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'Tweeting Ben Jonson’s Walk: Experiencing the Spatial-Temporality of the “Foot Voyage”'

Anna Groundwater
School of History, Classics and Archaeology, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, United Kingdom

ABSTRACT
In 1618, the playwright Ben Jonson walked from London to Edinburgh. In 2009 details of that walk were recovered in a manuscript account. In 2013, Jonson’s ‘Foot Voyage’ was tweeted real-time from July to October, and a linked blog hosted a digital map deepened with information from the text. Jonson’s ‘virtual’ journey was to enhance public engagement, his absorption into new communities echoed by exchanges with their twenty-first-century inhabitants. Simultaneously, the tweets suggested the spatial-temporality of Jonson’s actions in a manner not discernable in the linear narrative, revealing their kinetic quality. This stimulated a rethinking of the walk’s historical temporality, which challenges the historical distance between walker and audience.

In 1618, the playwright Ben Jonson walked from London to Edinburgh. In 2013, Jonson’s journey was tweeted real-time on its original days and months from 8 July to 5 October @BenJonsonsWalk. Jonson’s ‘virtual’ walk was part of a social media campaign designed primarily to enhance public engagement with a recently discovered manuscript account by an anonymous companion of this ‘Foot Voyage’ (as it was entitled), from which the tweets were excerpted.1 This journal detailed for the first time, the route he took, the people he met, and what he saw along the way. The tweeting of this account was linked into an accompanying blog, ‘Ben Jonson’s Walk’, which fleshed out the world through which Jonson was travelling, and marked his progress north on a map impregnated with information from the text.2 Whilst the immediate benefits of contact within and outside academia were anticipated, what became apparent was the way in which tweeting Jonson’s walk in real-time enabled the research team to experience something of the spatial-temporality of the journey from a perspective not so easily accomplished on the flat manuscript page, and within the linear narrative.3

This article therefore explores how this virtual re-enactment of Jonson’s ‘Foot Voyage’ stimulated a re-thinking of its social, spatial and temporal dimensions.4 Tweeting excerpts from the manuscript detailed his social encounters, and the sites visited, whilst locating this
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information on a digital map displayed the journey in its geographical framework. Beyond this, however, this article shows how the combination of tweeting and mapping suggests something of the social, spatial, and temporal frameworks of Jonson’s movements, and the kinetic qualities of his walk. The real-time release of tweets reconstructed the constraints of pedestrian travel, where daily progress was limited to around 20 miles, and thus compelled an experience of the slowly unfolding narrative. Each real-time tweet marked the passage of time, which was then geo-located on the digital map along the route travelled. As a result, the history of the Foot-Voyage can be written not just in the places Jonson went, but in the trace of his movements, the practice of walking itself, the social connections that he embodied as he walked north, the time it took him to do it, and the progress evident in the tweeted narrative.5

Furthermore, this article considers how the immediacy and connectivity of the internet facilitated the interaction of the project team, with those that followed Jonson on twitter, and their own engagement with the tweeted manuscript. It will be shown that the connections thus established helped to lessen the historical distance between Jonson, and his fellow virtual ‘walkers’. In 1618, as Jonson moved on from one parish, or town, or shire to the next he crossed the boundaries of social spaces and administrative places, passed on to the care of new groups of people. This fleeting absorption into new communities was echoed in 2013 in our exchanges on social media with the twenty-first-century inhabitants of those locales, as we, and a virtual Jonson, paused in shared social spaces. Some of these followers continued to accompany us on twitter interacting within a mobile social space, focused on Jonson, until the journey’s end. At the same time, the immediacy of this experience fostered by the synchronization of the tweeting of Jonson’s movements in 1618 with twenty-first-century life, collapsed the representation of the time between the walk’s first iteration and its virtual re-enactment four hundred years later. It demonstrates how the digital manipulation of texts, combined with the interconnectivity of the web, allows us to re-think historical spaces and distance. As Luke Tredinnick notes, the ‘immediacy of digital history, like the immediacy of the digital image, threatens to dissolve that gap between the past and the present’.6

Here it will be suggested that it is within the spheres of digital and online media, in its flexibility, networked and inherently mediatory nature, that we can provoke a flicker of recognition or affinity between past and present that allows simultaneously an acknowledgement of the very different historical contexts. Computational methods allow the reader to participate within this process, and to interpret the refigured texts from their own perspectives, achieving their own understanding of the historical record. There is no ‘properly historical perspective’ as Mark Salber Phillips shows. History has always been interpretive, affective, but an understanding of that can help diminish a prescriptive structuring of historical distance, that allows a reimagining of the multiple temporalities at play in any historical account. Furthermore, Salber Phillips’s suggestion of the value of multiple genres and medias for historical representation (although he did not include digital media in this) allow us some freedom to rethink ideas of historical distance.7

But turning first briefly to Ben Jonson himself, the walk and its contexts [see map].8 When Ben Jonson (1572–1637) set out on foot from London in July 1618 he was at the height of his career, the successful author of several plays, and a large body of poetry, recently collated in his published Works of 1616. He had also been appointed by the king, James VI and I, for his masque-writing skills to the court; he had been staging such spectacles there since 1605 in which members of the royal households participated, including Queen Anne and Prince
Henry. He was thus intimately connected with the king and his courtiers, several of whom were his patrons. He was also part of theatrical spheres beyond Whitehall, his plays performed at Blackfriars and Whitefriars, his works commissioned as well by civic institutions, the guilds and Inns of Court. A prominent figure in the convivial dining societies frequented by the
capital’s literary and legal fraternities, he was renowned for his sociability as much as his widening girth.9

