* provided seventeenth-century English readers with a clear sense of the overwhelming differences in the sizes of Amerindian as opposed to South Asian armies.

In the section on the Americas in *Cosmographie*, Heylyn scarcely mentions armies composed of native peoples. The omission is especially significant considering that the section on the Americas is about three times as long as the one on India. In the 1652 edition of *Cosmographie*, Heylyn devotes thirty-three pages to India and ninety-five to the Americas. For the relatively short section on India, Heylyn crams in twenty-seven numerical references to the size of India’s armies, nearly one per page. The sections on the New World only list five numerical allusions to indigenous armies, which is about one reference for every twenty pages.

By the time Heylyn produced his *Cosmographie*, then, it seems clear that he thought these numbers were important for India. At one point, he claims that King Badurius of Cambaia had an army that consisted of “150000 Horses, 500000 foot, 2000 Elephants armed, 200 Pieces of brass Ordnance, of which were 4 Basilisks, each of them drawn with 100 yoke of Oxen: and 500 Carts loaded with Powder and Shot.” The references in this passage to “Ordnance,” “Basilisks,” and “Carts loaded with Powder and Shot” are important because India’s armies had more than just

numbers; they were also equipped with gunpowder and cannons. In fact, the first recorded reference to the use of gunpowder in India dates from 1290, and the earliest known records of artillery use in battle were in 1368. England’s first known use and description of cannons in battle, by contrast, is 1327. India’s armies had therefore been using gunpowder-based projectiles for approximately as long as Europeans and were at no technological disadvantage with their Western adversaries. Many of the armies Heylyn described also had “Horse,” or cavalry, and war elephants. The depiction of Indian armies that Heylyn presents, complete with cavalry, war elephants, hundreds of thousands of troops, gunpowder, and cannons, would have been highly impressive to contemporary English readers, especially since their own military had no war elephants and only a small fraction of India’s soldiers (see fig. 1).

For Heylyn, cavalry and “ordnance,” both of which Amerindians lacked in the fifteenth century, were the hallmarks of an advanced nation and could compensate for overwhelming odds. When Heylyn describes a combined European and South American army, he distinguishes the “Savages” or Aztecs from the Spanish cavalry. He repeats the word “savages” when referring to an indigenous army of New Spain. In 1518 at the town of Potonchon, Heylyn writes that 550 Spaniards led by Cortez were able, “by the help of . . . Horse and Ordinance . . . [to] discomfit . . . 40000 of the naked savages.” Heylyn’s emphasis on the “naked” nature of the Amerindians reveals his small regard for armies that lacked armor and ordnance, and his reliance on the word “savages” to describe Amerindian troops marks a distinct contrast to his respectful descriptions of India’s armies.

While the “Indian” armies of the New World were largely overlooked or trivialized by Heylyn, the forces of India proper were a different story. He states that King Badurius of Cambaia’s army, which was approximately nine times the size of the Commonwealth government’s combined forces in all of England, Ireland, and Scotland, was still insufficient to defeat the soldiers of another Indian king named Merhamed. Heylyn then tells his

16 Heylyn, *Cosmographie*, 4:134.
17 Heylyn, *Cosmographie*, 4:134.
readers that even this victorious empire, which for a time ruled a huge portion of India, began to stagnate within a relatively brief period and was soon overrun by “puissant Rebels.”¹⁹ From the cycle of victory and defeat on a massive scale, Heylyn concludes that “Nature or Divine providence have given to Empires, as to men, a determinate growth, beyond which there is no exceeding.”²⁰ For English Royalists such as Heylyn who opposed the reigning Puritan government, the idea of a natural or divinely ordained “determinate growth, beyond which there is no exceeding,” which pertained even in the case of the largest armies and strongest empires, would have been appealing and comforting precisely because it could be applied to Cromwell’s regime, whose fall or at least decline would appear inevitable. The view would also explain the defeat of the Royalists which, to some extent, would have exonerated them from charges of mismanagement and tyranny. After all, if the decline of all nations is unavoidable, Charles I’s specific policy decisions do not seem to be solely responsible for the collapse of his government.

