Antiquarianism and Regionalism, 1580-1640

Thomas Roebuck

Magdalen College

105,000 words

DPhil Submission in English
University of Oxford

Abstract

Antiquarianism and Regionalism, 1580-1640

The last thirty years of Renaissance scholarship has debated the extent to which the origins of English nationalism can be traced back to the early-modern period. Countering the scepticism of modernists like Gellner, who date the rise of nationalism to the eighteenth century, Richard Helgerson and others have argued that the literary, legal, theatrical, and religious cultures of the period all present evidence for the existence of an early-modern English nationalism. Historiography has always been key to these debates: national identity is defined by creating histories and modes of historical thought suitable for the needs of that nation. This thesis will show that early-modern culture can better be interpreted through an understanding of its prevailing 'regionalism', and that local affiliations to places, counties, institutions, or patronage circles are obscured by a teleological interest in the rise of nationalism.

The first chapter presents a reevaluation of British antiquarianism from the perspective of the history of scholarship. It argues both that antiquarianism was an outgrowth of the transnational world of Latin scholarship, and that regional histories were emerging through the work of devolved networks of scholars. The second chapter considers two poets, one the poet of nationalism (Spenser), the other the poet of metropolitanism (Jonson), and through picking apart their encounters with early-modern antiquarianism shows that each had complex regional affinities. The third chapter, on drama in the regions, shows that the circumstances of dramatic performance make for unique (and problematic) encounters with regional jurisdictions. The history play, and the historical scholarship of early-modern dramatists, are the focus here. And finally a chapter on Milton explores the impact of the polarising effect of the civil war on clerical erudition.

Contents

Introduction		1
Chapter One	Early-Modern Antiquarianism in Context	22
Chapter Two	Poetry in the Regions	131
Chapter Three	Drama in the Regions	195
Chapter Four	Milton and the Confessionalization of Antiquarianism	290
Epilogue		322
Bibliography		327

Introduction: Antiquarianism and Regionalism, 1580-1640

This thesis challenges the notion that the intellectual and literary history of early-modern England should be seen in the context of the rise of nationalism. Instead, the catch-all term 'regionalism' is used to refer to the complex local affiliations of scholars and writers within institutions, locales, networks of correspondence and intellectual exchange, and so on. Antiquarianism, and the literary responses to antiquarianism, is a central focus for good reasons. The discovery of British history through methodologies developed by antiquaries, and the responses to antiquarian research by poets and dramatists, has been taken as evidence of nascent English nationalism -- indeed, a nascent nationalism which predates the development of any other nationalisms in Europe.[1] This line of thought is flawed on several levels. Nationalism is an anachronistic back-projection from the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries onto a very different period. Antiquarianism, as the first chapter will demonstrate in detail, simply cannot be understood in a national context. Rather, antiquarianism develops out of the twin pressures of local historical research and international Latin philology. Literary writers of the period are both producing work within ethnically fragmented and geographically dispersed territories, and are responding to the scholarly investigation of those territories by bringing particular regions into specific focus. In approach, this thesis seeks to combine a multitude of approaches to the early-modern period: the history of scholarship is

[1] Liah Greenfield, *Nationalism: Five Roads to Modernity* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP, 1992). Laura Ashe, *Fiction and History in England, 1066-1200* (Cambridge: CUP, 2007).

particularly important in the first chapter, giving way variously to matters of Irish history, theatre history, literary criticism and the history of religion. These diverse approaches help to trace the complex phenomena of regionalism across different documentary and generic forms, and aim to be responsive to the particular needs of each kind of writing that is being addressed.

Modernist theorists of nationalism have argued that nationalism is essentially a phenomenon of the late eighteenth, nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.[2] Nationalism proper is distinct from the vague sentiments of patriotism uttered by individuals that can be found in most periods of history because it is created by structural transformations within society. According to this analysis, nationalism is a phenomenon of modern communication technologies and the rapid exchange of information across large anonymous communities which they bring about. By far the most famous articulation of this position is of course that of Benedict Anderson, who argues that 'imagined communities' are created by these modern communication technologies, especially the newspaper.[3] Out of these modern communication technologies, and the need for delimited trading-zones they bring, emerges the modern nation state. That state has carefully defined, mapped-out boundaries, and exerts a continuous and equivalent legal authority over every square-inch of its territory.[4] That state also rests on a secular, political authority, where church

---

[2] Ernest Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1983); Eric J. Hobsbawm, *Nations and Nationalism since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality* (Cambridge: CUP, 1992).
[3] Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism* (London: Verso, 1983).
[4] Richard T. Ford, 'Law's Territory (A History of Jurisdiction)', *Michigan Law Review* 97 (1999): 843-930 offers an excellent overview of these issues, drawing its examples from British colonial occupation of nineteenth Thailand.

and state are clearly distinguishable.[5] Indeed, national affiliation needs must be substituted for the international affiliations of religion. History-writing is always co-opted within this process: the institutions of the state are back-projected into a history far-beyond the moment of their actual (modern) instantiation. Other intellectual tools and institutions are seen to help along this process too -- the development of the state museum or the authoritative mapping of territories, for example.[6] So the modernist position argues that nationalism is a complex of several characteristic phenomena of 'modernity': rapid communications, consolidation of the state, secularisation, and the co-option of intellectuals to serve state functions.[7]

The theorist Anthony D. Smith has presented the strongest counter arguments to the modernist position. Nations, to Smith, broadly require four defining constituents: a territorially bounded ancestral homeland; shared cultural myths and memories; common institutional and jurisdictional frameworks; the formation of a shared public culture based on an indigenous resource (language, religion, etc.).[8] Smith also distinguishes between the horizontal and vertical penetration of nationalism within a given territory. Nationalism, in Smith's view, can still be confined horizontally to a very small elite within society, rather than having to penetrate vertically downwards through that society. This notion allows Smith to avoid the necessary centrality

---

[5] For a powerful modern account of secularisation, which critiques the prevailing 'subtraction theory' and argues that secularisation is itself an ideological product of modernism see Charles Taylor, *A Secular Age* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP, 2007).

[6] e.g. Curtis M. Hinsley, 'Digging for Identity: Reflections on the Cultural Background of Collecting', *American Indian Quarterly* 20 (1996): 180-196;

[7] For influential theories of modernity see Hans Blumenberg, *The Legitimacy of the Modern Age* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1983); Jürgen Habermas, *The Philosophical Discourse of Modernity: Twelve Lectures* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1987).

[8] A good introduction to his many (and largely very similar) publications is Anthony D. Smith, *Myths and Memories of the Nation* (Oxford: OUP, 1999).

of mass-communications (and the emergence of mass-literacy) to narratives of the rise of nationalism. This frees him up to discover nations throughout history -- the first, in his view, were the ancient Israelites. This is impressive work because its tight(ish) definitions do provide tools with which to think about the past. However, so much has been evacuated here from the notion of 'nationalism', it might be better to think that Smith is simply describing a loose collection of group identities. This has also become the fate of Benedict Anderson's work. Starting as a piece of modernist historiography on nationalism, the notion of 'imagined communities' has proved so suggestive and dazzling, especially to literary critics, that any fictive community can now be considered an embryo of the nation, and hence of nationalism.[9] Any writers' patriotic sound-bites can be divorced from not only their immediate context within a text, but from their institutional and social context, to suggest that such communities were beginning to articulate national sentiments.[10]

Stronger arguments have been advanced, famously and paradigmatically, by Richard Helgerson.[11] In his massively influential work -- which has certainly inspired this project, even if the final thesis now seeks to critique some of his approaches and conclusions -- Helgerson presented impressive readings of debates on language, law, historiography, land-writing and theology to argue these multiple languages were all part of the emergence of 'forms of nationhood'.

---

[9] See the various way the term is used in the essays collected in David Loewenstein and Paul Stevens, *Early Modern Nationalism and Milton's England* (Toronto: Toronto UP, 2008). For all that Claire McEachern, *The Poetics of English Nationhood* (Cambridge: CUP, 1996) is full of excellent readings of literary texts, the claims for a sixteenth-century 'nationalism' remain to me unpersuasive.

[10] Cathy Shrank, *Writing the Nation in Reformation England, 1530-1580* (Oxford: OUP, 2004) is culpable here, although her readings of Andrew Boorde and other Tudor humanists are still of value.

[11] Richard Helgerson, *Forms of Nationhood* (Chicago: Chicago UP, 1992).

For all its subtlety and majestic range, Helgerson's work has been subjected to significant critiques in recent years. The most suggestive and important of these critiques derives from J.G.A. Pocock's work on the New British History, which later influenced civil war historians and now literary critics.[12] Helgerson, so goes this line of thinking, has presented an Anglo-centric model of state-formation which simplistically implies the existence of a centralized state by the Elizabethan and early Stuart period. Instead, it is necessary to see British histories in terms of the multiply complicated interactions between three emerging kingdoms, and the British territories themselves as characterized by 'debateable lands' -- borderlands where jurisdiction remained undefined.[13] The work of Colin Kidd has also argued that such devolved British identities cannot be seen in a secular context: national lineages were plotted into the repeopling of the world after the Flood by Noah's sons, according to Biblical history.[14] A fruitful interaction between the traditionally more amateur local history-writing and professional history-writing, encouraged by the 1980s civil-war revisionists and their students, has begun to complicate this picture even further.[15] Not only

---

[12] J.G.A. Pocock, 'British History: A Plea for a New Subject', *Journal of Modern History* 47 (1975): 601-24.

[13] Enormously influential here is the civil war historiography of Conrad Russell, especially: *The Causes of the English Civil War: the Ford Lectures Delivered in the University of Oxford 1987-1988* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990) and *The Fall of the British Monarchies 1637-1642* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991). John Morrill has adopted and extended this approach from the 1990s onwards. See for instance his: 'The War(s) of the Three Kingdoms,' in Glen Burgess, ed., *The New British History: Founding a Modern State 1603-1715* (London: Tauris, 1999), 65-91; 'Thinking about the New British History,' in David Armitage, ed*., British Political Thought in Literature, History and Theory* (Cambridge: CUP, 2006), 23-46; *'Uneasy Lies the Head that Wears a Crown': Dynastic Crises in Tudor and Stewart Britain 1504-1746* (Reading: University of Reading, 2005). This approach has also been situated in a comparative European framework by J.H. Elliott, 'A Europe of Composite Monarchies', *Past and Present* 137 (1992): 48-71.

[14] Colin Kidd, *British Identities Before Nationalism: Ethnicity and Nationhood in the Atlantic World, 1600-1800* (Cambridge: CUP, 1999); and for a broader overview see his *The Forging of Races: Race and Scripture in the Protestant Atlantic World, 1600-2000* (Cambridge: CUP, 2000). See the discussion of Camden in the next chapter.

[15] Diarmaid MacCulloch, *Suffolk and the Tudors: Politics and Religion in an English County 1500-1600* (Oxford: OUP, 1986); John Morrill, *Revolt of the Provinces : Conservatives and Radicals in the*

county affiliations, but the particular local politics of a town and region need to be taken into account when thinking about the origins of nationalism. It is no surprise that the best recent work on state-formation -- note, not state-building, which implies a more centralized and state-directed process -- is mainly a history of the political difficulties faced by local office-holders.[16]

So what does this thesis mean by the term 'regionalism'?[17] It too, of course, is an anachronistic term -- there were not 'regionalists' in the sixteenth and seventeenth century, any more than there were 'nationalists'. Nor is this even the sort of label that would be applied by contemporaries to the vague groups that may never even have existed, in the way say 'republicans', 'libertins' or 'atheists' might be.[18] However, 'regionalism' does have the advantage that it can describe a number of historical realities in the early-modern period, in a way that 'nationalism' does not. Regionalism refers to the specific local affiliations in which a writer or scholar is embedded, and to which his work gives expression. Such regionalism can be of multiple kinds: geographical affiliations with specific

---

English Civil War, 1630-1650 (London: Longman, 1980). Morrill's own comments on the intellectual origins of this work can be found in his revised edition, *Revolt in the Provinces: The People of England and the Tragedies of War 1630-1648* (London: Longman, 1990; rev. edn.). See also, for instance: Steve Hindle, *On the Parish?: The Micro-Politics of Poor Relief in Rural England, c.1550-1750* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2004); Keith Wrightson, 'The Politics of the Parish in Early Modern England', in Paul Griffiths, Adam Fox and Steve Hindle, eds., *The Experience of Authority in Early Modern England* (Houndmills: Macmillan, 1996), 10-46; Steve Rappaport, *Worlds within Worlds: Structures of Life in Sixteenth-Century London* (Cambridge: CUP, 1989); Phil Withington, *The Politics of the Commonwealth: Citizens and Freemen in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: CUP, 2005).

[16] Michael J. Braddick, *State formation in early modern England, c. 1550-1700* (Cambridge: CUP, 2000).

[17] A good starting point for this subject is Norman L. Jones and Daniel Woolf, eds., *Local Identities in Early Modern England* (London and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007).

[18] For a discussion of the difficulties of these sort of names see Michael Hunter, 'The Problem of "Atheism" in Early Modern England', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 35 (1985): 135-157.

places, counties, towns;[19] institutional affiliations with, for instance, universities, local power-structures, guilds, the clergy;[20] affiliations to patrons, or to other providers of financial security for scholars and writers; or the location of individuals within networks of correspondence, book production, intellectual exchange and so on.[21] This is therefore a broad term, but I hope one that has a guiding purpose behind its broadness. The aim is to find a term which is descriptive of the multiple kinds of local contexts within which early-modern works are produced and consumed, without reliance on the anachronistic notion that the 'nation' is the primary such affiliation, or the one to which early-modern works are always looking forward.