As an entrenched denizen of these markedly urban communities, and his writing in demand, Jonson’s decision to set off on foot for Edinburgh was a cause for conjecture, then and now. In 1617, one correspondent had observed ‘Ben Jonson is going on foot to Edinburgh and back, for his profit’, but what exactly that profit was remains uncertain.10 There was perhaps a monetary wager involved, or the hope of new commissions, or a future publication of his experiences. The references to money ‘subscribed’ by various nobles, and a lengthy deviation from the quickest route north (to his new patron Sir William Cavendish at Welbeck Abbey in Nottinghamshire), give credence to such pecuniary objectives. Or perhaps it was undertaken in the spirit of pilgrimage to the land, he was to claim, of his forefathers. In this he was replicating his royal master James who had the previous year, in 1617, made his own ‘salmond-lyke’ return to Scotland. Jonson was to find a warm welcome there, his entertainment amongst landed and civic elites orchestrated by a series of Scottish courtiers, and perhaps at the behest of the king himself. Certainly when Jonson returned to London he made haste to court, where he was pleased to relate that James ‘professed … some Joy to see me, and is pleased to hear of the Purpose of my Book’. His own planned narration of the walk, he lamented, was destroyed in a fire in his study in 1623; the loss of ‘my journey into Scotland sung, With all the adventures’.11 The finding of the ‘Foot Voyage’s’ manuscript has done much to fill this particular lacuna, but it also provides insight into the experience an early modern traveller might have in walking up the Old North Road.12

This was the account from which key phrases were selected for tweeting, at least one from each day of the journey. They were released nearest to the time of day in which the actions took place. Spelling was modernized to aid comprehension, but the original syntax retained, preserving the seventeenth-century phraseology. Here we took some inspiration from the tweeting of extracts from Samuel Pepys’s diary, @samuelpepys.13 In this way the manuscript’s text was being mediated by our intervention, made with a twenty-first-century audience in mind. It gave the text, as Chartier describes, a ‘new readability’, and thus a ‘new horizon of reception’.14

These selective modern digital representations of a seventeenth-century text have substantively changed it, from a linear account of 7,000 words to be read on the page, to extracted phrases and sentences limited to 140 characters to be read on an electronic screen, and available only online. This new representation of the text was shaped to our own narrative, appropriated by us to fulfil our own agenda. It was then re-appropriated by the followers on twitter in their reception, re-tweeting and quoting of the project’s tweets, moulding the text into their own narratives; our actions and theirs mediated and re-mediated the manuscript’s words. In the same way, historical appropriation had shaped the record of the journey itself, as it was initially recorded by the companion in 1618, a fair copy drawn up by a scribe in the 1620s, then transcribed, edited, and printed in 2010s, each process a reconfiguration of the text’s meaning.15 Textual instability has always been with us, and with digital methods we can use that malleability to deconstruct, and re-construct the original text, and look again at the Foot Voyage’s record might suggest; as Sharpe and Zwicker concluded ‘A proper account of the past, we suggest, should not merely tolerate the unstable text and its readers but license them to rewrite history’.16 The twenty-first experience of the manuscript therefore in twitter-sphere was very different from its author’s original intentions (although we cannot be certain what they were); and in tweeting the text, those words reached a far
greater, and differently constituted audience than the author or Ben Jonson could have ever envisaged.17

Tweets were released gradually, at the closest time to which the action described would have been occurred in 1618. This staggered timing helped to establish an unfolding narrative, but perhaps more significantly, it was also intended to create a sense of connection between Jonson’s actions, and those of the twenty-first-century reader; setting out on a journey to work, eating their lunch, and journeying back to where they were to eat supper and spend the night. In the same way, the City of York Council archaeologist John Oxley, @yorkarchaeology, tweeted the 1644 siege of York real-time from April to July 2014. Of this @AlcuinsLibrary observed in a blog post, ‘Terse messages gained suspense or poignance from their spatial connection to the modern city and to the actual date’.18 The constraints of a 140 character limit to the textual development of Jonson’s narrative, were ameliorated by its relation to the experience of its modern reader. And where possible, images of locations were included to encourage this connection between the old text and current realities, and to enhance the visual presence of the ‘virtual’ walk.
In order to expand the information on the tweeted Foot Voyage, and to increase the reach of the social media campaign, @BenJonsonsWalk was linked to a dedicated Facebook page, ‘Ben Jonson’s Walk’, where each tweet and image appeared on Facebook as it did on twitter, and also to the project’s blog, with a constantly updating twitter feed on the home page. This widened our online visibility beyond twitter, and drew in different audiences.

As significantly, the blogsite enriched the information contained within the tweets in its mapping of his journey and the accompanying blog posts. Every place in which Jonson stayed, or ate, was pinpointed on the map using its GIS coordinates, his progress revealed as the line of his route unfolded each day. Then by clicking on any specific location, a pop-up box unveiled biographical details about the people he met, what he did or ate, the weather and the distance travelled to get there [see image of digital map]. GIS was enabling us as historians ‘to structure, integrate, manipulate, analyse and display data’ in completely new ways, where ‘location [was] explicitly included as part of the data’. Here a simple layer of information was being added to the map, giving some vertical depth to the horizontal mapping of the geographical space Jonson was passing through, and the linear tracing of his movements. Quantitative and qualitative, spatial and temporal information were being integrated ‘within real and conceptual space’. In mapping Jonson’s journey, this process could be described as an elementary level of ‘deep mapping’, adding in brief moments of the lives lived at each geo-located position, adding to the layering of history at any one place along the walk.