Heylyn’s decision to expand the scope of Microcosmus into the Cosmographie and to add a religio-historical “General Introduction” assumes added significance when one views it in light of his personal situation in the middle of the seventeenth century. On the local level in England, Cromwell’s army must have seemed large and powerful, much to the Royalist Heylyn’s chagrin. From the grander perspective that Heylyn offers, however, the situation was not so bleak. If Indian empires with hundreds of thousands of troops and seemingly infinite wealth could be subsumed into a biblical master narrative of “determinate growth,” then the Cromwellian government’s relatively smaller forces and finances, which had existed for less than a decade, appeared far less threatening. From Heylyn’s Royalist perspective, the cycle of history would eventually restore the Stuarts to their rightful throne.

As one of the most influential works of its kind in England in the seventeenth century, then, Cosmographie demonstrates at least one Englishman’s recognition of the real-life limitations of his own country. It also reflects an effort to transcend those limitations by appropriating non-European histories to serve as a kind of consolation fantasy. Heylyn finds consolation in his account of the wealth and might of Indian rulers

¹⁹ Heylyn, Cosmographie, 3:237.
²⁰ Heylyn, Cosmographie, 3:237.
whose thriving monarchical governments seem to validate Royalist ideology. When he reached the parts of Indian history in which the empire began to decline, he enjoyed vindication of a different sort. The ultimate failure of the pagan rulers would confirm the belief that the Judeo-Christian biblical histories and prophecies in which non-Christians could not survive indefinitely still governed the fates of countries with other religions or “idolatries.” In the unpaginated “To the Reader” section of the 1652 edition of Cosmographie, Heylyn makes the connection between morality and long-term national survival: “If now we look into the causes of that desolation which hath hapned in the Civill State of those mighty Empires; to what can we impute it but their crying sins?” If the “crying sins” of such “mighty Empires” have led to their decline, what will befall the Commonwealth government?

Moreover, Heylyn was not above graphically recounting the “crying sins” for his readers, which provides a sensational aspect to his writing and doubtless accounts for some of its popularity. In one of the more gruesome descriptions, Heylyn tells of an Indian village where “Fathers devoured their Children, the stronger preyed on the weaker; not only devouring their more fleshly parts, but their entrails also: nay, they broke up the skulls of such as they had slain, and sucked out their brains.” The image of fathers eating their own children is horrifying enough, but Heylyn heightens the shock value by including lurid details that likely both repulsed and fascinated readers. In another passage, Heylyn describes a regional Indian king who “cutteth off his nose, ears, lips, and other parts.” In addition to the accounts of self-mutilation and cannibalism, other sections of the Cosmographie detail self-immolations, live burials, euthanasia, torture, polygamy, public nudity, bloody rituals, and defilement of virgins. Such sensational descriptions fit naturally into the exotic adventure fiction of the next few decades and may have inspired them.

— Heylyn, Cosmographie, 3:245. Descriptions such as this one support Robert Markley’s argument that Heylyn carefully or even obsessively anatomizes civilizations’ “crying sins” in order to reinforce the idea of humankind’s perpetual fall from Edenic grace into postlapsarian history. Markley contends that Heylyn’s fascination with the fall of empires is part of a larger seventeenth-century trend. See Robert Markley, “Newton, Corruption, and the Tradition of Universal History,” in Newton and Religion: Context, Nature, and Influence, ed. James E. Force and Richard H. Popkin (Dordrecht, 1999), 131.

— Heylyn, Cosmographie, 3:232.
In Aphra Behn’s *Oroonoko*, published in 1688, the narrator provides a similar description of native self-mutilation. A competition for leadership among Surinamese natives requires physical displays of valor that include cutting off their “nose,” “lips,” and “eye.” The line between voyage narratives and exotic adventure fiction was so thin that an authentic version of the former, *Madagascar*, or Robert Drury’s *Journal* (1729), was attributed to Defoe by some critics until 1945.