Two further points about such regional associations, which will be drawn out in detail in the thesis itself, are worth mentioning at the outset. One is that regional affiliations are by definition mutually overlapping, not mutually exclusive. Whereas the idea of nationalism implies a growing singularity of identification between political power and ideological affiliation with the singular state, the advantage of thinking regionally is that the full complexity of multiply overlapping and interactive affiliations can be allowed to steadily emerge. That is why the sections on drama are particularly important to an understanding of regionalism -- although at times depart from the focus on antiquarianism -- because they show how a sometimes embattled entity like the

---

[19] Excellent on this subject, and the importance of antiquarianism to the consolidation of such affiliations, see Jan Broadway, *William Dugdale and the Significance of County History in Early Stuart England* (Stratford-upon-Avon: Dugdale Society Occasional Papers, 1999).
[20] Warren Boutcher, 'Pilgrimage to Parnassus: Local Intellectual Traditions, Humanist Education, and the Cultural Geography of Sixteenth Century England', in Yun lee Too and Niall Livingston, eds., *Pedagogy and Power: Rhetorics of Classical Learning* (Cambridge: CUP, 1996), 110-48.
[21] On the importance for the nobility of building local affinities see Simon Adams, '"Because I am of that countrye & mynde to plant myself there": Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, and the West Midlands', in his *Leicester and the Court: Essays on Elizabethan Politics* (Manchester: Manchester UP, 2002), 310-373.

theatre can cause conflicts *between* such regional institutions.[22] The second point to be made is that, in my view, the sort of regionalism described in this thesis is an early-modern phenomenon, as opposed to a medieval phenomenon.[23] That is partly because the regional is necessarily dialectical: there cannot be any region without the centre. And London was establishing itself as not only an economic, political and cultural centre in the late sixteenth century, but also a centre for the storage of historical records, and hence a centre for research.[24] That is not to say that the regions were seen as 'parochial', although there is clearly evidence for a sense of isolation from the centres of intellectual and cultural life in the Universities and London emerging in the late sixteenth-century.[25] The word 'parochial', significantly, does not take on its pejorative modern sense until the nineteenth century.[26] While there is an increasing sense of the dialectical relationship between centre and region in both the scholarship and the literature of our period, this does not imply (as we shall

---

[22] Bradin Cormack, *A Power to Do Justice: Jurisdiction, English Literature, and the Rise of the Common Law, 1509-1625* (Chicago: Chicago UP, 2007) is excellent on jurisdictional conflicts and their ramifications on English literature. This thesis is much indebted to his work.

[23] On the rather different situation of early Tudor literature and the politics of regional affinities see David R. Carlson, 'Manuscripts after Printing: Affinity, Dissent, and Display in the Texts of Wyatt's Psalms', in Felicity Riddy, ed., *Prestige, Authority and Power in Late Medieval Manuscripts and Texts* (York: York Medieval Press, 2000), 171-188.

[24] London's role as a centre for research is discussed in chapter 1. On London's developing social and economic importance there is a vast literature, but see for instance: Lena Cowen Orlin, ed. *Material London, ca.1600* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2000); Ian Archer, *The Pursuit of Stability: Social Relations in Elizabethan London* (Cambridge: CUP, 1991); and other books and articles cited in my discussion of the Queen's Men below.

[25] In a letter to Dudley Carleton, Sir Charles Percy wrote from Dumbleton in Gloucestershire, 'I am so pestered with country business that I cannot come to London. If I stay here long, you will find me so dull that I shall be taken for Justice Silence or Justice Shallow; therefore take pity of me and send me news from time to time, the knowledge of which, though perhaps it will not exempt me from the opinion of a Justice Shallow at London, yet will make me pass for a very sufficient gentleman in Gloucestershire' (*Calendar of state papers, domestic series, of the reigns of Edward VI, Mary, Elizabeth, 1547-1580 : preserved in the State Paper Department of Her Majesty's Public Record Office*, 7 vols. (London: Longman, 1856-1871), V.502). For more on this issue see Penry Williams, 'The Crown and the Counties', in Christopher Haigh, ed., *The Reign of Elizabeth I* (Houndmills: Macmillan, 1984), 125-46.

[26] See *OED*, 'parochial', sense 2.

see) that geographically dispersed households, territories and institutions could not also be centres of poetic and intellectual production.

This introduction has begun by thinking about the second term in the thesis' title, what 'regionalism' means in context and how does it try to supplement the inadequacies of thinking along 'nationalist' lines. Why link 'regionalism' specifically to 'antiquarianism'? There are several important reasons in the context of this thesis. One is because the great works of English antiquarianism -- especially Camden's *Britannia* -- have been seen as a part of, or even a stimulus to, the rise of nationalism. There is much to be said for this view when it comes to thinking about eighteenth-century history-writing, but far less to be said for it in an early-modern context. Secondly, antiquarian histories focus on the reconstruction of local history. This is the subject of the first chapter -- how did scholarly resources emerge with which to reconstruct local histories, genealogies, geographies and so on? Antiquarianism is also the scholarly genre produced across the whole of England, and therefore it allows us to reconstruct something of the intellectual milieu of local communities which conventional intellectual and political histories often neglect.[27] Bearing in mind the important idea that the regional does not simply mean the parochial, but can also refer to interactions between English scholars and transnational regional contexts, antiquarianism is a scholarly genre which has distinguishable audiences: Latin texts aimed at the international republic of letters, county histories often aimed at local gentry and scholars. And these kinds of writing, as the next chapter shows, interact with one another. Finally, it is antiquarianism, of all the areas of

---

[27] Jan Broadway, *'No historie so meete' : gentry culture and the development of local history in Elizabethan and early Stuart England* (Manchester: Manchester UP, 2006).

early-modern erudition, which interests literary writers the most. So when tracing the interactions between scholarship and literature in the period, antiquarianism is a natural focus. Antiquarianism is therefore, a genre that is ripe for a thorough intellectual reconsideration in the context of the present thesis.

Antiquarianism has been an enormous area of study for twentieth-century scholars. We will leave questions of precisely what antiquarianism is for the next chapter. In this introduction, though, I do want to sketch the history of some of the approaches to the history of antiquarianism that have been taken in modern times. These approaches fall into four groups: (a) the medievalist approach; (b) the Momigliano approach; (c) the English historical approach; (d) the literary critical approach. The first of these approaches is the one which perhaps has the most continuity with the work of early-modern antiquaries themselves. This is the approach of scholars who are continuing to work on the same documents which antiquaries themselves used, or indeed are using antiquaries' papers in which documents which have since been lost are now preserved. Antiquarianism and antiquaries are not only objects of study in their own right, but still contribute to a living tradition of scholarship which continues in the present day. One example of this is the continuing updates of Henry Spelman's *Concilia*, which extended from Wilkins in the eighteenth century to Haddan and Stubbs in the nineteenth century.[28] These cumulative projects constitute both a commentary on the original documents and on the historical methods through which they were analysed. The project to write the history of

[28] Arthur West Haddan and William Stubbs, eds., *Councils and ecclesiastical documents relating to Great Britain and Ireland*, 3 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1869-1878).

all the counties of England still continues today in the form of the Victoria County Histories (VCH), still 'Inscribed to the Memory of her late Majesty Queen Victoria', and still using the resources of seventeenth-century antiquaries. Modern manuscript historians have increasingly been turning to the antiquarian bibliographical tradition to reconstruct the contents of British medieval libraries.[29] The antiquarian project is still unfinished, and attending to the ways it has been extended since the seventeenth-century is an essential means to understand that project.

The second approach to antiquarianism I am calling the 'Momigliano' approach. To some extent this is the richest approach to antiquarianism, and it is certainly the most intellectually complex. The starting-point for all antiquarian study remains Momigliano's great article of 1950.[30] It is a work of vast conceptual and empirical reach, the main outlines of which can be summarized as follows: antiquarianism's classical foundations were to be found in the empirical and ethnographical research of Herodotus, Varro and Dionysius of Halicarnassus; seventeenth-century historians, especially those of the later seventeenth-century, were responding to a Pyrrhonistic crisis of faith in historical evidence; such a crisis encouraged a turn towards material artefacts from the past; such historical writing was written in non-narrative forms, borrowed from geography, to allow plenty of room for documentary analysis; however, a fundamental tension remained into the eighteenth century between 'philosophical history', works of historical narrative that sought to explain causes of the Great Events of the past, and works of antiquarian erudition; it was

[29] See the volumes currently being published in the British Medieval Library Catalogues series.
[30] Arnaldo Momigliano, 'Ancient History and the Antiquarian', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 13 (1950): 285-315.

left to Edward Gibbon to unite the writing of philosophical history with the world of erudition.[31] The essential outlines of this argument are ones that Momigliano continued to develop throughout his later work on historiography, especially through his work on the differences between Herodotean and Thucydedean history, on Gibbon, and, as Peter Miller has suggested, in his work on Max Weber, the sociological inheritor of the antiquarian tradition in modern times.[32]

This way of thinking about antiquarianism has had many divers and important products. There has been a great deal of emphasis on the use of visual or archaeological evidence in history writing.[33] Antiquarianism has been set broadly, by Anthony Grafton, both within the scholarly world of the late Republic of Letters, and as an off-shoot of the chronological tradition.[34] The relationship between antiquarianism and the Jewish historiographical tradition has been explored.[35] The second volume of J.G.A. Pocock's current series *Barbarism and Religion* is dedicated to the memory of Momigliano, and seeks to expand, while essentially confirming, his thesis that Gibbon united philosophical history with

---

[31] For a contemporary review of the collection of essays of which 'Ancient History and the Antiquarian' was republished see Peter Green, 'Ancient History and the Modern Historian', *Times Literary Supplement* (1955): 412.

[32] Arnaldo Momigliano, 'The Rise of Antiquarian Research', *The Classical Foundations of Modern Historiography* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, Oxford: University of California Press, 1990), 54-79; 'The Place of Herodotus in the History of Historiography', *Studies in Historiography* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1966), 127-42; 'The Herodotean and the Thucydidean Tradition', in *The Classical Foundations*), 29-53; 'Gibbon's Contribution to Historical Method', *Contributo alla storia degli studi classici* (Roma: Edizioni di storia e letteratura, 1955), 195-211; 'After Gibbon's Decline and Fall', *Sesto contributo alla storia degli studi classici e del mondo antico* (Roma: Edizioni di storia e letteratura, 1980), 265-284; 'Eighteenth-Century Prelude to Mr. Gibbon', *Sesto Contributo*, 249-263; 'From Mommsen to Max Weber', *History and Theory* 21 (1982): 16-32;

[33] Leonard Barkan, *Unearthing the Past: Archaeology and Aesthetics in The Making of Renaissance Culture* (New Haven & London: Yale UP, 1999).

[34] See especially the essays collected in: Peter N. Miller, *Momigliano and Antiquarianism: Foundations of the Modern Cultural Sciences* (Toronto: Toronto UP, 2007); and Joanna Weinberg, 'Where Three Civilizations Meet', *History and Theory* 30 (1991): 13-26.

[35] See the introduction to Joanna Weinberg, ed. and trans., *The Light of the Eyes* (New Haven and London: Yale UP, 2001).

erudition.[36] And Momigliano's approach to the history of antiquarianism was brought to England most effectively by Joseph Levine.[37] But many of Momigliano's students -- including Anthony Grafton, Peter Miller and Joanna Weinberg -- have gone on not only to explore and develop the study of the European antiquarian tradition, but also to think reflexively about Momigliano himself and the context from which his work emerged.[38] Of course, Momigliano's work was not without precedents, some of which he cites in the footnotes to his article. Anthony Grafton has brilliantly contextualized Momigliano's article within the work of the Warburg Institute in the mid-twentieth-century more broadly, including the important relationship between the development of early twentieth-century art history and Momigliano's article.[39] Momigliano's work also had a political dimension: as a Jewish exile from Italy, his anti-fascism encouraged an interest in a form of historiography that could not be appropriated for political ends.[40]

---

[36] J.G.A. Pocock, *Barbarism and Religion: Narratives of Civil Government* (Cambridge: CUP, 1999). On the relationship between Pocock's work and the history of scholarship see Peter N. Miller, 'The Ancient Constitution and the Genealogist: Momigliano, Pocock, and Peiresc's Origines Murensis Monasterii (1618)', *Republics of Letters: A Journal for the Study of Knowledge, Politics, and the Arts* 1:1 http://rofl.stanford.edu/node/37. [accessed 7th October 2010]. Also on Momigliano and ancient century history see Mark Salber Phillips, 'Reconsiderations on History and Antiquarianism: Arnaldo Momigliano and the Historiography of Eighteenth-Century Britain', *Journal of the History of Ideas* 57 (1996): 297-316.

[37] Joseph M. Levine, *Humanism and History: Origins of Modern English Historiography* (Ithaca, NY.: Cornell UP, 1987).

[38] Ricardo Di Donato's article provide important biographical material on Momigliano. See for instance: 'Materiali per una Biografia Intelletuale di Arnaldo Momigliano', *Athenaeum* 83 (1995): 213-244. See also Peter Brown, 'Arnaldo Dante Momigliano 1908-1987', *Proceedings of the British Academy* 74 (1988): 405-442.

[39] Anthony Grafton, 'Momigliano's Method and the Warburg Institute: Studies in his Middle Period', in Peter Miller, ed., *Momigliano and Antiquarianism*, 97-119.

[40] See Peter N. Miller, 'Introduction: Momigliano, Antiquarianism, and the Cultural Sciences', in Miller, ed., *Momigliano and Antiquarianism*, 3-65, 27: 'the Nazis denounced antiquarian learning that was not sufficiently politically motivated as "schulmeisterlich", or "antiquarian"'. Miller has himself brilliantly excavated the national socialist dimensions to the historiography on neo-Stoicism in his 'Nazis and Neo-Stoics: Otto Brunner and Gerhard Oestreich Before and After the Second World War', *Past and Present* 176 (2002): 144-186.

The whole discipline of the history of scholarship, to which this thesis' substantial first chapter seeks to contribute, was encouraged by the work of the Warburg Institute, and by Momigliano's work specifically.[41] But there are one or two points worth making here about ways in which this thesis sits at an angle to recent developments in the history of scholarship. Recent history of scholarship has often taken whole disciplines as its purview: Grafton's work on Scaliger, of which the first volume tells the history of textual criticism, and the second the history of the development of chronology, is the clearest example here. This thesis is more modest, but does wish to suggest that by thinking about the ramifications of a mode of scholarship across distinct fields and into other kinds of writing, insights into the social and cultural significance of scholarship are made possible which would not be within the history of a single discipline. There is also something to be said for this thesis' insular approach. Despite the obvious charge of parochialism which this can encourage, insular history does anchor scholarship within a subtly changing social context, in a way that histories with a pan-European scope sometimes do not.[42] It also seems that there has been a tendency to depoliticize, and even decontextualize, scholarship, to an extent which can be reductive in ways reminiscent of the crudely functionalist accounts of the history of science and erudition they seek to refute.[43] By ignoring the content of works, and reducing their production to a set of contextual circumstances, political readings of scholarship, or indeed of literary

[41] The best introduction to the history of scholarship is now Christopher Ligota and Jean-Louis Quantin, eds., *History of Scholarship: A Selection of Papers from the Seminar on the History of Scholarship held annually at the Warburg Institute* (Oxford: OUP, 2006).
[42] For an overview of the motivations for scholarship in England, which does take into account such social contexts, see Keith Thomas, 'The Life of Learning', *Proceedings of the British Academy* 117 (2002): 201-35.
[43] For a critique of functionalist accounts of the history of science see Mordechai Feingold, 'When Facts Matter', *Isis* 87 (1996): 131-139.

texts, can risk becoming painfully reductive, as well as misleading.[44] But this thesis does try to maintain a sense that scholarship does have political and religious ramifications within the culture of early-modern Britain.