The depth of this information was increased through the blog posts by Loxley, and Groundwater. Here additional biographical information was given about the more prominent of Jonson’s hosts, as well as contextual information on, for instance, the local politics affecting the people he encountered; or, as at Newcastle, seventeenth-century hangover remedies, as after a tweet about a big night on the town. Linking in this way the tweet, the blog, and the digital map, geo-located the historical behaviour and events described in the manuscript through a multi-media format to its current digital representation. In a term used by Todd Presner, David Shepard, Yok Kawano and Phil Ethington amongst others, this is ‘thick mapping’, a Geertz-ian anthropological history in cartographic form; the ‘time-layers, or sedimented palimpsests’ creating a digitally emplaced multi-level history of human behaviour. Thick is more than deep, moving both horizontally and vertically: while deep mapping adds layers of emplaced events to create multiple histories, thick mapping contributes the behaviours and practices, the human experience. Digitization enables the connecting of spatial-temporal narratives with ‘embodied navigation’, which enriches the history of each place as much as it suggests a ‘thicker’ description of the journey itself.

This description was further amplified by knowledge fed back into the project by our fellow ‘walkers’. For instance, at Ware, the ‘token’ pressed into Jonson’s hand by the grateful innkeeper’s wife was explained by a Facebook follower to be a tavern token, issued when small coinage was scarce, and as a form of credit in inns. For the ‘HyperCities Now’ team, capturing, mapping and archiving the tweets in Egypt during the ‘Arab Spring’ in 2011, a core objective was to amplify participation in the creation of the historical record, ‘an approach to historical documentation that builds from the fragments of participatory discourse’. In 2013, the conversations established on twitter between @BenJonsonsWalk and Jonson’s virtual companions had a similar ‘respect for multiplicity’, and ‘a concept of archivization made possible by the contingent material technologies of communication’; in doing so, they enriched the historical record of the Foot Voyage. Information was being exchanged,
and enhanced, deepening the layers of historical knowledge attached to the places Jonson visited, at the same time as extending the contextual knowledge surrounding the manuscript. Connections were being made between past and present that compressed the temporal distance between them.

When Jonson set out from London in 1618 he appears to have had an itinerary in mind, one that had probably been in the planning for some time. During the social media campaign however, the only location our audience knew of in advance was that he reached Edinburgh. A deliberate decision was made to reveal the route slowly through Jonson’s own movements to underline the sense of progression, and to emphasize where this progress was halted, these stops significant indicators of the connections Jonson was apparently trying to establish. This interrupted progress was captured by the tweets describing his setting out, the mode of travel of those accompanying him, and his arrival at each destination, sometimes delayed by the unpredictable weather, or the abundant hospitality that he met on the way. Geo-locating where he halted pegged the route of his walk, and the blog’s map automatically updated his progress. This demonstrated to our fellow ‘walkers’ how far they had reached that day, and located this within the wider geographical framework on a zoom-in-able map of Great Britain. In visualizing the ‘story’ of the ‘Foot Voyage’, the lengthening line on the map between London and Edinburgh, inevitably bookended the portrayal of Jonson’s journey, within that point of departure and the walk’s intended end destination. At the same time, the zoom-ability of the digital map was a reminder of Jonson’s individual encounters, located in a specific place, which were both singular happenings, and part of the longer narrative frame. That zoom-ability is, as Todd Presner et al have shown ‘a way of investigating space’ within that particular location, that particular encounter. The longer history of the walk can thus be constructed ‘as places to be mapped, as sites for the emplotment of narratives as cartographies’; the digital mapping of Jonson’s journey was emplacing its history.

This digital twenty-first-century map, filtered out some of the modern features, highlighting terrain, place names and roads. In common with any mapping, it was inevitably selective in its representation of Britain now, shaping it to prioritize the route and the story of the walk. It was no “more realistic” or “more accurate” than the older mapping of England that Jonson will have had access to. But unlike us, with easy access to Google maps, Jonson will not have had any precise idea of his route, for when he left London his knowledge of the route will have been built not on any mapping of the roads, but oral and anecdotal report, the descriptions by such as Holinshed in 1577, and on the almost road-free county maps in William Camden’s Britannia, Michael Drayton’s Poly-Olbion, and in John Speed’s Theatre of Empire of Great Britaine. The digital mapping of the route pre-supposes perhaps too definite an idea of the sense of direction that Jonson may have had, his ‘psycho-topography’, his mental mapping of the route; we must be wary of how the modern map ‘imposes its reality’ on its subject. For much of his journey in England, Jonson (our subject) was roughly to follow the Old North Road, a road that had been etched into the landscape by centuries of other travellers. Prior to the discovery of the ‘Foot Voyage’ manuscript, and in common with our fellow ‘walkers’, it might have been presumed that Jonson would have stuck to this well-known route given his ultimate destination in Edinburgh. The unfolding narrative however within the tweets, and the abrupt divergence of Jonson on the map from the quickest route north was to demonstrate important decisions to make sizeable detours, that indicated some forward planning. Given that this was done on foot, the lengthy nature of these detours, westwards to Belvoir to see the earl of Rutland, and after Newark a huge loop to visit his
Cavendish patron in west Nottinghamshire, the map visualized the significance of these patrons to Jonson. This was replicated when he diverged again in Northumberland to follow the coastal route rather than the more direct inland road, arranged also through his Cavendish connections. The mapping of these deviations, seen within the wider geographical framework of the walk, emplaced in the places he visited, and populated by the people he met told a story not so readily perceived in the tweeted narrative.