While Behn may or may not have directly consulted Heylyn’s work, there is no question that Richard Head plagiarized *Cosmographie* for the section of *The English Rogue* (1665) where Meriton Latroon travels to India. Heylyn provides the following: “The people are of coal-black colour (differing therein from the rest of the Indians, swarth and complexioned like the Olive) well limbed, and wearing their hair long and curled: about their heads an hankerchief wrought with gold and silver, and about their middle a cloth, which hangeth down to conceal their nakedness.”

Head has: “These Malabars are coal-black, well limb’d, their hair long and curled; about their heads they only tye a small piece of linen, but about their bodies nothing but a little cloth which covers their secrets.”

---


26 Richard Head, *The English Rogue: Being a Complete History of the Most Eminent Cheats of Both Sexes* (1665; repr., London, 1996), 267. Other authors who directly took material from Heylyn’s works were: John Newton, *Cosmographia* (London, 1679); Edmund Bohun, *Geographical Dictionary* (London, 1688); Laurence Echard, *A Most Compleat Compendium of Geography* (London, 1691). Later historians, such as E. G. R. Taylor and Margarita Bowen, criticize Heylyn himself for what would today be called plagiarism. While modern scholars might expect original research or personal travel from a geographer, Robert J. Mayhew points out that in Heylyn’s time there would have been nothing unethical or unusual about his practice since he saw his original authorial contribution in his method, the way that he collected, organized, and presented information from a variety of sources that he put into a spatial framework by country. Heylyn’s clear organizational method was especially valuable during the Renaissance as the English received a flood of new information from the Americas and the rediscovery of classical texts. See E. G. R. Taylor, *Late Tudor and Early Stuart Geography*, 1583–1650 (Cambridge, 1934), 140; Margarita Bowen, *Empiricism and Geographical Thought: from Francis Bacon to Alexander*
Phrases such as “coal-black,” “well-limb[e]d,” and “hair long and curled” are identical. These passages not only suggest *Cosmographie*’s direct influence on popular seventeenth-century fiction but also reveal Heylyn’s distinction between the “coal-black” skin color of Malabar natives on the southern coast of India and “the rest of the Indians” under Mughal rule, who are “complexioned like the Olive.” The inhabitants of central and northern India generally looked more like Europeans, and more important from Heylyn’s perspective shared more of their religious beliefs than the Hindi natives of southern India and its surrounding islands.

This distinction between English perceptions of Mughal Indians in the north and Hindi natives in the south is important because it helps to contextualize later authors’ depictions of East Indian characters. In Balachandra Rajan’s book *Under Western Eyes*, he says that “Mughal history is treated by Dryden with a disrespect that no writer would have thought of bringing to bear on the Greek and Roman past. Such a disrespect points to a stubbornly resident devaluation of the Orient.” In the context of the relative economic and military positions of England and India in the 1670s, however, there would have been few reasons for Dryden to disrespect or devalue the latter country, especially since it was an ally. As Heylyn’s 1674 edition of *Cosmographie* and other contemporary voyage collections make clear, India and its surrounding islands provided valuable spices, cloth, precious metals, and stones for the English market, and the Mughal Empire was far more powerful than England at this time. Since these voyage collections were enormously popular, almost all English men and women in the seventeenth century knew that their country was weaker than India. Under Aurangzeb’s rule, the Mughal Empire achieved its largest territorial size ever, and his military forces dwarfed England’s.

Far from treating Mughal history with disrespect, Dryden compares it to the venerable Romans of antiquity and even elevates an East Indian

---

27 Balachandra Rajan, *Under Western Eyes: India from Milton to Macaulay* (Durham, 1999), 76.
character above some Englishwomen of his own time. Jack Armistead argues that the Mughal prince Morat in *Aureng-Zebe* (1676) resembles the Roman character Sempronius in Joseph Addison’s *Cato*, and Dryden himself makes the following comparisons in his unpaginated Epistle Dedicatory: “I have made my *Melesinda*, in opposition to *Nourmahal*, a Woman passionately loving of her Husband, patient of injuries and contempt, and constant in her kindness, to the last: and in that, perhaps, I may have err’d, because it is not a Virtue much in use. Those *Indian* Wives are loving Fools, and may do well to keep themselves in their own Countrey, or, at least, to keep company with the *Arria’s* and *Portia’s* of old *Rome*: some of our Ladies know better things.”