This brings us on to the third approach to antiquarianism, the 'English' approach. It is called 'English' here not because it is produced in England, but because it primarily tries to describe an English tradition of historical writing. It is telling that Thomas D. Kendrick's classic study *British Antiquity* was published in the same year as Momigliano's famous essay on antiquarianism -- and that Momigliano hated Kendrick's book.[45] To Momigliano, historical forms were inescapably related to the description of the particular classical cultures within which that form had been pioneered. Varro was a model -- and a problem -- for antiquarians reconstructing the history of classical Rome because they were writing in a form pioneered for that very purpose in classical times. It is not clear to me that Momigliano felt a 'British antiquarianism' would be possible. To Kendrick, and to others writing in the same tradition, antiquarianism was part of the wider fragmentation of the medieval chronicle tradition into the genres of late sixteenth and early seventeenth century historical writing. The foremost modern exponent of this tradition is Daniel Woolf, who has brilliantly traced the fragmentation of the chronicle tradition throughout the entire social scale, arguing that chronicles turned into plays, newsbooks, cheap ballads, as well as

---

[44] But such work on the politics of scholarship can also yield immensely revealing results, with consequences for our understanding of current scholarship. See for instance David Norbrook, 'The Life and Death of Renaissance Man', *Raritan* 8 (1989): 89-110 and 'The Emperor's new body? *Richard II*, Ernst Kantorowicz, and the politics of Shakespeare criticism', *Textual Practice* 10 (1996): 329-357.

[45] Thomas D. Kendrick, *British Antiquity* (London: Methuen, 1950).

other more scholarly forms of history writing.[46] The key movement in this tradition is not from chronicle to antiquarianism, but from chronicle to *politique* history, of the kind written by Francis Bacon.[47] Where antiquarianism is treated in this tradition, it tends to be part of an interest in the disintegrating belief in the mythical history of Geoffrey of Monmouth -- a kind of Pyrrhonism too, but, tellingly, nothing to do with the mainstream history of scepticism in European philosophy.[48]

It must be said of these first three approaches that there are many scholars whose work is hard to categorize in this framework. The classic work of Fritz Levy, for example, takes elements from all three approaches; Gerald Toomer's unrepeatable work on John Selden does the same, while of course extending far beyond Selden's antiquarian interests.[49] However, the fourth approach's practitioners tend to be more isolated, for their work on antiquarianism is really an epiphenomenon of the scholarship of the first three approaches. This is the 'literary' approach, that of literary critics who are primarily interested in using scholarly works as 'context' in which to read literary texts. This has yielded some powerful and exciting rereadings of texts by Shakespeare and Spenser, and a host of more minor writers.[50] However, this approach is always in danger of being reductive because it rarely endeavours to

---

[46] Daniel Woolf's more recent work has taken a materialist approach to the history of historiography: *Reading History in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: CUP, 2000); *The Social Circulation of the Past: English Historical Culture, 1500-1730* (Oxford: OUP, 2003).
[47] Daniel Woolf's early work was very much in this tradition: *The Idea of History in Early Stuart England: Erudition, Ideology, and 'The Light of Truth' from the Accession of James I to the Civil War* (Toronto: Toronto UP, 1990). A rather crude, but nevertheless influential, product of this tradition is F.S. Fussner, *The Historical Revolution: English Historical Writing and Thought 1580-1640* (London: Routledge, 1962). For a critique of this tradition see David Womersley, 'Against the Teleology of Technique', *Huntington Library Quarterly* 68 (2005): 95-108.
[48] On which tradition see Richard H. Popkin, *The History of Scepticism from Erasmus to Spinoza* (Berkeley and London: California UP, 1979).
[49] See the works by both these authors cited in the next chapter.
[50] See especially Bart van Es, *Spenser's Forms of History* (Oxford: OUP, 2002).

burrow inside historical works on their own terms, to understand the contexts and means that have produced them. Antiquarian works are reduced to being about the 'revival of the past' or some such useful conceit which can then be followed into literary texts.[51] This thesis tries to think more practically and directly about contacts between the literary world and the world of early-modern erudition, but it is certainly not free of this fourth approach -- indeed, it began life as part of this tradition.[52]

The second part of the thesis turns its attention to the literature of the period, especially to its poetry but also its drama. There are several reasons for this. Partly they are personal -- I began work on this thesis in a literature department, which while making gestures towards 'historicism' still largely preserves an old-fashioned text and (supplementary, subservient) context relationship. This does give the final form of the thesis a miscellaneous feel: the approach of the intellectual historian in the first chapter is not applied throughout. But there are good reasons to turn to the poetry of the period too, and good reasons to do so with other approaches in mind. The distinction between poetry and other forms of writing is only beginning to emerge in the sixteenth century -- we might see it in Sidney's *Defence* for instance. But, in a unified early-modern culture based on the humanistic reading of classical texts, poetry and erudition are never far apart. The Renaissance is the age of the poet-scholar, especially in France in the sixteenth-century, where the Pléiade (the

---

[51] e.g. Andrew Escobedo, *Nationalism and Historical Loss in Renaissance England: Foxe, Dee, Spenser, Milton* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell UP, 2004); Philip Schwyzer, *Archaeologies of English Renaissance literature* (Oxford: OUP, 2007).

[52] I should confess to a piece of juvenilia of my own in this genre: Thomas Roebuck and Laurie Maguire, '*Pericles* and the Language of National Origins', in Willy Maley and Margaret Tudeau-Clayton, eds., *This England, That Shakespeare: New Angles on Englishness and the Bard* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2010).

name emphasising links to Alexandrian poet-scholars) practiced criticism, translation and Latin scholarship.[53] It was this movement which Spenser's early publications, under the influence of the Cambridge scholar Gabriel Harvey, sought to imitate.[54] In the seventeenth century, Daniel Heinsius took his Latin and Dutch poetry as seriously as his scholarship, and indeed he edited a famous volume of poetry which commemorated his teacher and the greatest scholar of the age, Joseph Scaliger.[55] Ben Jonson probably met Heinsius in person in Leiden.[56] Jonson himself was a celebrated *érudit*, friend of John Selden and Thomas Farnaby, providing manuscripts and books to both of them.[57] He was memorialized in a volume edited by Oxford University's former vice-chancellor, Brian Duppa.[58] Milton was celebrated in Italy as one of England's most erudite Latin poets, and the German scholar Lukas Holste asked Milton to visit the Laurentian library in Florence for him to copy one of the Medicean manuscripts there for him. And it was not only the poets who could be scholarly, but the scholars were also poets: Camden wrote his own Latin poetry, as did John Selden, admittedly with questionable success. John Leland's Latin poetry celebrated some of the greatest French scholars of the day, including Guillaume Budé, and could have been a useful entrée into the scholarly circles of 1520s

---

[53] On the Pléiade see for example George Hugo Tucker, *The poet's odyssey : Joachim Du Bellay and the 'Antiquitez de Rome'* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990).
[54] Ruth Samson Luborsky, 'The Allusive Presentation of *The Shepheardes Calender*', *Spenser Studies* 1 (1980): 29-67.
[55] On Heinsius' contacts with England see Paul R. Sellin, *Daniel Heinsius and Stuart England* (Leiden: Leiden UP, 1968). Nicholas Heinsius sent his edition of his father's poetry to John Selden (Bodl. shelfmark, 8o H.21. Art.): *Danielis Heinsii Poemata Auctiora. Editore Nicolao Heinsio, Dan. Fil.* (Leiden, 1640).
[56] David McPherson, 'Ben Jonson Meets Daniel Heinsius, 1613', *English Language Notes* 14 (1976-77): 105-109.
[57] On Jonson's associations with seventeenth-century scholars see Mark Bland, 'Jonson and the Legacies of the Past', *Huntington Library Quarterly* 67 (2004): 371-400.
[58] Brian Duppa, ed., *Ionsonus Virbius* (London, 1638).

Paris. So there is good reason to see poetry and erudition as overlapping interests in early-modern Britain.

The sixty-year period covered by this thesis can be justified at its beginning and its end. The reason to begin in 1580 is that this is the moment Camden's *Britannia* is taking shape. By 1582 a substantial draft of the *Britannia* was complete.[59] This is a key moment of transition in English humanism, or rather it is a movement from first to second generation humanism. English humanists like More and Colet had already established European-wide reputations in the early sixteenth-century. But that was for an earlier form of humanism, which was not concerned primarily with the making of works of erudition.[60] Scholarship was a new phenomenon in this period, and Camden applied the techniques of humanist philology in a British historical context for the first time. The next chapter says a little more about this issue. 1640 is the end-point for this thesis because the civil war changes the nature of many of the issues discussed here. The last chapter confronts the reading and polemic of the young Milton because here is an example of a literary writer using the techniques of philology to make public arguments against the policy of the church. The tools of English philology have become confessionalized. After the Restoration, English scholarship would be transformed again by the increasing consolidation of Baconianism and its impact on the chorographic tradition to create natural history writing. So within these sixty-years, the thesis tries to provide some coverage of the three most significant scholar-poets of this period. Drama is included here for two reasons. As mentioned above, drama provides a

[59] BM Cotton MS Titus F.vii-viii.
[60] I am grateful to William Poole for discussions on this point.

particularly good illustration of the discontents of regionalism, rather than implying the early-modern period was entirely characterized by benevolent unity. Secondly, the history play, a form pioneered by the Queen's Men in the 1580s, has frequently been connected to the rise of nationalism in this period. It is therefore particularly significant to show that this genre, too, was inflected by early-modern regionalism. The most significant writer who is missing from this thesis is, of course, Shakespeare. This is partly because there is already a surfeit of writing about Shakespeare's relationship to national and regional identities, and to historical writing, to which the reader is referred. [61] But it is also significant that Shakespeare is not really an *érudit* in the sense most of the other writers are, who this thesis discusses -- including, significantly, Thomas Middleton.

It remains to summarize briefly the following chapters of the thesis. The first, and the longest, chapter presents a synthesis of British antiquarianism. This aims to be a broad contribution to the history of scholarship, but also specifically to show that such scholarship cannot be seen within a nationalist framework: antiquarianism is shaped both from below by regional research, and from above by the Latin philology of the Republic of Letters. The second chapter situates the work of two of the period's most well-known poets into a regional

---

[61] Including: Jonathan Baldo, '"Into a thousand parts": Representing the Nation in Henry V', *English Literary Renaissance* (2008): 55-82; Alex Garganigo, 'Coriolanus, the Union Controversy, and Access to the Royal Person', *Studies in English Literature* 42 (2002): 335-359; Philip Schwyzer, *Literature, Nationalism and Memory in Early Modern England and Wales* (Cambridge: CUP, 2004), ch.6; Ernest Jones, 'Stuart Cymbeline', *Essays in Criticism* 2 (1961): 84-99; Ronald J. Boling, 'Anglo-Welsh Relations in Cymbeline', *Shakespeare Quarterly* 51 (2000): 33-66; Huw Griffiths, 'The Geographies of Shakespeare's Cymbeline', *English Literary Renaissance* 34 (2004): 339-358; Andrew Escobedo, 'From Britannia to England: Cymbeline and the Beginning of Nations', *Shakespeare Quarterly* 59 (2008): 60-87; David J. Baker, 'Where is Ireland in The Tempest?', in Mark Thornton Burnett and Ramona Wray, eds., *Shakespeare and Ireland: History, Politics, Culture* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1997), 68-88; Michael Neill, 'Broken English and Broken Irish: Nation, Language, and the Optics of Power in Shakespeare's Histories', *Shakespeare Quarterly* 45 (1994): 1-32.

context: Spenser and Jonson. Spenser is the quintessential writer of the nation and Jonson the writer of the city, so situating them both in regional contexts suits the thesis' revisionist aims. The transition to literature encourages us to ask a question which will recur throughout the rest of the thesis: in moving from scholarship to literature, in its various forms, are we moving into works which mediate erudition in a fundamentally different way to scholarship? Can literature -- and approaches to literature -- tell us anything about scholarship that an intellectual historian might not be able to discover? The thesis' third chapter, 'drama in the regions', explores the way drama necessitates, and dramatizes, the contradictions between regional jurisdictions. The chapter's focus is on the history play, from its origins in the Queen's Men in the 1580s, through the Welsh history play in the 1610s period, to Thomas Middleton's *Hengist King of Kent* in 1619. Finally, the thesis turns to the work of John Milton, to examine what happens when the tools of erudition are turned inwards onto a dispute within the British church. Antiquarianism always has a confessional dimension, but previously the disputes with which it engages are primarily between Protestants and Catholics. In the early works of the 1640s, Milton uses erudition to attack other English Protestants -- with results that have consequences for the kind of historical poetry he had originally intended to write. A short epilogue will draw some conclusions from the foregoing discussion, and suggest some possible directions for further research.

Chapter 1: Early-Modern Antiquarianism in Context

Definitions and Sources

The new understanding of the identities and history of the regions of Britain emerged from a complex combination of scholarly practices and methodologies.[1] This chapter will try to contextualize the methodologies which antiquaries used to prepare their scholarly works. In doing so, this chapter will not seek to provide overviews of the lives and works of even the most major scholars of this period, or when doing so it will only touch on them incidentally. The aim of the chapter is to analyse emblematic moments of antiquaries' texts which revealed the methodologies by which they approached historical artefacts. I have followed antiquaries into every one of their interests, approaches and methods, over four years of reading in archives in Oxford and London. This chapter is designed to present a synthesis of these findings, not a comprehensive survey.[2]

The earliest antiquarian works to be treated in detail here are those of William Camden, particularly his *Britannia* (1586, first edition).[3] There is a very good reason for this. William Camden was the first Englishman to have a European reputation for scholarship: he is lauded, for instance, by the great French philologist, chronologist and orientalist, Joseph Scaliger.[4] And, as has

---

[1] For advice on aspects of this chapter I am grateful to Mordechai Feingold, Gerald Toomer and Joanna Weinberg.

[2] See the taxonomy of different approaches to the history of antiquarianism in the introduction to this thesis for a sense of the vast bibliography on antiquarianism.