Simultaneously, however, the tweets and blog posts enriched the linear trajectories suggested by the journey’s cartographic representation: the glossing of text in subsequent tweets, the attachment where possible of a visual image, and most days the inclusion of a URL to link to the related blog post, and map. An attempt was being made to suggest the connections between the past physicality of the walk itself, and its built and rural environments, with the present realities, despite their evident differences. For @AlcuinsLibrary he ‘will wait to see if sharing [his] story this way creates any echoes’; and as Chris Speed says of ‘Walking through time,’ the ‘social, spatial and temporal synthesis offered through locative media offers many new ways of beginning to organize data and generate new occurrences for the user that combine, correlate and augment them with actual, physical experiences’. Hashtagged locations, and the inclusion of any relevant twitter accounts, also linked our project in with more site-specific information, and alerted those twitter accounts’ people to Jonson’s virtual presence in their area; such were the tweets including @English Heritage at its sites of Bolsover, Warkworth, and Dunstanburgh castles, and the fortifications at Berwick-on-Tweed. The geo-locating of Jonson’s tweeted movements thus built the history of that walk, as it also added to the history of those locations.

The sites described in the tweets, and the linked images, also acted as waymarkers, identifying the route taken, for Jonson and for the virtual ‘walkers’ four centuries later; as the anthropologist Alfred Gell concludes it is the combination of maps and topographic images that are the ‘essential tools of navigation’. Occasional topographical references consciously located the route taken and situate the walker in the landscape; at the bridge at Croft-on-Tees they went ‘2 miles about for we would not use the ferry’, and from Skelbrooke, north of Doncaster, they went ‘over Barnsdale to Wentbridge’. As Lorimer notes, by ‘its natural inclinations, topography offers the path most obvious, or most comforting, for safe and scenic passage’. Others tweets implied it, as in the view of Bamburgh castle prominent within the coastal landscape and visible from their more inland route at this point; or that of Lumley castle which they viewed on their journey from Durham to Newcastle. Nearing Durham however, Jonson’s companion became separated from him as they toiled over the hill at Ferryhill, apparently losing him in a storm. He seems briefly to have lost his way, arriving in Durham ‘muck wet’. Here was an indication of the physicality of the original journey in the tweeted walk. Similarly as the two walked off the effects of the night before at Ayton Castle over the moors to Cockburnspath in Berwickshire: ‘We hired a guide who brought us to Cockburnspath’. The main road in southern Scotland appears to have been insufficiently clear necessitating the hiring of assistance, something not suggested anywhere else in the text.

Tweeted reminders like this of the act of walking itself served to amplify the kinetic qualities of the journey, making explicit the movement implicit in the gradually extending route shown on the map. From Skelbrooke to Wentbridge ‘Mr Copley & his man came on foot with us’; and from Tadcaster to York, Jonson’s ‘two friends errant still keeping us company who although they rid we could not be rid of them’. Jonson and his companion’s progress
on foot deliberately slowed the unfolding of the narrative, so that others wishing to accompany them had to adapt to their slower mode of travel. Twitter followers therefore were also forced to wait for the next event. Along the way there were departures as Jonson left his companions behind, as he moved onwards. From Howick, ‘Mrs Fenwick, Mrs Gray & her maid brought us two miles to a field where her cows fed to give us a merrybub for our farewell’. Unlike those who awaited his arrival and waved goodbye in 1618, however, in 2013 Jonson’s fellow ‘walkers’ remained with him between the fixed locations, experiencing the walk itself, which after all was the body of the Foot Voyage itself.

At this point in his life, Jonson could easily have afforded to make this journey on horseback. Choosing to walk indicated that it had been the act of walking itself that was central to Jonson’s objectives. The history of this journey therefore is as importantly written in the walk itself, its mobilities, and not just the sites he visited which the project was able to geo-locate on the map. Not so easily mappable however was the very motion carrying Jonson forward; the icon of two walkers on the digital map marking specific locations captured where they halted, but his exact route, and the footsteps that embodied his motion could only be implied on a map; the connections between ‘the walk, as an event; the walker, as a human subject; and walking, as an embodied act’. In contrast, the tweets that suggested the physicality of walking, the terrain crossed, their companions’ modes of travel, the timings of departures and arrivals, and where the rain shaped their day’s journey, gave more substance to the lived experience of walking in early modern England and Scotland. In Yorkshire, they were guided to Sandhutton ‘where we shifted by reason of a huge shower overtook us’, taking shelter from the rain; an experience surely recognized by the twenty-first-century virtual ‘walker’. By tweeting these details real-time, over the course of a day, a week, a month, the whole journey, the twitter campaign suggested the time that was passing between each location, each encounter, each experience. The length of time between tweets reinforced the passage of time in each day, and thus suggested the slow movement between each located departure and arrival. The envisaging of this movement through twitter and mapping therefore captured also something of the journey’s temporality: as Ethington notes, ‘We never observe time isolated by itself in nature; only motion and the traces of motions’.