Although Dryden refers to Indian wives as “fools,” a word that was less harsh in the seventeenth century than it is today, he actually praises their devotion with words such as “patient,” “constant,” and “Virtue.” The true targets of Dryden’s mockery are some of his contemporary English women who do not exhibit the admirable characteristics of their East Indian and Roman counterparts. Dryden therefore reinforces the respectful attitude toward the Mughal Empire that Heylyn displays in his *Cosmographie*, a book that remained current and went through a new edition two years before the first publication of *Aureng-Zebe*.

Heylyn’s moralistic approach to his subject matter encouraged and entertained English readers who shared his views because it enabled him to invoke biblical origins and rationalize apparent historical contradictions (such as the seemingly infinite number of inhabitants of India and the relatively short time since Noah’s flood). Moreover, because Heylyn provided a lengthy biblical explanation of history in his “General Introduction,” a section that did not appear in *Microcosmus*, the shift between the historical claims of his sources and the ways in which they could be reconciled with Judeo-Christian historiography often led him to reiterate and expand upon points he had made in the earlier work. For instance, Heylyn used this rhetorical strategy to explain a potentially unsettling disparity between the reported size of one Indian army and biblical history: how could King Staurobates of India have a “greater force made up of natural *Indians* only” than Queen Semiramis, whose own army was

---

“three Millions of men and upwards,” within “four hundred years” of the great flood’s destruction of all human beings except Noah and his family? The presence of this enormous population in a single area of the world posed a direct challenge to the Mosaic narrative.

Heylyn further complicated the question by noting that the descendants of Noah were said to be scattered to the far corners of the earth after the Tower of Babel or “Confusion of Tongues,” described in Gen. 11. In order to resolve the apparent disparities between his sources and the biblical account, Heylyn used about three double-columned pages of small print in his “General Introduction” and another column in his section on India. The argument that Heylyn begins in the “General Introduction” and continues in the India section is too lengthy to deal with here. The gist is that people lived longer in those days and therefore had more opportunities to have children; he also specifies Noah’s Ark as landing “on the top of Mount Caucasus in the Countries of Tartary, Persia, and India” and claims that the people in these countries started reproducing rapidly before the Tower of Babel dispersal. Heylyn’s constant shifting between a specific country’s description and the way that it fits into the biblical view of history enabled him to impose a rigorous master narrative on individual events that might have seemed chaotic or threatening if viewed in isolation.

Heylyn derives satisfaction in returning to what he calls the “Real” or “True” version of interpreting world affairs, which suggests a macro-cosmic divine perspective. However, this perspective encompasses more traditionally secular elements such as lists of army sizes and currency exchange rates (see fig. 2). The association between wealth and military size would have been natural to the English in the seventeenth century for several reasons. On a practical level, India would have to be incredibly spacious and endowed with an abundance of natural resources to support a population capable of producing armies of that magnitude.

More specifically, English government was structured in the seventeenth century so as to link money and army size since revenues went almost entirely to military expenditures. Between 1689 and 1697, for
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instance, seventy-four percent of England’s overall government expenditure was devoted to the military.\textsuperscript{34} No large-scale social programs existed and specific tolls rather than general income taxes paid for necessary public works like roads and bridges. Heylyn makes the connection between wealth and armies explicit:

if Badurius, which was King of Cambaia only, could bring into the field at once 500 Tun of Gold and Silver to pay his Army; and after the loss of all that treasure, advanced upon the sudden the sum of 600000 Crowns, which he sent to Solyman . . . What infinite Treasures must we think this Prince to be Master of, who hath more than four times the estate of the King of Cambaia?\textsuperscript{35}

As this passage suggests, the size of India’s armies reveals a complex network of associations that connect the size of the army to the cost of its maintenance and thence to the wealth of the ruler.