[3] The recent biography of Camden, Wyman Herendeen, *William Camden: A Life in Context* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2007), sadly adds nothing to our understanding of Camden's scholarship or his intellectual context.

[4] See Joseph Scaliger, *Illustriss. Viri Iosephi Scaligeri Iulii Caes. A Burden F. Epistolae omnes quae reperiri potuerunt, nunc primum collectae ac editae* (Leiden: Elzevir, 1627), letters CCXXXII to Richard Thomson (an important go-between for Dutch and English scholars) and CCCCXLVI to Johannes de Laet.

been noticed by Fritz Levy (whose important work on Camden has yet to be superseded), it was Camden who introduced English scholars to the latest in continental neo-Latin scholarship. The means by which he did this was two-fold. Camden himself was the first English scholar to maintain a large and multi-dimensional correspondence within the Republic of Letters. He exchanged and received knowledge of books, ideas, and material historical artefacts, from across Europe.[5] And, secondly, his *Britannia*, published in six Latin editions in England, and further Latin editions (in abridged form) in Frankfurt, served as a central rallying point for English scholars. Close analysis of both Camden's own copy of the *Britannia* and of copies of the book currently in Oxford and London libraries will show that Camden's great book provided a centre-point for research into British history, and especially the material history of Britain's regions. Nothing like this had ever existed before, although it had been dreamed of and attempted by many scholars: John Leland, before he was famously sent insane by the magnitude of the task; William Lambarde, who suggested that a collaborative approach to such a British history, with scholars taking on different parts of the realm individually; and Daniel Rogers, whose drafts for a history of Britain survive in the British Library.[6] But it was only Camden who created this centre-piece of scholarly research, and consequently ushered in a new era of English scholarship.

---

[5] Thomas Smith published a good deal of his correspondence in the 17th century in Thomas Smith, ed., *Camdeni et Illustrium Virorum Epistolae* (London, 1691). Smith also copied a large number of letters from BM MS 36294 (Camden's draft letter-book) into what is now Bodl. MS Smith 74. Other letters could be added to this store: see Philippe Tamizey de Larroque, ed., *Lettres de Peiresc à Divers* (Paris, 1898), 759ff.; Jan Willem van Meel, ed., *Francisci et Joannis Hotomanorum ... et clarorum virorum ad eos epistolæ. Quibus accedit, epistolarum miscellanearum appendix. Ex bibl. J.G. Meelii.* (Amsterdam, 1700), 275 and 276.
[6] BL Cotton Titus F.X

Before delving in detail into the methodologies of antiquarians and how scholars employed them, it will be worth saying a few words about what exactly antiquarianism is.[7] Existing histories have tended to focus on two properties of the antiquarian work to distinguish 'antiquarianism' from 'history': its synchronic as opposed to chronological arrangement; and its focus on material evidence as opposed to literary sources, especially classical sources.[8] This chapter suggests that although there has been a great deal of value in these approaches to antiquarianism, they are increasingly starting to obscure as much as they illuminate. The diachronic versus synchronic division, for example, becomes confused when applied to Camden's *Britannia*; the paradigmatic work of antiquarianism produced in England in the early-modern period, around which any understanding of antiquarianism needs to be calibrated.[9] The first section of the *Britannia* is organised chronologically, following the history of Britain from the 'first inhabitants' down through the Saxons, Danes, Normans and so on. This narrative is often drawn from Tacitus-- a classic example of a traditional diachronic approach to historiography. But mixed into this narrative is a great deal of antiquarian, critical analysis: of language, of coins, and of inscriptions. Clearly, it is not sufficient here to categorize Camden's work by its mode of organisation alone. Equally as much, 'chorographic' histories -- histories

---

[7] On this subject, particularly acute and valuable is Anthony Grafton, 'Jean Hardouin: The Antiquary as Pariah', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institute*s 62 (1999): 241-267.
[8] The starting point (and still the touchstone) for these arguments is Arnaldo Momigliano, 'Ancient History and the Antiquarian', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 13 3:4 (1950): 285-315. The best modern development (and critique) of this article is Ingo Herklotz, 'Arnaldo Momigliano's "Ancient History and the Antiquarian": A Critical Review', in Peter N. Miller, ed., *Momigliano and Antiquarianism: Foundations of the Modern Cultural Sciences* (Toronto: Toronto UP, 2007), 127-153. See the introduction for more context on these approaches.
[9] Interestingly, Momigliano, to my knowledge, only discusses Camden's *Britannia* in the context of his essay on 'Fabius Pictor and the Origins of National Historiography', in *The Classical Foundations of Modern Historiography* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990), ch.4.

which take as their mode of analysis the landscape, its contours and features, rather than a conventional historical narrative -- may have little in common with the kind of antiquarianism we find in Camden's *Britannia*. It also seems inappropriate to restrict antiquarianism to the analysis only of material evidence, not least because several of the most notable antiquaries of the period pay little attention to such forms of evidence. Henry Spelman, for instance, constructs his *Concilia* (1639) out of documents about the early church. James Ussher, similarly, does not make great use of inscriptions in his *Britannicarum Ecclesiarum Antiquitates* (1639). Even John Selden -- who does make great use of inscriptions in his *Marmora Arundelliana* -- does not draw on much visual evidence in his paradigmatic work of European antiquarianism, his *Titles of Honor* (1614).[10]

So in a British context I would suggest current definitions of antiquarianism are not adequate. Instead, this chapter argues that antiquarianism is an outgrowth of early-modern humanist classical philology.[11] Antiquarian methodologies analyse sources -- and these are, more often than not,

---

[10] A point made by Peter Miller in his paper, 'Studying the Middle Ages in Early Seventeenth-Century Paris, London and Aix: Another Look at "Peiresc and the English Scholars"', delivered at a conference in Oxford, 'John Selden: Scholarship in Context', 24th-26th June 2010.

[11] For a sceptical analysis of the history of philology see Geoffrey Galt Harpham, 'Roots, Races, and the Return to Philology', *Representations* 106 (2009): 34-62. On the history of classical philology see: J.E. Sandys, *A History of Classical Scholarship*, 3 vols. (Cambridge: CUP, 1906-1921); Rudolf Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship from 1300-1850* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976); F.A. Wolf, *Prolegomena to Homer*, trans. Anthony Grafton, Glenn W. Most and James E.G. Zetzel (Princeton, 1985); Anthony Grafton, 'Polyhistor into Philolog: Notes on the Transformation of German Classical Scholarship', *History of the Universities* 3 (1983): 159-192; Ralph Häfner, ed., *Philologie und Erkenntnis: Beiträge zu Begriff und Problem frühneuzeitlicher "Philologie"* (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 2001); Luc Deitz, 'Iohannes Wower of Hamburg: Philologist and Polymath. A Preliminary Sketch of his Life and Works', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 58 (1995): 132-151; Jean-Louis Quantin, 'Philologie et Théologie: Les Textes Patristique dans les Controverses Religieuses (XVIe-XVIIe Siècles)', *Studia Borromaica* 21 (2007): 93-128; Anthony Grafton, *Joseph Scaliger: A Study in the History of Classical Scholarship*, 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983 and 1993); Benedetto Bravo, *Philologie, histoire, philosophie de l'histoire* (Wrocław : Zakład Narodowy Imienia Ossolińskich, Wydawnictwo Polskiej Akademii Nauk, 1968).

literary sources -- with an awareness that they were produced within a specific historical context.[12] Language itself is treated as a historical artefact by antiquaries, which is a particular legacy of European philologists.[13] Criticism of sources based upon an attempt to use manifold kinds of evidence (physical, linguistic, stylistic etc.) to date, analyse, and contextualize those sources is the defining feature of antiquarianism. The mode of arrangement of this material -- diachronic, synchronic, or otherwise -- is secondary to the mode of analysis which takes place within an individual scholarly work. It follows that it is important to distinguish works of 'chorography' that are often lumped together by historians of antiquarianism. Tristram Risdon's *Peritinerary of Devon* is borne out of a fundamentally different intellectual and social context, with very different purposes, to, for instance, Camden's *Britannia*.[14] In very broad terms, it is useful to distinguish those antiquaries who are directly connected to the philological debates going on within the European Republic of Letters, particularly William Camden, Henry Spelman, John Selden and James Ussher, from those antiquaries who are working within much more specifically regional contexts. These regional contexts, and the works produced in them, are

---

[12] It is also important to remain aware, however, of the potential tensions between antiquarianism and philology, which Grafton brilliantly points out: 'Here Scaliger was writing not as philologist but as antiquarian. He was addressing the problem of moving from a written testimony to the reality that lies behind. There were two paths that the antiquarian could follow. On the one hand, he could try to employ a rigorous philological method - to establish the exact context and meaning of every scrap of evidence before drawing any inference. On the other hand, he could concentrate on reconstructing in its entirety some feature of the ancient world: a religious ceremony, the constitution of a state, a military organization. The problem was just that to produce a coherent reconstruction it was usually necessary to jettison some of the philologists tools For it was impossible to pay full attention to every detail of every source and to stitch the details together into a seamless and elegant whole' (Anthony Grafton, 'Rhetoric, Philology and Egyptomania in the 1570s: J.J. Scaliger's Invective Against M. Guilandinus's Papyrus', *Journal of the Warburg and Couratuld Institutes* 42 (1979): 167-194, 186).

[13] See Arno Borst, *Der Turmbau von Babel: Geschichte der Meinungen über Ursprung und Vielfalt der Sprachen und Völker*, 4 vols. (Stuttgart: A. Hiersemann, 1957-63).

[14] A copy of Risdon's *Peritinerary* is preserved in the Bodleian in MS Gough Devonshire 3.

described in detail below, but it is worth just summarizing some of their distinguishing features. Regional antiquarian circles are often tight-knit, and tend to exchange information, manuscripts and their own works with one another. Such antiquarianism often runs in the family, or at least antiquarian works, or unfinished projects, are handed down between generations. Regional antiquarian works tend to be formulaic: they usually begin with a description of the geographical features of the county, an account of its place names, and then move into detailed analysis of genealogical history. They are almost always written in the vernacular. Such works tend not to be specific about their source citations, and their sources often encompass a wider range of oral and written records. It is of course also important not to go too far in the opposite direction. The work of antiquaries like Camden certainly also contain plenty of these features. But the intellectual context they are born out of is different: they write in Latin for international scholars; their arguments are plugged into debates taking place over the whole of Europe, not just specific counties; their range of reference is far more Latinate, or even polyglot (especially in the case of Selden). But the members of the Republic of Letters were by no means deracinated intellectuals moving freely in an international sphere. Selden was proud of his roots in Sussex and mentioned them frequently; William Camden drew extensively on regional contacts in the process of expanding his *Britannia* through successive editions; James Ussher was embedded within Irish politics and religious circumstances. The local and the regional remains important even for the most internationally feted British scholars.

What are the most useful sources with which to pursue a deeper understanding of antiquaries and their works?[15] One important point to note here is that seventeenth- and eighteenth-century antiquaries were themselves creating the archives through which we now study the past. The records of antiquarian activities have been (often literally) bound up with their own attempts to preserve the materials they were studying. And in some cases antiquarian papers now stand in for documents, especially charters, that antiquaries themselves studied.[16] We study the British past through a filter of the systems of information storage -- especially libraries and library catalogues -- that antiquaries produced. Some of these antiquarian collections reached their present archival setting due directly to the work of seventeenth century antiquaries. One obvious example is the collection of Robert Cotton, but examples could be multiplied. The process by which John Leland's *Collectanea* reached their present home in the Bodleian is another good example of the ways antiquaries processed the work of earlier generations into libraries so that they could be drawn upon as part of a wider scholarly endeavour.[17] Many antiquaries' works reached their present archival setting in the eighteenth century, with the establishment of the British Museum collections and the

---

[15] An invaluable guide to antiquaries' papers is Historical Manuscripts Commission, *Papers of British Antiquaries and Historians* (London: TSO, 2003).
[16] See Simon Keynes, 'Anglo-Saxon Charters: Lost and Found', in Julia Barrow and Andrew Wareham, eds., *Myth, rulership, church and charters: essays in honour of Nicholas Brooks*, eds., (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008), 45-66; Richard Ovenden, 'Scipio Le Squyer and the Fate of Monastic Cartularies in the Early Seventeenth Century', *The Library* 13 (1991): 323-337; Julia Crick, 'The art of the unprinted: transcription and English antiquity in the age of print', in Julia Crick and Alexandra Walsham, eds., *The Uses of Script and Print, 1300-1700* (Cambridge: CUP, 2004), 116-34; Neil R. Ker, 'Sir John Prise', *The Library* 10 (1955): 1-24.
[17] Oliver Harris, '"Motheaten, Mouldye, and Rotten": The Early Custodial History and Dissemination of John Leland's Manuscript Remains', *Bodleian Library Record* 18 (2005): 460-501.

donations of papers of eighteenth century antiquaries to the Bodleian.[18] So the present archival setting of antiquarian papers itself brings with it the history of antiquarianism. The instinct to hoard and catalogue important manuscripts also extended to antiquaries' own personal manuscripts, especially their letters. If personal antiquarian papers were left to another antiquary who was himself a great collector of manuscripts -- and here Robert Cotton's inheritance of Camden's papers is the prime example -- this encourages the preservation of those papers alongside the objects of antiquarian study.[19] In the later seventeenth century, the nonjuror and Cotton Librarian, Thomas Smith (1638-1701), played a crucial role in collecting papers of the major scholars of the early seventeenth century as part of a series of projected biographies: of Camden, Selden, Patrick Young, and others.[20] So any serious attempt to understand antiquarianism simply cannot focus on printed works.[21] A proper study must pay imaginative attention to the way we have inherited an archival landscape created by antiquaries themselves.

---

[18] See for example the essays collected in Giles Mandelbrote and Barry Taylor, eds., *Libraries Within the Library: The Origins of the British Library's Printed Collections* (London: The British Library, 2009). For a thorough, but ultimately rather inert, survey of eighteenth-century antiquarianism see Rosemary Sweet, *Antiquaries: The Discovery of the Past in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (London: Hambledon and London, 2004).

[19] On the fate of Camden's library see Richard L. DeMolen, 'The Library of William Camden', *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 128 (1984): 327-409.