In choosing to walk, Jonson was instigating a very different set of circumstances to that which he would have experienced had he chosen to ride. Tweeting the extracted text enabled our audience to share in something of this experience. Constrained by the slow speed of walking, and unable to spur himself away on a horse, Jonson was forced to endure the attention of others on the road, the ‘shake-ragg errant’ and his two doxies just outside London, and in Yorkshire the inebriated parson that stuck to them ‘leaping and dancing’ from Tollerton to Topcliffe. Through the practice of walking Jonson was travelling in a different space from that afforded by the more elevated perspective on top of a horse. Here I am borrowing from de Certeau’s definition of a social space, ‘space is a practiced place’; ‘space is composed of intersections of mobile elements. It is in a sense actuated by the ensemble of movements deployed within it’. For Tim Cresswell and Peter Merriman, ‘Practices of mobility animate and co-produce spaces, places, and landscapes’; ‘mobilities also need space in which to enact mobility’. Jonson’s practice thus defined the space through which he was moving, and which he emplaced in each footstep, arrival and departure, and represented by the project on the digital map; for Lorimer ‘walking offers an embodied space’, which is then locatable within the landscape.
As for Jonson, so for the ‘walkers’ on twitter, each tweet read or retweeted one more digital footprint shaping a socially produced virtual space. One of those spaces was that which surrounded Jonson as he moved, connecting him to others walking beside him, or encountering him from the opposite direction. For Merriman, roads are ‘active spaces’. Jonson’s footsteps intersected with those of others, ‘their intertwined paths [giving] their shape to spaces’. With these people he shared commonalities of experience, the rutted tracks, torrential rain, disorientation in bad weather, the welcome sight of an inn. Our fellow virtual ‘walkers’, too, became part of that onwardly mobile space. At Great Stukeley Jonson and his companion ‘were frecked by rain, we were fain to take to an Alehouse’; in response, Claire Kenward @CKmemes tweeted ‘Melting in the #heatwave I started wondering what weather was like for Jonson on his Walk... now I know: “frecked by rain”’. Making overt that connection between past and present experience, Groundwater’s appearance on the Janice Forsyth Show on BBC Radio Scotland was flagged up by the programme @BBCJFCulture, ‘In honour of that, and the sun, tell us your favourite walk in Scotland!’ Jonson’s virtual companions were co-inhabiting a space defined by Jonson’s walking, re-enacted real-time in twitter-sphere. The linear direction of his travel thus acquired a spatial dimension through Jonson’s lived experience, and four centuries on, a wider social space that encompassed his fellow ‘travellers’ in the virtual world. Walking seen as a ‘social practice’ could not be more exemplified by the bibulous conviviality of Jonson’s companionable walk, interacting with the sociability of his virtual companions.

As Jonson moved northwards the space his movements were creating intersected with other spaces, in particular those he entered on his arrival at each town, or inn, or country house. That social space focused on Jonson grew to encompass those with whom he was interacting, each merry group around a dining table, the antics of drunken vicars, the sedate walk of the horses of those accompanying them on horseback. Four centuries later, these spaces were being expanded by the interaction of our virtual ‘walkers’ with Jonson’s walk on twitter, as the audience read the tweets, fleetingly inhabiting a space shared with those merry diners, or inebriated parsons. Some of them more actively engaged in retweeting and favouriting tweets expanded that space still further to include their followers. At York, Lisa @YorkStories, a local writer who keeps an online record of ‘york and its changes’, welcomed @BenJonsonsWalk to the city, speculating ‘They’re probably feasting & boozing at Ingram’s mansion this evening?’. This convivial image was retweeted by @BenJonsonsWalk to our 800 followers, and by a heritage enthusiast in York to their 5,000 followers. Lisa @YorkStories linked her tweet about Jonson’s visit to a longer post on her website where she noted ‘It’s evening as I’m writing this, and perhaps Ben Jonson and his companion are now over at Ingram’s mansion being entertained’, an overt synchronization of her life in 2013, her virtual world joining that social space surrounding Jonson in York in 1618. The use of online social media was changing the way in which, as Tredinnick suggests, we can connect to history, here that of Jonson in York, through ‘shared experiences’. Those retweeting posts, such as those on his reception by the aldermen of Pontefract retweeted by followers in New York and Oxford, were expanding a space and an experience in which Jonson’s seventeenth-century companions and us were enjoying his company.

When Jonson was on the road, and where the exact locations in which he stayed are not identified, or are now untraceable, the social spaces created by his movements and his interactions with others are no longer locatable. In 2013, the precise routes of the Old North Road, or of his possible deviations from it have faded from the record, or from the landscape;
and some of the places in which he stayed have gone, Worksop manor, for instance, burnt down in the 1720s, and we cannot identify exactly which inns he stayed in at Stamford, Tadcaster, Darlington and Durham. The routes therefore indicated on the blog’s map in the geo-locating of the places he visited are conjectural, as are those digitally mapped locations. The location of the behaviour creating the social spaces in each site, or along the road, is thus equally conjectural. In 1618, however, each footstep, each glass of wine drunk, emplaced that particular social space. Whilst the boundaries of those spaces were fluid, moving with the movements of the people that defined them, they were anchored, centred, locatable, in the person of Jonson himself. At the same time, the walk itself could be ‘understood as a cultural activity that is made distinctive and meaningful by the physical features and material textures of place,’ through which he was walking; the walk was the ‘Product of Places,’ located in the built and natural landscapes.47