By repeatedly listing these figures in an almost incantatory way, Heylyn excites his readers’ appetites for a revival of the East India trade, a project that both Charles I and Cromwell endorsed. Each of these rulers used the East India Company as a creditor, or more accurately as a benefactor since neither of the two men repaid their loans.\textsuperscript{36} Consequently, Heylyn’s promotion of trade to the East Indies testified to loyalty to Charles I which could be safely made in print without endangering Heylyn further with the Commonwealth government. With such broad support in place, Heylyn was free to dwell on the trade benefits that India could offer England. He exclaims, “Only we may conjecture by the great wealth of those several Princes, and the vast Armies by them raised in their several Territories; that his Annual Revenues, Casualties, and united Forces must be almost infinite.”\textsuperscript{37} The phrase “almost infinite” indicates one of his main points about the Mughal Empire. By constantly emphasizing the numbers of Mughal troops, and the wealth that the maintenance of those soldiers suggested, Heylyn expresses his envy of India’s power. A strong army also provided rulers with the ability to seize and defend strategic

\textsuperscript{34} John Childs, Warfare in the Seventeenth Century (London, 2001), 88.
\textsuperscript{35} Heylyn, Cosmographie, 3:237.
\textsuperscript{36} Markley, Far East, 64.
\textsuperscript{37} Heylyn, Cosmographie, 3:246.
ports. Thus, wealth led to the equipment and provision of armies, which in turn captured and protected wealth. The large forces could guarantee, at least in theory, safe trade with the English. India’s vast military would also require a steady supply of gunpowder, so England’s saltpetre merchants could have a ready market. Appropriately enough, the sentence about the infinite nature of Mughal military might and wealth is the last line that Heylyn writes about India before closing with his stock phrase: “And so much for” India.\(^\text{38}\)

What they could not take by force, then, Englishmen might gain through trade. Yet trade was not favorably balanced in the seventeenth century. England’s main export, wool, was not especially valuable on the European market, and the English were running out of natural resources. Timber, which was crucial for the production of ships, buildings, and heat during England’s cold winters, serves as a case in point. In Andrew Marvell’s 1653 poem “Bermudas,” a crew in an “English boat” describes the island as “far kinder than [their] own” with pineapple trees and “cedars,” and Aphra Behn’s narrator in *Oroonoko* says “The very wood” in Surinam has “an intrinsic value above common timber . . . and bear[s] a price considerable.”\(^\text{39}\) By 1732, according to Oliver Goldsmith, a dispute over England’s right of “cutting logwood in the bay of Campeachy” led directly to war with Spain.\(^\text{40}\)

Heylyn follows Purchas by attempting to provide an ideological justification for the trade imbalance through theological rhetoric:

> But nothing more sets forth the Power and Wisdom of Almighty God, as it relates to these particulars, than that most admirable intermixture of Want with Plenty, whereby he hath united all the parts of the World in a continual Traffique and Commerce with one another: some Countries being destitute of those Commodities, with which others abound; and being plentiful in those, which the others want.\(^\text{41}\)

\(^{38}\) Heylyn, *Cosmographie*, 3:246.  
\(^{41}\) Heylyn, *Cosmographie*, 1:5.
In this passage, which idealistically posits that nations will “Traffique and Commerce with one another” rather than forcibly taking the things they need by warfare, Heylyn argues that the Judeo-Christian God created a world in which the intermingling and interdependence of all His people was not just encouraged but actually required. In practice, Englishmen were forced to trade with “Indians” in India if they wanted to gain access to valuable spices and commodities since a military takeover of the Mughal Empire was out of the question. By framing the weakness as obedience to divine mandate, Heylyn furnished his countrymen a sense of dignity and importance in global affairs.

Voyage collection editors such as Heylyn had a determinative impact on the popular fiction and worldviews of the ensuing decades. Heylyn is especially significant since he was not just an isolated bestselling author; he summarized firsthand accounts by English travelers such as William Hawkins, Ralph Fitch, and dozens of others. Heylyn’s religiously saturated *Cosmographie* reveals a good deal about the ways in which the English saw themselves in relation to the rest of the world and performs the cultural work of national identity formation which the more secular and fictionalized literary forms would increasingly share.