[20] On Smith see Theodor Harmsen, 'High-Principled Antiquarian Publishing: The Correspondence of Thomas Hearne (1678-1735) and Thomas Smith (1638-1710)', *Lias* 23 (1996): 69-98; Theodor Harmsen, *Antiquarianism in the Augustan Age: Thomas Hearne 1678-1735* (Oxford and Bern: Peter Lang, 2000). On the attempts to publish scholars' correspondence in the seventeenth century Republic of Letters see Paul Dibon, 'Les Avatars D'Une Édition de Correspondance: Les *Epistolae I. Casauboni* de 1638', in *Regards Sur La Hollande Du Siècle D'Or* (Naples: Vivarium, 1990), 221-265. On the 26th April 1619, Pierre Dupuy wrote to Camden asking if he was in the possession of any letters by Joseph Scaliger, and if so could he send them along; he already had ones from Welser, Freherus, Lingelshemius, Gruterus and 120 Scaliger had written to Casaubon (Thomas Smith, ed., *Camdeni...Epistolae*, 273).

[21] And here Graham Parry, *The Trophies of Time: English Antiquarians of the Seventeenth Century* (Oxford: OUP, 1995) is unfortunately particularly culpable.

And finally, before launching this account of antiquaries' methods, connections, manuscripts and readers, it is necessary to say a few words about antiquaries' relationship to the problematic notion of 'nationalism'. It would clearly be silly to deny that 'Britain' was an important unit for antiquarian thinking. It was of course Camden's great achievement to write the history of every county in England and Wales, and even to encompass Ireland and Scotland (albeit much more briefly). But to conclude, as many scholars have done, that this somehow constitutes the signs of full-fledged English nationalism is wrong. I have outlined in the introduction some of the conceptual problems with such an anachronistic concept as 'nationalism'; here it is only necessary to mention a few factual problems. Camden's project originated in Europe and to a large extent its destination was European too: it was a work of scholarship, part of the European Republic of Letters, and needs to be seen in the context of that international world of Latin scholarship.[22] Antiquaries also collaborated at this international level to produce works which reflected the multinational empires of the past: André Duchesne's *Historiae Normannorum Scriptores*, discussed below, is a good example here. And secondly, antiquarian histories do not attempt to identify any sort of national 'essence', any sort of national core or spirit, which the term nationalism implies. What we instead discover from reading antiquarian works is that national history is conceived as a continuous process of ethnic conquest and reconquest; that language is sedimented with the history of battles and

[22] By far the best essay on Camden's *Britannia* and its genesis within the world of international scholarship remains F.J. Levy, 'The Making of Camden's Britannia', *Bibliotheque d'Humanisme et Renaissance* 26 (1964): 76-97. See also , Christiane Kunst, 'William Camden's *Britannia*: History and Historiography', in M.H. Crawford and C.R. Ligota, eds., *Ancient History and the Antiquarian: Essays in Memory of Arnaldo Momigliano* (London: The Warburg Institute, 1995), 117-31 and Christiane Kunst, *Römische Tradition und Englische Politik : Studien zur Geschichte der Britannienrezeption zwischen William Camden und John Speed* (Hildesheim: Olms, 1994).

bloodshed; and that the English regions are sharply characterized according to traditions, geographies, economics and so on. If there is any one unit that antiquaries return to consistently it is the 'county' (also often called 'country' in this period). Even in the case of Camden's *Britannia*, the local county is a vital unit for correspondence and from which his history can be assembled. Finally, there is a problem of what 'Britain' really means in this period -- which has been so comprehensively and brilliantly analysed recently by John Kerrigan. Kerrigan shows that far from being a unified state and nation, Britain was a complex and multiply overlapping series of borderlands, disputed ethnicities and territories. Something of the difficulty of writing the history of 'Britain' will become apparent when we consider the relationship between Ussher and Camden. And the difficulty of such work is even more apparent by the obvious absence from this chapter: there is nothing about Scottish antiquarianism. The study of Scottish antiquaries is so embryonic, and would be such a vast project in itself, that it was simply impossible to encompass any study of it here. Clearly, a full study of the interaction between Scottish antiquaries and antiquaries elsewhere in Britain is a major desideratum.[23] Even so, antiquarianism is already a complex and regionally differentiated practice, producing multiply divided British histories which interact with histories across Europe and beyond. It is to the study of antiquarianism that we now turn.

Methodologies and Practices

[23] In the meantime see e.g. Cosmo A. Gordon, 'Letter to John Aubrey from Professor James Garden', *Scottish Gaelic Studies* 8:1 (1955): 18-26; Richard Sharpe, 'In Quest of Pictish Manuscripts', *The Innes Review* 59:2 (2008): 145-167.

(i) Antiquarianism and Philology

In the 'Preface' to his *History of Tithes* (written after the work had already created a furore among the court and clergy), Selden defends his work's status as a piece of philology. 'The truth is, both it', says Selden, referring to the *History of Tithes*, 'and not a few other enquiries of subiects too much vnknowne, fall only vnder a farre more generall Study; that is, of true Philologie the only fit Wife that could be found for the most learned of the Gods' (XVIII-XIX).[24] Philology, Selden argues, is the original discipline from which all other disciplines draw their learning and practices: it 'establishes principles to euery Facultie that could not of it selfe alone know how to get them' (XIX). This is comparable to the kinds of argument the French philologist Joseph Scaliger had made in the late sixteenth-century when he was editing the work of Manilius: as a philologist he was capable of deeper understanding of the text than were the scientists who claimed ownership of it.[25] These are arguments for the fundamental unity of a Renaissance culture founded upon the reading, emending and editing of classical texts.[26] In Selden's case, as in Scaliger's, 'philology' was being stretched far beyond a tool which simply applied to the core classical texts. Selden attempted to tell the history of tithes from the times of the Hebrew state down to the present, and in the process extended philological tools over a massive range of objects: the Talmud, the texts of the Judaeo-Hellenistic cultures of the early

---

[24] Selden is drawing on Martianus Capella, *Martiani Minei Capellæ ... de nuptiis Philologiæ, & septem artibus liberalibus libri novem optime castigati* (Leiden, 1539). Bodleian shelfmark: 8° C 5 Art.Seld.

[25] See the review essay of Grafton's Scaliger volumes, Timothy J. Reiss, 'Towards the Early Modern Separation of Disciplines: From Philology to Science and History -- Joseph Justus Scaliger', *Comparative Literature* 48:2 (1996): 172-179.

[26] See Mordechai Feingold, 'The Humanities', in T.H. Aston, ed., *The History of the University of Oxford: Volume IV: The Seventeenth Century*, ed., Nicholas Tyacke, 8 vols. (Oxford: OUP, 1984-), 211-357.

Christian period, Byzantine Greek writings, and the documents of English medieval history.[27] Quite what 'philology' was needs to be unpacked.

This is a potentially vast issue and we need to pick out only a few points that are most relevant to the understanding of British antiquarianism. The best available account of the development of classical philology, volume 1 of Anthony Grafton's study of Joseph Scaliger, observes that sixteenth century philology was characterized by an argument between *emendatio ope codicis* (pioneered in Italy) and *emendatio ingenii* (defended and practiced in France). Scaliger, Grafton argues, oscillates between these two methods according to various intellectual priorities and contextual pressures.[28] Sebastiano Timpanaro's argument is that modern philology is characterized not only by the movement towards *emendatio ope codicis*, but by a very specific branch of this approach: the understanding that the oldest manuscript may not contain the oldest readings, but instead that the notion of the transmission of a lost textual archetype is necessary to appreciating which manuscript contains the oldest readings.[29] It is here that close linguistic analysis becomes particularly important -- the kind that Casaubon brought to bear on the Hermetic corpus, to show that it was in fact written in a very late form of Greek rather than a very early one.[30] This interest in the multiplicity of manuscripts and in discovering ways to adjudicate between their readings was not restricted only to what is conventionally conceived of as

---

[27] G.J. Toomer, *John Selden: A Life in Scholarship*, 2 vols. (Oxford: OUP, 2009).
[28] Anthony Grafton, *Joseph Scaliger*, vol.I.
[29] Sebastiano Timpanaro, *The Genesis of Lachmann's Method*, trans. Glenn W. Most (Chicago: Chicago UP, 2005).
[30] Anthony Grafton, 'Protestant versus Prophet: Isaac Casaubon on Hermes Trismegistus', in *Defenders of the Text: The Traditions of Scholarship in an Age of Science, 1450-1800* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard, 1991).

the classical tradition.[31] The phenomenon of the Polyglot Bible -- the attempt to publish side-by-side the known Oriental texts of the Bible -- which began in Alcala, and moved through Antwerp, Paris and culminated in London, encouraged the awareness of the multiplicity of potential Biblical readings.[32] Furthermore, the question arose as to whether it were possible, or even whether one should, adjudicate amongst those readings to find an ideal, perfect text. The Polyglot Bibles (and more broadly the attempt to collect manuscripts of the Septuagint, the Origenian Hexapla, and so on) could be seen as records of what the Bible has meant in various cultures and to various peoples, rather than a means of reconstructing the one lost original sense.[33] Further linguistic problems arose when thinking about the hybrid cultures of the Judaeo-Hellenistic period: many scholars in the early seventeenth century were becoming interested in the idea that the Greek of the Bible was overlaid on a view of the world filtered through Semitic languages.[34] But it was also the demands for absolute accuracy when it came to readings of Christian (including patristic) texts which encouraged the movement towards manuscript citation as

---

[31] The most potent introduction to the messiness of what we call 'the classical tradition' remains Arnaldo Momigliano, *Alien Wisdom: The Limits of Hellenization* (Cambridge: CUP, 1975).
[32] On the Polyglot Bibles see: Peter N. Miller, 'Les Origines de la Bible Polyglotte de Paris: Philologia Sacra, Contre-Réforme et Raison d'État', *XVIIe Siècle* 194 (1997): 57-66; Peter N. Miller, 'Making the Paris Polyglot Bible: Humanism and Orientalism in the Early Seventeenth Century', in Herbert Jaumann, ed., *Die Europäische Gelehrtenrepublik im Zeitalter des Konfessionalismus* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2001), 59-85; Peter N. Miller, 'The "Antiquarianization" of Biblical Scholarship and the London Polyglot Bible (1653-1657)', *Journal of the History of Ideas* 62 (2001): 463-482.
[33] See Toomer, *John Selden*, 814.
[34] See BM MS Harley 1328, fol.51r for Patrick Young's list of Greek words in the Septuagint that can be interpreted with reference to Hebrew words ('Vocabula hebraea à 70 interpretibus retenta'). This manuscript is Patrick Young's fair copy of his collations of the Old Testament, using the Cotton Genesis manuscript and Codex Alexandrinus, as well as published Polyglot Bibles. The Greek world of the New Testament fascinated the students' of Joseph Scaliger. See especially Daniel Heinsius, *Danielis Heinsii Sacrarum Exercitationum ad Novum Testamentum*. Heinsius sent a gift-copy of this, his most important scholarly work, to John Selden (Bodl.Th.Seld. H.1.8) with an inscribed note on the title-page: 'Ex imio ac summae eruditionis viro Ioanni Seldeno IC. singulari obseruantia testando, d.m. autor'.

proof of the rightness of a particular reading.[35] Historical multiplicity came up sharply against the *odium theologicum*. This is the philological world within which we need to set British antiquarianism: a world riven by contradictions, but also driven by a common attempt to use bibliographical and linguistic analysis to bring a historical understanding to the development of the British past.

Within this intellectual milieu, textual cruxes can have significant historical consequences. There is a very famous example, discussed by Anthony Grafton, in which Scaliger argues that he has provided the earliest evidence for the existence of the Scottish nation by emending (in his notes to Tibullus (1577)) a line from Seneca's *Apocolocyntosis* from '*scuta Brigantas*' to '*Et caeruleos Scotobrigantas*'.[36] As Grafton explains, Scaliger 'wanted to push back into the first century AD the evidence that the Romans knew the Scots - and, accordingly, that the Scots already had some sort of national identity'. Both Buchanan and Camden responded to these arguments.[37] Grafton's discussion concludes: 'The chronologer lurked within the editor' (II.82). This moment where a philological emendation necessitates the rethinking of an entire nation's history is illustrative of the relationship between antiquarianism and philology.

We can multiply this example several-fold by thinking about the debate between Selden and Richard Montague over the history of tithes. Richard Montague's *Diatribae*, published in 1621, constitutes a massive philological

---

[35] See Jean-Louis Quantin, *Le Catholicisme Classique et Les Pères de L'Église: Un retour aux Sources (1669-1713)* (Paris: Institut d'études Augustiniennes, 1999), ch.4: 'Le Jansénisme, Illustration et Exagération de la Théologie Gallicane'.
[36] See Grafton, II.79-82. Jacob Bernays also discusses the episode in *Joseph Justus Scaliger* (Berlin, 1855), 138.
[37] Camden's discussion is already completed, as it appears in the 1586 *Britannia*, in the first draft of the *Britannia*, dated 1582: see BM Cotton MS Titus F.vii-viii, fol.20r.

riposte to the arguments of the first three chapters of Selden's book.[38] We will come on to discuss this conflict in more detail when thinking about the institutions of antiquarianism below. For now, let us take an example from chapter III of Selden's *History*, the emendation of a crucial line in Paul the Deacon's epitome of Festus (28-29). Paul quotes Festus saying '*Decima quaeque veteres Dijs suis offerebant*' (the Ancients offered tithes to their Gods). Selden cites Scaliger's attack on Paul, who he dismisses as 'barbarus ille', and emends the line to '*Decima quaeque Herculi veteres offerebant*'. But Selden wants to go further: the line cannot be emended, because it is pure Paul, and Festus has not been epitomized but ventriloquized by him. Neither the 'Dijs suis' (implying all their gods) nor the 'Decima' (implying a fixed amount) were correct: 'no such matter. some did, and only somtimes, and of some things, and most usually to some gods only' (28). And Selden goes on to blame Paul for the confusion: 'No doubt it is, but that which *Festus* had there in some larger note obserued, according to a truth agreeing with what is before opend, was too boldly contracted into that piece of vntruth, by his Epitomator *Paulus Diaconus*' (29). Montague's response to these arguments is telling. He begins by altogether dismissing Scaliger's emendation of the line by substituting 'Hercules' for 'their Gods' as 'but his owne priuate opinion' (411). Implicitly he is here rejecting *emendatio ingenii* altogether: the modern humanist scholar is not better placed to understand a text's true meaning than those who were present when it was first produced and copied. He then attempts to defend Paulus by recreating the historical circumstances in which an epitome of a text was necessary: 'they did it out of a charitable intent, for the ease and helpe of the Student, that eyther had

[38] Richard Montague, *Diatribae vpon the first part of the Late History of Tithes* (London, 1621).

not leysure to transcribe the many and Voluminous Authors themselues, nor money to procure them intire...nor perchance opportunitie to meet with them, that were but in publique Libraries, or in few mens hands' (417-418). He finally goes on to argue that, were in not for Paulus, Festus may well not have survived at all: 'it is more then probable, that had not *Paulus* beene, *Festus* had perished vtterly' (419).