Moving four centuries on, where we are able to establish Jonson’s geographical position through the continued existence of the places that he visited, pinpointed by the original text, the geo-locating of those locations on the map emplaces for his twenty-first-century audience Jonson’s interactions with his seventeenth-century companions, and thus the social spaces formed. In 2013 the interaction of the virtual ‘walkers’ with a tweeted Jonson at these places could be locatable. At York, an exchange on twitter with current staff in the King’s Manor, visited by Jonson and his companion on 13 August 1618, announced his arrival amongst them in a virtual space that was connectable to the physical building of the Manor’s offices in 2013. This meeting was represented in the geo-located icon on the digital map, and by an image of the Manor taken by Julian Richards @Julian62523002, director of the Archaeology Data Service attached to the University of York, which appeared on 13 August alongside his tweet, ‘Ben Jonson has chosen to visit King’s Manor and @uofYArchaeology on a fine day’. This connection was emphasized by our original tweet being linked to our own image of the Manor in the related blog post.48 @Julian62523002’s tweet was then retweeted by @ADS_Chatter, the twitter account of the Archaeology Data Service housed in the Manor; and then also by the project’s twitter @BenJonsonsWalk to our followers, and to his by a pinot noir loving ‘walker’ in Canberra, Australia. A globally extended space created by these interactions on twitter was thus connected through a physically located place to that social space created by Jonson’s movements four centuries ago.

Taking these connections further, the twitter campaign prompted also a reimagining of temporality. Within the experience of the historical account, through the connections that were being established between the spaces defined by Jonson’s movements, and the interaction of his fellow ‘walkers’ in twitter-sphere four centuries later, these associations were inherently trans-temporal. Ethington questions Heidegger’s ‘unsustainably transcendant temporality’, but do the interactions of the tweeters with the historical record of Jonson’s walk, intertwining with their own experiences, suggest an identification of a shared temporality that transcends period?49 The making of these connections was consciously encouraged by the twitter campaign’s synchronization of Jonson’s slow progress with the daily features of twenty-first-century life, the tweets made at the closest possible times to events described. These synergies were further stimulated by the immediacy of the interaction on twitter with the tweeted text, in its reception by the virtual ‘walkers’ that comprised its modern audience, and in its re-appropriation and remediation by those that retweeted it.50 For Tredinnick, the ‘fertile interaction of the scholarly history and mass culture’, through new media ‘cannot leave either unchanged’51 Four hundred years ago those interactions with
the walk were embodied personal encounters, Jonson in face-to-face contact with his immediate audience. Though a much greater physical distance existed between fellow tweeters, and the project team (itself split between two universities), the immediacy of the interaction between text, its tweeting, reception, and retweeting suggests similar levels of intimacy with the original events. This proximity challenges therefore our understanding of the temporal distance between the walk’s first iteration and its virtual re-enactment four hundred years later.52

The connections thus made between the virtual world and the social spaces focused on Jonson in 1618 compress the passage of years between the physical and virtual foot voyages. The meaningfulness of historical time contracts in the synergies between the twenty-first-century traveller, and Jonson and his companions.53 For Allice Legat, walking itself ‘binds narrative to the acquisition of knowledge. Walking … validates the reality of the past in the present and continually re-establishes the relation between place, story and all the beings who use the locale.’54 From the slowing down of twenty-first-century time on twitter, where the walk’s progress was measured in days rather than hours, to the contraction of time between us and the events described, to the quickening of interplay between actor and audience, tweeting Jonson’s walk forces a re-thinking of historical temporality. The fragility of these linkages, however, stretched over time, and routed via the virtual world of the internet, challenges both the significance and tangibility of these connections. They are ephemeral, tweets and retweets created in a moment, deleted at will, twitter accounts terminated. Blog sites quickly become outdated, inactive, URLs obsolescent. Reference rot abounds. In terms of creating the historical record, however, it may be, as Tredinnick notes, that the ‘distributed storage’ of multiple media arising out of the digital archive which ‘saturates the entire social network,’ ‘represents the most robust preservation strategy possible’.55 But in terms of the social media campaign’s significance, the ephemerality and currency of specific media is problematic: twitter users move onto new media, develop new interests. Their mental landscapes are worlds away from the thought patterns of the seventeenth-century travellers. Connections between their worlds and Jonson’s through twitter may appear nebulous at best. Do they matter, do they have any authenticity?

The answer is partly within the very ephemerality of interaction between walkers in 1618, and in the 2010s, their phenomenological nature. The brief happening that constitutes history in that moment. No matter how fleeting however, at the same time it is a moment set within the wider framework of hundreds of years, of the accretion of human actions in a history that is emplaced by those actions within the physical environment. As Lorimer identifies for the modern walker, the experience of walking for Jonson was both transient and durable.56 Each post, each reading, each interaction on twitter is in itself one of those transient but accumulative actions, linked to its contemporary physicality, and located in the digital map, and in the locations of the twitter followers themselves. Each one of these actions adds another layer to the infinite depth of located human behaviour, the fleeting interaction that incrementally builds the history of any particular place.57 The digital record of these moments may disintegrate, vulnerable to the obsolescence of computer software; their happening however cannot be so easily erased, lodged in the memories of those participant ‘walkers; changing perhaps the way they view Jonson, or a building he stayed in, or the life of the market place in Pontefract where ‘Giants’ were out to meet him. In tweeting the Foot Voyage, the walker can be seen as ‘both visceral presence and will-o’-wisp’.58
In some of these places the connection between the tweeted and the built past was made explicit. On 26 September 2013, Jonson’s feasting in Edinburgh on his creation as honorary burgess was retweeted by @EdinburghWH, Edinburgh World Heritage, an organization with explicitly educational objectives, conserving and promoting the city’s World Heritage site at the centre of which Jonson had been welcomed. The previous week, having retweeted the manuscript excerpt on his arrival, @EdinburghWH had tweeted ‘Here’s how Edinburgh looked as @BenJonsonsWalk arrived in 1618, with a photograph of building with wooden half-shutters on the High Street; the connection was being made overt between Jonson’s experience as he walked up the street in 1618 to the Mercat Cross, and the current physical environment. Several present day guardians of the sites he visited similarly retweeted his visit to them, for instance Historic Scotland @welovehistory at the palace and abbey of Dunfermline, and as he viewed Inchcolm Abbey. In doing so they were connecting those historical happenings within their physical locations, and within the minds of their thousands of followers. And these happenings are being written into the wider record of Jonson’s journey. Lisa @YorkStories, on her linked page on the ‘York Stories’ website, drew the connections between Jonson’s walk and the physical remnants of the places he hung out; the website itself is an accumulation of such moments located in the city of York, and in the virtual world at http://yorkstories.co.uk. Moreover, the knowledge accumulated in some of these exchanges is included now in the hard copy edition of the ‘Foot Voyage’, a tangibility that will hopefully outlast the ephemerality of the internet. Not the least of these was the inclusion of the answer to the question we posed on twitter about the token Jonson was given at Ware.

One of the most representative ways in which to display this accumulated historical knowledge, and located accretions of human action, is within the digitized map. For Ethington ‘knowing the topoi of history is literally to map the past’. The ‘past can only be known by placing it, and the way of knowing places is to map them’. We have shown previously how the mapping of Jonson’s slow progress on the project’s blog, on a digital map impregnated with further information from the original text, could be considered a simple level of deep mapping; in its addition of vertical layers of digitized information to the horizontal geographical information of the map’s surface. Phil Ethington’s thick mapping of Los Angeles, his digital cartography of history, uses multi-media to bring together the accumulated record of centuries of human action and experience with contemporary footage made by, for instance, the Hispanic community. In the case of the 2013 mapping of the ‘Foot Voyage’, its deep mapping was not very deep, just one layer of information. However, in the hyper-linkage/co-existence of the map to the twitter feed, and to/with blog posts containing visual images and additional biographical and contextual information, a thicker mapping was being suggested.

The thickness of this mapping, combined with the real-time tweeting, informed the twenty-first-century ‘walker’ in a way that was to maximize the synchronicities between physical and virtual voyage, and thus to consolidate the connections between the spaces defined by the interactions of Jonson, the project team, and his virtual fellow ‘walkers’. This was to suggest to all something of the lived experience of the walk. Twenty-first-century tweeters were being encouraged to relate their own joys of walking to Jonson’s Foot Voyage, this common experience suggesting the physicalities of Jonson’s walk, and potentially the shared joys of reaching the top of a hill, the pint at the end of the day. Tweeted in real-time, that experiencing of the slow progress of 10 or 20 miles a day, re-enforced the specific kinetic
qualities of the walk in its seventeenth-century context, and thus the short daily distances
covered appearing very short in relation to the overall distance to be covered. The combi-
nation of twitter, blog and digital map created a thicker description of the physical walk four
hundred years later, a thicker mapping of the human experience engraved in the land; the
‘non-simultaneous, fractured histories that co-exist as “time-layers” in any given present’. Action, the space it forms, its location in place, and its temporality are brought together: to
refer again to Ethington’s ‘Placing the Past’, the ‘emplacement of all human action presumes
locations in spacetime, which materializes each place’. Experience is revealed ‘as the inter-
section of place and space, which is also the intersection of human and natural time’. In
thick mapping that lived experience we can emplace it in geographical locations and social
spaces that compress the meaningfulness of historical distance, whilst re-shaping our under-
standing of the temporality of Jonson’s walk.

The virtual re-enactment of Jonson’s Foot Voyage in a social media campaign was pri-
marily intended to be an exercise in public engagement. Arguably of greater significance
were the deeper academic benefits that the exercise brought to our reflection on a discovery
of a momentous primary source, and a huge body of research. Above all it reiterated the
journey itself, the act of walking, Jonson’s arrivals and departures, the experience between
the sites visited as much as the inns, castles, and houses themselves, and the passage of
time over a day, a month, a season. On the one hand tweeting and mapping the journey
visualized how very slow pedestrian travel was within the longer framework of a journey
from London to Edinburgh, and the ability now to traverse the same distance within hours. I
remember driving from Huntingdon via Newmarket to Stamford in a matter of minutes
during the project, something that the twitter feed took two days to accomplish; and then
from Stamford to Edinburgh in a few hours, not months. On the other, the tweeted richness
of each day’s experience, the interactions of Jonson with his companions, and of our virtual
‘walkers’ with the project on social media, expanded, and deepened the narrative being told
in the manuscript’s pages, suggesting the physicality and sociability of a companionable
journey.

This compression of history was re-enforced by the tweeting and digital mapping of the
manuscript’s account of the built and rural landscapes that still retain features that Jonson
will have experienced, not the least of these the sections that remain of the Old North Road,
and the survival of those inns and houses in which he stayed. Similarly, as they perambulated
around remarkable local sights, his companion recorded the tales associated with them.
Four centuries later those stories resonate, traces of them connecting today’s tourist follow-
ing a heritage trail in Fife, for example, to the tales heard by seventeenth-century travellers.
These descriptions of places, and retelling of stories were now tweeted with an immediacy
of interaction with our audience not achievable at such scale to early modern writers. So
from a slowing down of time, where speed is measured in days rather than minutes, to the
contraction of time between us and the events described, to the quickening of interplay
between actor and audience, tweeting Jonson’s walk forces a re-thinking of historical tem-
porality, and its representation.