In this debate we witness the imbrication of philology and history. On the one hand, we have Selden thinking historically about the process by which that line of Festus has come down to contemporary scholars, and therefore arguing that a clear demarcation between two authors in the text needs to be made, between Festus and Paulus. On the other, we have Montague dismissing Scaliger for his ahistorical practice of *emendatio ingenii*, while imaginatively reconstructing the process of historical transmission that allows him to argue we should take Paul's epitome to be an accurate(ish) reflection of Festus. These philological debates have religious and political consequence (even if neither view is necessarily religiously or politically motivated): Montague is trying to show that Scaliger and Selden are deliberately attacking Paul the Deacon to show that tithe-giving was not a universal practice in classical antiquity. But the most crucial point for our purposes is to observe that this is the kind of historically-sensitive philology that antiquarians were also bringing to bear on texts (of all kinds) from British history.

Let us take an example, again from Selden, but this time from one of his latest works: the biographies and notes on 'Scriptores X' which he published as a preface to Roger Twysden's *Historiae Anglicanae Scriptores* (London, 1652). Although Selden's later published works mainly attempt to reconstruct the

Hebrew Republic, he maintained an active research interest in British history until the end of his life.[39] Although Selden claims his help with the edition has been very minimal, restricted to reading manuscripts from the Cotton Library for Twysden ('percurrendo Codices nonnullos veteres ei inservientes'). But his lavish entry for Simeon of Durham, belies this claim.[40] This very long entry is, characteristically for Selden, highly miscellaneous: it allows him to slip a whole history of an early form of Scottish presbyterianism in amongst this seemingly uncontroversial biography.[41] His argument is that Simeon of Durham's chronicle was in fact written by a monk of Durham, Turgot, and Simeon later appropriated Turgot's work for his own. Professor Toomer points out that this is one of the occasions on which Selden is quite wrong in identifying an author -- in comparison with his virtuoso demonstration that the work of the 'Geographus Nubiensis' was written by al-Idrisi for example.[42] But Selden's working methods are revealed very clearly here, which makes it a moment of particular interest.

Selden's principles remain basically the same as those he articulated in the prefatory epistle to his 'Illustrations' to Drayton's *Polyolbion*, that he would seek for '*Synchronisme* (the best Touch-stone in this kind of Triall)', and in the Preface to *Titles of Honor*, where he promises to '*vent to you nothing quoted at*

---

[39] On the European attempts to reconstruct the Hebrew state see Guido Bartolucci, *La Reppublica Ebraica di Carlo Sigonio: Modelli politici dell'età moderna* (Bologna, 2007) and François Laplanche, 'L'Érudition Chrétienne aux XVIe et XVIIe Siècles et l'État des Hébreux', *L'Écriture Sainte au temps de Spinoza et dans le Système Spinoziste* (Paris: Université de Paris-Sorbonne, 1992), 133-47. Colin Tite, *The Early Records of Sir Robert Cotton's Library* (London: The British Library, 2003), 88, records a loan to Selden from 1652: '[241] Lent to Mr Selden a Booke concerning Acts of Parliaments in Ed the 3d tyme markt Titus E.I.'

[40] See Toomer, *John Selden*, I.351.

[41] John Selden, 'De Scriptoribus hisce nun primum editis', in Roger Twysden, ed., *Historiae Anglicanae Scriptores X* (London, 1652), VI-XX.

[42] For the identification of the 'Geographus Arabus' or 'Nubiensis' as al-Idrisi see John Selden, *Uxor Ebraica* (London, 1646), 533.

second hand', for he has '*ever loved the Fountain*'.[43] He goes on to concede that *'where euer I was driuen to take vp other mens credits, I acknowledge it*' (c4v). Clearly, 'Synchronism' is still vital in 1652: Simeon could not have seen events he claimed to be an eyewitness to, so he was not the author of the Chronicle. But what is incomparably developed from the early works is the way Selden makes use of the bibliographical evidence to establish 'Synchronisme'.

Selden's argument begins by pointing to a clear 'AntiChronisme'. He draws on Leland's notes on *Cygnea Cantio* to establish that Simeon's History narrates the period '400 annos & 4 menses exitum historiae Bedae sequentes' (III). Selden dates the end of Bede's *History* to 731. Therefore, Simeon's history is finished by the year 1130. He then points to a clear contradiction in Bale, who says both that the history ends in 1130, and that Simeon completed his History shortly before his death (he puts this down to 'Sed mirus interea Balaei memoriae, in ejusdem vita, lapsus'). So this leaves a puzzling gap of 34 years unaccounted for: 'Sed ita anni 34 supra verum historiae ejus terminum male excrescunt' (III). He also points out that the whole of the bibliographical tradition has followed Bale in dating Simeon's death to 1164.[44] Selden tries to solve this puzzle by turning to the manuscript tradition. The manuscript which Twysden has used for his edition (actually a Cambridge manuscript) is divided into 'Libri' and 'Capita', and has an 'Apologia' before the History, in which the author says he has not only written every word, but also arranged the history into its present bibliographical form for publication (III-IV). This 'Apologia', and

---

[43] Michael Drayton, *Poly-Olbion* (London, 1612), A2r. John Selden, *Titles of Honor* (London, 1614), c4v.

[44] For a modern analysis of the bibliographical tradition, including Bale, see Richard Sharpe, 'The English Bibliographical Tradition from Kirkstede to Tanner', in Charles Burnett and Nicholas Mann, eds., *Britannia Latina* (London, 2005), 86-128.

the textual apparatus by which this manuscript is arranged, are forgeries added later by Simeon of Durham, Selden argues. Two other manuscripts are more valuable for the scholar. One was owned by Thomas Allen in the early seventeenth century.[45] Allen, Selden says, believed this work to have been written by Turgot, and Robert Cotton has recorded that ascription on the manuscript ('Turgotus Prior Dunelmensis autor hujus libri'). This is really an argument from authority, but it is interesting to see Selden here relying on the arguments of earlier scholars: antiquarianism was a cumulative occupation, a point we will reinforce later in this chapter. Selden gives the example of a further manuscript of Simeon in the Cotton Library, which was in fragmentary state, missing the first book and a few chapters of the second ('acephalus nihil habet posteriora capitis Quarti libri secundi antevertens, sed tum omnia usque ad finem' (V)). Although in a fragmentary state, this manuscript is very valuable because it contains a line that is not present in the manuscript Twysden has published: a reference to the writer, '*Prioratum tunc tenente*' (holding the office of Prior). Selden emphasizes that this manuscript says the author was currently holding that office, 'Hodie inquit *tenet*' (VI). The other important bibliographical point is that this manuscript is not divided into 'Libri', only into 96 Chapters (VI). So if this manuscript is most trustworthy, it casts doubt that the arrangement of the work into chapters is authorial. And if this arrangement is not authorial, it means that the 'Apologia', which claims responsibility for the arrangement of the work, as well as the words, is a forgery. And it is this 'Apologia' which, according to Selden, is the main authority for Simeon of Durham's authorship of the History.

[45] BL Cotton MS Faustina A.v

Selden connects this bibliographical evidence to problems of 'Synchronisme' within the text itself. The author of the History claims to have been an eyewitness to various events ('VIDIMUS', 'AUDIVIMUS', Selden emphasizes in capitals (V). One of these is particularly telling: the author claims to have witnessed the translation of the body and relics of St Cuthbert to Durham Cathedral. Selden calculates this happened in 1105 (V), at which time Simeon (dying, according to Selden, in 1164) would have been very young indeed. So Selden is looking for someone who could have been a Prior when writing a history of Durham, could have witnessed the translation of St Cuthbert's remains in 1105, and also, ideally, would have been known to have written a historical work about Durham. All of these problems are resolved by attributing the text to Turgot -- for which he also has the backing of Allen, Cotton, and, as he goes on to point out, James Ussher and Thomas Dempster too (XXV). So Selden is here using the kind of philological principles we have already seen in a classical and Biblical contexts -- looking for anachronisms (linguistic or empirical) and using a thorough knowledge of the bibliographical materials to prove his argument. This is antiquarianism as philology. The fatal blow was dealt to Selden's argument for Turgot's authorship of the History in the eighteenth century by Thomas Rud. Rud's treatise was edited by Thomas Bedford, who also published an edition of Simeon. It is not a coincidence, in the context of the present discussion, that Beford describes Rud as having refuted the arguments of the 'celeberrimi Philologi Joannis Seldeni'.[46]

[46] Thomas Rud, *Disquisitio de vero auctore hujus 'Historiae Dunelmensis ecclesiae', Symeonis monachi Dunhelmensis libellus*, ed. Thomas Bedford (London, 1732), A2r. This treatise makes Selden's original argument considerably clearer while showing its flaws.

As a philological enterprise, antiquarianism necessitated polyglot learning. Reading and analysing documents from the past necessitated learning the language of the earlier inhabitants of Britain.[47] Paramount here was the rediscovery of Anglo-Saxon, a narrative that has been told many times elsewhere.[48] The only point I want to make in the present context is that British antiquaries did not restrict themselves to learning only the languages of Britain. British tongues -- and here we come back to the inadequacies of thinking within a nationalist paradigm -- were increasingly being placed within a comparative philological context.[49] The most direct statement of principle on this subject I

---

[47] See Thomas Smith on the necessity of learning languages for Camden's work on the *Britannia*: 'Cum ergo vix sperandum videretur, gentis Britannicae Origines, mores, instituta, reconditasque Antiquitates e spissis tenebris, quibus per tot secula delituere, erui posse sine ope luminis, quod sermonis eorum, tum qui primae hujus insulae Incolae & quasi Aborigines erant, tum qui, illis in Occidentalibus Angliae plagis protrusis, illorum sedes occuparunt, cognitio earundem sedulo investigatori affundit, utriusque linguae tam Britannicae quam Saxonicae usum sibi familiarem reddidit, & praeter Authores omne genus Graecos & Latinos, qui ab omni aevo, ex quo hic quasi alter Orbis detectus fuerit' (Thomas Smith, 'Vita', in Thomas Smith, ed., *Camdeni et Illustrium Virorum Epistolae* (London, 1691), x-xi).

[48] The synthesis of the history of Anglo-Saxon scholarship in John Considine, *Dictionaries in Early Modern Europe: Lexicography and the Making of Heritage* (Cambridge: CUP, 2008), 156-249 is essential reading. See also: Eleanor N. Adams, *Old English Scholarship in England from 1566-1800* (New Haven: Yale UP, 1917); Timothy Graham, 'Robert Talbot's "Old Saxonice Bede": Cambridge University Library, MS Kk.3.18 and the "Alphabetum Norwagicum" of British Library, Cotton MSS, Domitian A.IX', in James P. Carley and Colin G.C. Tite, eds., *Books and Collectors, 1200-1700: Essays Presented to Andrew Watson* (London: The British Library, 1997), 295-316; Benedict Scott Robinson, 'John Foxe and the Anglo-Saxons', in Christopher Highley and John N. King, eds., *John Foxe and his World* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2002), 54-72; the essays collected in Timothy Graham, ed., *The Recovery of Old English: Anglo-Saxon Studies in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (Kalamazoo, Mich., 2000); R. Flower, 'Laurence Nowell and the Discovery of England in Tudor Times', in E.G. Stanley, ed., *British Academy Papers on Anglo-Saxon England* (Oxford: OUP, 1990), 1-27; Carl Berkhout and Milton Gatch, ed., *Anglo-Saxon Scholarship: The First Three Centuries* (Boston, 1982); Richard J. Schoek, 'Early Anglo-Saxon studies and legal scholarship in the Renaissance', *Studies in the Renaissance* 5 (1958): 102-10. On the discovery of Old Welsh see Brynley F. Roberts, 'The Discovery of Old Welsh', *Historiographia Linguistica* 26 (1999): 1-21. On the study of Welsh in the seventeenth century see also: David Cram, 'Francis Willughby's Catalogue of Welsh Words (1662)', *The National Library of Wales Journal* 32:1 (2001): 1-55;

[49] Anthony Grafton and Joanna Weinberg, *"I have always loved the Holy Tongue": Isaac Casaubon, the Jews and a Forgotten Chapter in Renaissance Scholarship* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP, 2011) will be a major contribution to the understanding of Hebraic scholarship in England. See also: Mordechai Feingold, 'Oriental Studies' in T.H. Aston, ed., *The History of the University of Oxford: Volume IV: The Seventeenth Century*, ed., Nicholas Tyacke (Oxford: OUP, 1984-; 8 vols.), 449-503; David Katz, *Philo-Semitism and the Readmission of the Jews to England 1603-1655* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982); Stephen Burnett, *From Christian Hebraism to Jewish Studies: Johannes Buxtorf (1564-1629) and Hebrew Learning in the Seventeenth Century* (Leiden: Brill,

have discovered comes, unsurprisingly, from Abraham Wheelock, professor of Anglo-Saxon and Professor of Arabic at Cambridge.[50] Wheelock writes to Simonds D'Ewes (also, of course, a distinguished scholar of British antiquity to whom we will return) to describe his 'two-fold imployment of the Arabick one, & the other of the Brittish, & Saxon Ecclesiastical, & political Antiquities'.[51] He goes on to describe the synergy between these two areas of research: most sure it is, that Antiquitie tels vs we owe more to the Easterne church, then to Rome', and that the early British church followed 'the customes of the East in many thinges, as wel as they followed other Christians: an easie matter it is to see in Beda, Malmesbur- Harding, &c.' (129r). By the 'Easterne church' he probably means the Greek church, but it is important to note that the early study of Arabic was as

---

Lloyd Jones, *The Discovery of Hebrew in Tudor England: A Third Language* (Manchester, 1983); Cecil Roth, 'Jews in Oxford after 1290', *Oxoniensia* 15 (1950): 63-80; Cecil Roth, 'Leone da Modena and his English Correspondents', *Transactions of the Jewish Historical Society of England* 17 (1953): 39-43; Peter T. van Rooden, *Theology, Biblical Scholarship and Rabbinical Studies in the Seventeenth Century: Constantijn L'Empereur (1591-1648), Professor of Hebrew and Theology at Leiden*, Studies in the History of Leiden University, 6 (Leiden: Brill, 1989); Yaacov Deutsch, '"A View of the Jewish Religion": Conceptions of Jewish Practice and Ritual in Early Modern Europe', *Archiv für Religionsgeschichte* 3 (2001): 273-295; Allison P. Coudert and Jeffrey S. Shoulson, eds., *Hebraica Veritas? Christian Hebraists and the Study of Judaism in Early Modern Europe* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004).

[50] On the study of Arabic in England see: P.M. Holt, 'The Study of Arabic Historians in Seventeenth-Century England: The Background and the Work of Edward Pococke', in *Studies in the History of the Near East* (London: Cass, 1973); Alastair Hamilton, *William Bedwell: Arabist* (Leiden: Thomas Browne Institute, 1985); G.A. Russell, ed., *The 'Arabick' Interest of the Natural Philosophers in Seventeenth Century England* (Leiden: Brill, 1994); G. J. Toomer, *Eastern Wisedome and Learning: The Study of Arabic in Seventeenth Century England* (Oxford: OUP, 1996); Alastair Hamilton, 'Isaac Casaubon the Arabist: "Video Longum Esse Iter"', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 72 (2009): 143-168. On European Arabic study more broadly, the first chapters of Toomer, *Eastern Wisedome* and Alastair Hamilton, 'The Study of Islam in Early Modern Europe', *Archiv für Religionsgeschichte* 3 (2001): 169-182 provide useful overviews, the latter being particularly strong on the differences between northern and southern European Arabic studies. J. Fück, *Die arabischen Studien in Europa bis in den Anfang des 20. Jahrhunderts* (Leipzig: O. Harrassowitz, 1955) has much that is still of value. On the translation of the Qur'an specifically see Thomas E. Burman, *Reading the Qur'an in Latin Christendom* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007). On Hottinger's Arabic scholarship see Jan Loop, 'Johann Heinrich Hottinger (1620-1667) and the "Historia Orientalis",' *Church History and Religious Culture* 88 (2008): 169-203. On Arabic study in Spain see Noel Malcolm, 'The Crescent and the City of the Sun: Islam and the Renaissance Utopia of Tommasso Campanella', *Proceedings of the British Academy* 125 (2004): 41-67.

[51] BL MS Harley 374, fol.129r. The letter is undated but reference to 'if peace continue' makes 1639 a likely date.

much a means to discover more material about Christian history (including the history of the Greek church) as it was to find out about Islam.[52] Wheelock here describes the coalescing of his two, seemingly unrelated, areas of scholarship: Anglo-Saxon and Arabic philology communicate mutual insights to one another. Selden clearly has a galvanizing affect on the development of this kind of comparative philology in England. After he had imitated Scaliger's Oriental learning in *De Diis Syris* (1617), he synthesized Hebrew scholarship with British antiquarianism for the first time in *Historie of Tithes* (1618).[53] But even before Selden, Thomas Bodley had begun to research the history of the Jews in England, which brought together both his Hebrew learning and late sixteenth-century curiosity for the British past.[54] Thinking about historiography within nationalist paradigms cannot encompass the work of figures like Bodley, Selden or Wheelock.

(ii) Etymology

Philological learning did not only provide the tools needed to unlock the contents of arcane texts. Language itself had a history and contained evidence of

---

[52] Alastair Hamilton, 'The English Interest in Arabic-Speaking Christians', in *The 'Arabick' Interest of the Natural Philosophers*, 30-53.
[53] Camden described Selden as 'nostro Scaligero' in a letter to Peiresc, which can now be found in BM Add. MS 36294, fol.83v. Selden combines his interest in British history with Arabic manuscripts in 'De Scriptoribus hisce nunc primum editis', in Twysden, ed., *Scriptores*, XXXIV.
[54] Bodley's work on Hebrew deserves a far fuller study. For now, on Bodley as a Hebraist see: Cecil Roth, 'Oxford Starrs', *Oxoniensia* 22 (1957): 63-77, 65-66, on Bodley's translation into Latin of a Hebrew Starr from the Merton College muniments; more generally, Cecil Roth, 'Sir Thomas Bodley, Hebraist', *Bodleian Library Record* 7 (1966): 242-251; A.R. Bonner and P. James, 'Two letters in Hebrew addressed to Sir Thomas Bodley', *Bodleian Library Record* 8 (1971): 258-262; W. Wesselius, 'Johannes Drusius the Younger's Last Journey to England and his Hebrew letter-book', *Lias* 16 (1989): 159-176. I am grateful to Theodor Dunkelgrün for his advice on this subject.

history.[55] It is very rare in British scholarship from the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century to find anything resembling an explicit discussion of the methodology by which a word's etymology can be found. This is part of a more general difficulty in trying to pick apart the methodologies of early-modern scholars: there are very few methodological discussions at all, and mostly methods must be derived either implicitly or, sometimes, from prefatory letters and other material.[56] However, that does not mean there was no such methodology implicit in etymological practice. It is important to sketch out how the process operated.[57] John Selden's *De Diis Syris* (1617) was not strictly a work of antiquarianism, but it was one of the most widely revered works of early seventeenth-century English philology: it found admirers across Europe and was republished in Leiden in 1629.[58] In the second 'Syntagma' of this work, Selden discusses the proper form of the name of the son-god Heliogabalus, after whom the Roman Emperor was named. Selden argues that the original form of this name was Algabalus (which inscriptions testify), and then proceeds to derive the word's etymology from 'Agalibalus', via the Hebrew עגל בעל (egel ba'al).[59]

---

[55] The best account of this subject remains Daniel Droixhe, *La Linguistique et l'appel de l'histoire (1600-1800): Rationalisme et révolutions positvistes* (Genève: Droz, 1978).
[56] A point made by Anthony Grafton in the introduction to Scaliger, vol.1.
[57] For Aubrey's thinking about names see Gillian Fellows-Jensen, 'John Aubrey, Onomast?', *Nomina* 23 (2000): 89-106. The classic assessment of Leibniz's thinking about language history remains Hans Aarsleff, 'The Study and Use of Etymology in Leibniz', in *From Locke to Saussure: Essays on the Study of Language and Intellectual History* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1982), 84-100.
[58] Pierre Dupuy wrote to Camden on the 3rd September 1617 expressing his frustration at not being able to get hold of a copy of *De Diis Syris*; he received a copy from Camden the same November (Thomas Smith, ed., *Camdeni...Epistolae*, 194, 202). On Selden's links with the Netherlands see G.J. Toomer, 'John Selden, the Levant and the Netherlands in the History of Scholarship', in Alastair Hamilton, Maurits H. van den Boogert, and Bart Westerweel, eds., *The Republic of Letters and the Levant* (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 53-76.
[59] John Selden, *De Diis Syris* (London, 1617), 133. See also Toomer, I.234, who points out that Selden's etymology is 'patently absurd'.

Selden argued that this happened by a process of 'literarum metathesis' (the metathesis of letters), which he puts down to the differences between scripts and pronunciation when words are translated from 'Asian' languages (i.e. Hebrew) to European ('scriptionis & pronuntiationis varietas in ijs quae ab Asia Europaei traduxerint'). Selden here is unusual in not only specifically naming the etymological principle by which one word has been converted into another - 'the metathesis of letters' - but also in identifying a material, historical reason for this process. However, this process of the 'permutation of letters' which Selden describes explicitly is in fact implicit throughout British scholarship, and it is worth giving a brief account of it here.[60]

The 'permutation of letters' refers to the principles by which letters can be added to, or altered in, existing words, to form new words. Gerard Vossius' *Etymologicon Linguae Latinae* (first published by his son, Isaac Vossius, in Amsterdam in 1662) begins with a treatise, 'De Litterarum Permutatione Tractatus', which does not at any point explain the principle of metathesis, or letter permutation. Rather, it gives examples of how permutation works in practice. Vossius gives examples of, for instance, 'A *additur in initio*', 'A *additur in medio*', 'A *additur in fine*', and for the way one letter becomes another, 'E *mutatur in* A'. A more systematic account of this process is given by Stephen Skinner in

---

[60] This account is greatly indebted to the magnificent articles of David Cram, e.g. David Cram, 'Edward Lhuyd and the Doctrine of the Permutation of Letters', in Gerda Haßler and Peter Schmitter, eds., *Sprachdiskussion und Beschreibung von Sprachen im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert* (Münster: Nodus Publikationen, 1999), 317-335 and David Cram, 'On wild etymology and descriptive profligacy: A contrastive case study', in Bernadette Smelik, Rijkolf Hofman, Camiel Hamans and David Cram, eds., *A Companion in Linguistics: A Festschrift for Anders Ahlqvist on the Occasion of his Sixtieth Birthday* (Nijmegen: Stichting Uitgeverij de Keltische Draak, 2005), 219-230. Also very sophisticated on Renaissance language sciences is M. Tavoni, 'Renaissance Linguistics' in G. Lepschy, ed., *History of Linguistics, iii: Renaissance and Early Modern Linguistics*, 4 vols. (London: Longman 1998), 1-108. The opening chapters of Hannah Dawson, *Locke, Language and Early-Modern Philosophy* (Cambridge: CUP, 2007) provide a good overview of early-modern language study.

the second half of the seventeenth-century in his *Etymologicon Linguae Anglicanae* (London, 1671; first edition). He begins his 'Prolegomena Etymologica' (D3r) by stating various 'Canones Etymologici': 'Vocales omnes in omnibus Linguis facile invicem commutantur' (all letters in all languages are easily changed reciprocally into one another), but he also argues that this process is bound by 'affinitatis vinculo' (by the chain of affinity). Letters have particular groupings, and particular tendencies to turn into one another. He goes on to categorize these 'affectiones literarum' under 'quatuor capita generalia': 'Adjectio' (addition of a letter), 'Abjectio' (subtraction of a letter), 'Trajectio' (movements of letters), and 'Transmutatio' (change of letters). He goes on to say that particular rhetorical tropes can be applied to each of these processes. So he anatomizes 'Adjectio' as follows: 'Adjectio seu Additio literae est vel in principio dictionis, & tum a Grammaticis *Prosthesis* dicitur, vel in medio & tum *Epenthesis*, vel in fine & tum *Paragoge* appellatur' (Adjectio or the Addition of letters can be at the beginning of a word, where it is called, from Grammar, *Prosthesis*, or in the middle where it is called *Epenthesis*, or at the end where it is called *Paragoge*). The most powerful single tool here is 'Transmutationis seu Metaplasmi', the process of actually turning one letter into another, and this is where Skinner gives by far the largest number of examples (F2r-T2r). But the very most powerful tool is combining all the possible tools: as David Cram points out, this allows any word to be derived from any other word. This is the implicit logic behind Renaissance etymology, and while most writers probably could not have anatomized etymology with the care of Skinner, these are widely-known principles adopted by many different kinds of antiquaries.

The sort of etymologies which these principles produce, which often seem wildly speculative and even comic to modern readers, can be traced back to the central section of Plato's *Cratylus*.[61] Plato's *Cratylus* is specifically cited by William Camden at the start of his discussion of the origin of the name of Britain in the *Britannia*: 'For, ancient tongues are reputed passing necessarie, for the searching out of Originals: and Plato teacheth us, *That the first names being through* the long continuance of time growen out of use, are preserued in barbarous tongues, as being more ancient than others'.[62] In the printed margin, 'In his Cratylus', is noted. If there is a limit to Renaissance etymology set by the potentially limitless process of the 'permutation of letters' it is, as Camden suggests, that etymologies should have history on their side: there should be some reason for the process of preservation of old words and the transformation into new ones. This does further suggest the double-bind of etymology to the antiquarian: history is contained in words, but word-history can only be traced by an awareness of a history that is not embedded within language itself. There is no Renaissance antiquary, to my knowledge, who points out this paradox.

Let us turn now to some detailed examples from the work of William Camden of antiquarian etymology in practice. Camden's search for the origins of the British people leads him to think etymologically: what were the names of the first inhabitants of Britain? And do their names offer us a clue as to their

---

[61] The most sympathetic discussion of Plato's etymologies in *Cratylus* is David N. Sedley, *Plato's Cratylus* (Cambridge: CUP, 2003).

[62] William Camden, *Britain*, trans. Philemon Holland (London, 1609), 25. For a recent discussion of etymology see Angus Vine, 'Etymology, Names and the Search for Origins: Deriving the Past in Early Modern England', *The Seventeenth Century* 21 (2006): 1-21. Frank L. Borchardt, 'Etymology in Tradition and the Northern Renaissance', *Journal of the History of Ideas* 29 (1968): 415-429 contains sadly little of any value.

origins?[63] The first thing to notice in Camden's discussion of the original inhabitants of Britain is that he places British history into a Biblical framework. He dismisses Annius of Viterbo's fragments of Berosus and Manetho as an absurd forgery (citing all the relevant sixteenth-century authorities on the matter), but his own argument is similar in principle to Annius' attempts to trace the travels of Noah's sons more precisely than would seem to be possible from reading the Bible.[64] He needs first of all to show that Japhet and his progeny were the colonizers of Europe.[65] For this evidence, Camden goes not to historians but to theologians. He cites, for instance, the Genesis Commentary of Wolfgang Musculus. In one of Camden's manuscripts, in which he was compiling material relating to the repeopling of the world by Noah's sons, he inserted a leaf on which he noted the work of Musculus: 'Wolphgangus Musculus in Genesim existimat gentes & familias quo a Japheto profluxerunt, primum occupasse insulas Europae'.[66] This is one of the clearest examples of the problem of

---

[63] The most relevant pages in the 1607 *Britannia* for this discussion are 7-8.

[64] An excellent guide to the attacks on Annius of Viterbo is Joanna Weinberg, 'Azariah de' Rossi and the Forgeries of Annius of Viterbo' in David B. Ruderman, ed., *Essential Papers on Jewish Culture in Renaissance and Baroque Italy* (New York: New York University Press, 1992), 252-79. See also on Annius: Christopher Ligota, 'Annius of Viterbo and Historical Method', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 50 (1987): 44-56. On Noah's repeopling of the world after the flood see Don Cameron Allen, *The Legend of Noah: Renaissance Rationalism in Art, Science and Letters* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1949) and, more recently, the essays collected in Martin Mulsow and Jan Assmann, eds., *Sintflut und Gedächtnis: Erinnern und Vergessen des Ursprungs* (München: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 2006), especially Anthony Grafton, 'The Chronology of the Flood', 65-83. On Biblical chronology generally see: Anthony Grafton, *Joseph Scaliger*, Vol.II; Grafton, 'Tradition and Technique in Historical Chronology', in M.H. Crawford and C.R. Ligota, eds., *Ancient History and the Antiquarian: Essays in Memory of Arnaldo Momigliano* (London: The Warburg Institute, 1995); Grafton, 'Dating history: the Renaissance and the reformation of chronology', *Daedalus* (2003): 74-85. On Ussher's work on Biblical chronology see James Barr, 'Why the World was Created in 4004 BC: Archbishop Ussher and Biblical Chronology', *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library* 67:2 (1985): 575-608. See also the essays collected in: Jitse M. van der Meer and Scott Mandelbrote, eds., *Nature and Scripture in the Abrahamic Religions: Up to 1700*, 2 vols. (Leiden & Boston: Brill, 2008).