This may help to address the concerns of scholars, such as Johanna Drucker, over the
deterministic qualities of digitization in relation to the humanities; and fears that the ‘expe-
rience of temporality; the representation of that experience’, and the ‘distinction between
time and temporality’, evaporate in the ‘fallback position of taking timelines as an adequate
measure on which to map the complexities of historical and aesthetic experience’. Tweeting
the voyage real-time re-established its temporality, lost on the printed page. That said, this article cannot claim any ‘veracity’ in the translation of early modern to modern experience in the tweeted ‘Foot Voyage’. It is not possible for us to ‘know’ the past. The ‘half-silent connotations’ in the original manuscript of encounters, tales, and the built landscape resist any such claim; our understandings of the meanings of the words of the ‘Foot Voyage’ itself are inevitably interpretative. And in extracting, and modernizing the vocabulary and spelling, the tweeted account necessarily and overtly changes those words, moulding them to a twenty-first-century understanding. Do the inevitable losses here therefore outweigh the gains in such an exercise?69

To return to Johanna Drucker’s resonant warnings on the representation of time and temporality in the digital humanities, and the need for flexible and variable approaches; in particular the ‘multi-dimensional [which] will be necessary to realize a humanistic system for the graphical analysis of temporal relations’.70 @BenJonsonsWalk’s combination of the deconstructed, and reconstructed text on twitter, and its connection to wider social spaces via the internet; linked to the contextual enrichment on the blog, and the visual image of the extending line of the walker’s progress north on a map impregnated with geo-located information, goes perhaps some small way to embracing that multi-dimensional approach, and capturing the temporal, the spatial, the mobilities and the aesthetic experience of the walk. And in its multi-dimensional envisaging, the connecting of the twenty-first-century virtual world, with its seventeenth-century physicality, the digital representation of the walk compresses the significance of the many years passed between them, a de-periodization that foregrounds the temporality of the walks themselves over the time that has passed between them.71

Notes

4.  This article has benefited hugely from the comments of its peer reviewers, in helping to focus and clarify its objectives. Many thanks to both of them. Many thanks also to Deidre Molloy, a Digital Media Consultant, whose insightful questions helped to articulate my original ideas: https://diallingthepast.wordpress.com/
5.  The thinking behind this article was inspired by Philip J. Ethington, ‘Placing the past: “Groundwork” for a Spatial Theory of History’, in Rethinking History, 11 (4) (2007), pp. 465-93.
7.  Mark Salber Phillips, ‘Introduction: Rethinking Historical Distance, in Salber Phillips, ed., Rethinking Historical Distance (Basingstoke, 2013), pp. 1-20, 3, 6-7, 13-14, quote at p. 5. Many thanks to Dr Tom Webster (University of Edinburgh) for his invaluable suggestions, especially relating to historical distance.
8.  The map shows the route Jonson took, in relation to that of James VI and I in 1617, and John Taylor, the water poet, in 1618. See also Taylor, The Pennyles Pilgrimage (London, 1618). The map was produced by Tracey Mooney, and Andrew Nickolls, and appears in Loxley et al, Ben Jonson’s Walk, p. 117.


13. @samuelpepys is linked to fuller entries on ‘The Diary of Samuel Pepys: *Daily entries from the 17th century London diary*’ website, the text tagged to reveal further information and references, [http://www.pepysdiary.com](http://www.pepysdiary.com).


20. Screenshot of entry on the digital map for Tollerton, 17 August 1618/2013. With thanks for web development to David Oulton of the University of Edinburgh’s College of Humanities and Social Sciences web-team.


42. I would like to thank @CKmemes, @YorkStories, @Julian62523002 and @ADS_Chatter for their permission to use their tweets in this article.


56. Lorimer, ‘Walking’, p. 27.

57. Ethington, Placing the Past, pp. 466, 480, 482-5, 487.

The research for this work was supported by the Arts and Humanities Research Council under Grant RA1552. The article draws heavily on the work of the team on the 'Ben Jonson's Walk to Scotland' project conducted by James Loxley, Julie Sanders and Anna Groundwater, and in particular to the conversations prompted by our reflections on the spaces Jonson was moving through on his walk north. An edition of the manuscript appears in Loxley, Groundwater, and Sanders, Ben Jonson's Walk to Scotland: an annotated edition of the ‘Foot Voyage’ (Cambridge, 2015). An annotated transcription appears in the online version of David Bethington, Martin Butler, and Ian Donaldson (eds), The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Ben Jonson (CWBJ) (Cambridge, 2012). http://universitypublishingonline.org/cambridge/benjonson/. I’d also like to thank the people behind the personal twitter accounts for their permission to use their tweets.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author.

Notes on contributor

Dr Anna Groundwater is an early modern British and Scottish historian with interests in networks of power, kinship and patronage, and routes of cultural transmission, in particular those that spanned the physical distance between London and Edinburgh in the early years of the Union of the Crowns. She is also involved in the digital humanities exploring the potentials of network visualization, and deep mapping for her research, and runs modules in digital history. She is Coordinator of Graduate Methods Training in History at the University of Edinburgh, and director of the university’s Centre for Medieval and Renaissance Studies.