[65] Alden A. Mosshammer, *The Chronicle of Eusebius and Greek Chronographic Tradition* (London: Associated University Presses, 1979) is essential reading on conceptions of Biblical history in the Renaissance.

[66] BM Cotton MS Titus F.vii-viii, fol.8r.

describing the *Britannia* as a product of British nationalism: here is none of the secularizing impulses of nationalism, but instead the opposite. A theologian's commentary on Genesis is given the status of a historical source.[67]

Camden then turns directly to etymology for help in tracing the movement of Japhet's descendants. Japhet's eldest son was 'Gomer', and 'in these farthest and remotest borders of Europe, gave both beginning and name to the Gomerians, which were after called Cimbrians and Cimerians' (10).[68] He links the name Gomer to the Gauls: 'They which now are the Gaules, were, as Iosephus and Zonaras write, called of *Gomer*, *Gomari*, *Gomerai* and *Gomeritae*' And he goes on to argue that these 'Gomerians' or Gauls must have been the origin of the original British inhabitants: 'From these Gomarians or Gomerians of Gaule, I have alwaies thought that our Britans drew their beginning, and from thence, for a proofe of the said beginning, brought their name: the very proper and peculiar name also of the Britains...For even they call themselves ordinarily *Kumero*, *Cymro* and *Kumeri*' (10). The transposition of letters from 'Gomer' to 'Kumero' allows Camden to trace the historical progress of Japhet's sons to Britain. He then brings in the clinching piece of evidence: 'Which thing also, the very name of Gomer, imposed first not upon some light occasion, but even by Divine providence and inspiration, doth signifie: For Gomer in the Hebrew tongue, betokeneth *vtmost Bordering*' (10). This is drawn from Casper Peucer's edition of Philip Melancthon's *Chronicon Carionis* (1581), again a work which

---

[67] It is suggestive that in *De Synedriis: Liber Primus* (London, 1650), 46, Selden says he speaks 'not as a theologian but as a historian' ('nec Thologum heic ago sed Historicum'). This is a distinction only beginning to emerge in the seventeenth century.

[68] The identity of the Cimbrians was a matter of great interest in the Renaissance, and was debated within Camden's circle. George Carleton wrote a very long letter to Camden discussing the issue; there is a copy among John Selden's papers, in the manuscript which is now Bodl. MS Arch. Seld. B.8, fol.242r-243r.

blurred the boundary between theology and history.[69] Melanchthon lists the etymologies of the names of the various 'Posteritas Iaphet', placing Gomer first: 'Gomer, id est, finiens' (24). So here we can see Camden drawing upon the philological arguments of international Latin scholarship to make his own argument about the antiquity of the inhabitants of Britain. It is significant that Camden is here invoking the Hebrew etymology: as Hebrew was widely believed to be the original language of Adam, or something very close to it, Hebrew preserved a particularly close bond between name and signification.[70] Etymologies here serve to link British history into the wider narrative of Biblical history -- a narrative which it is unnecessary to point out is a trans-national one.

Attempts to derive history correctly from etymology were matters for debate within the scholarly correspondence of the Republic of Letters. In one of Isaac Casaubon's surviving letters to Camden, sent from Geneva on the 9th November 1596, Casaubon advises Camden on matters philological.[71] He is particularly exercised by Camden's derivation of the word 'Britain'. The debate over the name's origin was already an old chestnut by the time Camden intervened, arguing that it was compounded of the Welsh name 'Brith' (from the original inhabitants' own description of their land as 'Brithon') and the Greek

---

[69] Philip Melanchthon, *Chronicon Carionis* (Wittenberg, 1580). Because Camden does not cite page numbers from this work it is difficult to say which edition he used; there are many. Camden's notes on this work are preserved among other notes on the etymology of the word 'Britain' in BM Cotton MS Cleopatra A.iv, fol.67v. On Melanchthon as a historian of the church see Irena Backus, *Historical Method and Confessional Identity in the Era of the Reformation (1378-1615)* (Leiden: Brill, 2003), ch.6.

[70] On this large subject see David S. Katz, 'The Language of Adam in Seventeenth-Century England,' in Hugh Lloyd-Jones, Valerie Pearl and Blair Worden, eds., *History & Imagination: Essays in Honour of Hugh Trevor-Roper* (London, Duckworth, 1981), 132-45.

[71] Thomas Smith, ed., *Camdeni...Epistolae*, 60-61. Camden would also send Casaubon the final edition of the *Britannia*, in folio, published in 1607; the letter from Camden which accompanied this edition is preserved in Casaubon's letter book, Burney MS 363, fol.132r. On Casaubon's Greek scholarship see Hélène Parenty, *Isaac Casaubon, Helléniste: Des Studia Humanitatis à la philologie* (Geneva: Droz, 2009): it is a disappointment that Parenty does not tackle Casaubon's manuscript materials, and so the books' insights remain only partial.

'Tania'. Camden argues that Greek geographers originally gave names to the western provinces of Europe, and so it is no surprise we should look for a Greek derivation of the word. He finds the definition of 'Tania' in the 'Greek Glossaries', which say it 'betokeneth...a region' (27). His clinching further evidence is that 'besides our Britaine, a man shall not find, over the face of the whole earth above three countries of any account and largenesse, which end in the termination TANIA: and those verily lying in this west part of the world, namely, MAURITANIA, LUSITANIA, and AQUITANIA. Which names, I doubt not but the Greeks made and delivered to the Latines' (27).[72] The idea of that correspondence between Greek and English showed that English was derived from the Greeks when they travelled to Britain can be found before Camden. Daniel Rogers discusses the subject in his notes towards a history of Britain: he points out that Hadrianus Junius had derived 'Belgica vocabula', and then lists English words that can similarly be derived from the Greek.[73] He even goes on to say that the 'Ara Vlysses' (altar of Ulysses) can be found in Scotland, and bears Greek inscriptions.[74] This manuscript of Rogers' was owned by Camden -- a fuller study would be able to show what use Camden made of it, but it is likely these arguments influenced his attempt to find Greek etymologies for the word 'Britain'. Daniel Rogers was encouraged to prepare his history of Britain by

---

[72] Maurice Powicke, 'William Camden', *Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association* 1 (1948): 67–84, describes Camden's philology as 'pitiful' (75). This is a grossly unfair and historically unsympathetic assessment. I prefer Anthony Wood's assessment, which also points to the essential unity of Camden's intellectual interests: 'He was an exact Critick and Philologist, an excellent Grecian, Latinist and Historian, and above all a profound Antiquary, as his elaborate works testifie' (Anthony Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses: An Exact History of all the Writers and Bishops Who have had their Education in the most ancient and famous Vniuersity of Oxford*, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1691-92), I.411.)

[73] On the perceived relationship between English and Greek see the superb article: John F. Eros, 'A 17th-Century Demonstration of Language Relationship: Meric Casaubon on English and Greek', *Historiographia Linguistica* 3 (1976): 1-15.

[74] BM Cotton Titus F.x, 96r-97r.

Abraham Ortelius.[75] His work is another clear example that both the idea for a project to write the history of Britain, and the methodologies by which this project could be achieved, cannot be seen only in a national context.

It is left to Isaac Casaubon to pick apart Camden's argument: he does not accept the authority of the Greek Glossary ('quibus equidem sine locuplete teste fidem arbitrabor nunquam'); and gently, but possibly more devastatingly, he points out that there are other countries which could have been included in Camden's list of names that terminate in 'tania': 'cur *Capataniam* & *Occitaniam* omiseris?' (60-61). In other words, there is no necessary connection between Greek naming of Western provinces and the use of the termination 'Tania'. He goes on to say that he has annotated the whole book with similar observations ('Haec & pauca id genus alia annotabam').[76] It is also interesting that Casaubon does not argue that it would be wrong to assume the name 'Britain' would be derived from Greek: he only critiques the detail of Camden's argument. So the etymology of a name like 'Britain' was not simply a matter of national interest: it was part of the scholarly, intellectual exchange of the Republic of Letters.

Etymology was not only a matter of global, world-historical concern to Camden, but had significance for local history too. This is revealed most clearly in a very short treatise on word transformation by Camden, which was collected

---

[75] J.H. Hessels, *Abrahami Ortelii (geographi Antverpiensis) et virorum eruditorum ad eundem et ad Jacobum Colium Ortelianum...epistulae* (Cambridge, 1887; Osnabrück: Zeller, 1969), letter number 42, Rogers to Ortelius, 20 October 1572. Fritz J. Levy, 'Daniel Rogers as Antiquary', *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance* 27 (1965): 444-62 remains invaluable for the study of Rogers. Angus Vine, *In Defiance of Time* (OUP, 2010), 29-37 adds little. On Ortelius' correspondence see Joost Depuydt, 'Le cercle d'amis et de correspondants autour d'Abraham Ortelius', in Robert W. Karrow, Jr, ed., *Abraham Ortelius (1527-1598): Cartographe et Humaniste* (Turnhout: Brepols, 1998).

[76] If this annotated copy survives it has not yet come to light. I am grateful to Joanna Weinberg for her advice about Casaubon's books.

by Thomas Smith.[77] He begins by distinguishing two different kinds of word transformation: one in which 'De was prefixed to a word, another in which 'Le' was 'set before them'. He then goes on to point out that there is not 'any towne, village, hamlet, or place in England but hath made names to families', but because these significances were now largely forgotten 'many names are locall w^{ch} do not seeme so' (i.e. many family names are of some local, geographical significance, but the families no longer know what that significance is). Names, too, can come to seem strange because they are 'so chaunged by corruption of spech': here we have Camden identifying a motor for linguistic transformation. Finally he notes that many place names ('locall names') have 'Att prefixed before them in ould evidences'. In this very short piece of writing we see Camden applying the philological tools of etymology and word-transformation to derive information about the history of specific places.[78] The scholarly tools of the Republic of Letters are being used to analyse 'ould evidences', and so to write regional history.

(iii) Manuscripts and Archives

Antiquarian philology was fed by the discovery, cataloguing and analysis of manuscripts.[79] We have already seen an example of this in practice, in the case of Selden's discussion of the authorship of Simeon of Durham's history. This

[77] Bodl. MS Smith 84, fol.3r.
[78] See also the treatise copied by Camden into the back of his own copy of the *Britannia* (MS Smith 1).
[79] For surveys of the private libraries and manuscript collections of antiquaries see Nigel Ramsay, 'Libraries for antiquaries and heralds', in Giles Mandelbrote and K.A. Manley, eds., *The Cambridge History of Libraries in Britain and Ireland: Volume II: 1640-1850* (Cambridge: CUP, 2006), 134-157; Richard Ovenden, 'The libraries of the antiquaries (c.1580-1640) and the idea of a national collection', in Elisabeth Leedham-Green and Teresa Webber, eds., *The Cambridge History of Libraries in Britain and Ireland* (Cambridge: CUP, 2006), 527-561, and in the same volume, Julian Roberts, 'Extending the Frontiers: Scholar Collectors', 292-321.

section aims to set the use of manuscripts in a broader context by asking how far manuscripts, and the collections they were part of, were beginning to be conceptualized in a new way in this period. How did the centralization of archives in London alter antiquaries' conceptualization of the manuscripts which belonged to bishops and county gentry? Was there anything like a concept of the public scholarly resource in this period? And how were manuscripts themselves being analysed and incorporated into scholarly works? Although as before we will draw on evidence from the life and books of Camden and Selden, this is the point at which Henry Spelman (1563/4-1641) will become a prominent figure in our analysis. Spelman worked very closely with Jeremy Stephens (1591-1665), who helped Spelman acquire manuscripts and published some of Spelman's work posthumously. The correspondence between the two of them, preserved in the British Library, is probably the single most important source for the study of British antiquarianism in the early seventeenth century.[80] It tells us, in particular, a huge amount about the ways British historical manuscripts were discovered, copied, circulated and put to use. It will be a regular touchstone in this section.

The records generated by legal and financial state business had undergone a constant process of organisation and reorganisation throughout the medieval period.[81] But, as May McKisack has observed, in a book which still

---

[80] Spelman's correspondence is now bound in three sizeable volumes: BM Add. MS 34599-34601. The only good account of Spelman, which takes account of these volumes of correspondence, remains F.M. Powicke, 'Sir Henry Spelman and the "Concilia"', *Proceedings of the British Academy* 16 (1930): 345-379.

[81] On this massive subject see Elizabeth M. Hallam, 'Nine Centuries of Keeping the Public Records', in G.H. Martin and Peter Spufford, eds., *The Records of the Nation: The Public Record Office, 1838-1988* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1990), 23-42; Elizabeth M. Hallam, 'The Tower of London as a Record Office', *Archives* 14 (1979): 3-10; R.B. Wernham, 'The Public Records in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries', in Levi Fox, ed., *English Historical Scholarship in the*

offers one of the most valuable accounts of British antiquarianism, historians had not really made use of the full range of past records in any organised way before the sixteenth century.[82] And so antiquaries' attempts to catalogue the records and to establish guides to them were new phenomena in the sixteenth, with new consequences.[83] The Keeper of the Tower Records increasingly became the office held by an antiquary of standing: distinguished holders of the post included William Bowyer (1563-1569), William Lambarde (Jan-Aug 1601) and Robert Bowyer (from 1604). Increasingly during this period, antiquaries came to copy records in the Tower for use in their research. Thomas Talbot (1535-1595) became a clerk of the Tower Records from around 1580, and he had already been copying records from 1573.[84] Particularly interesting are his notes from the Tower Records which survive among Elias Ashmole's papers in the Bodleian. Here we can see Talbot carefully organising his notes according to the *kind* of record he was copying. So he headed the manuscripts' pages with record names, including 'Patentes' (patents), "Clausae' (Close-rolls), 'Francia' (French-rolls) and 'Escateria' (escheats).[85] Talbot's interests in particular were heraldic and genealogical: his records were a means of tracing lineages and lines of

---

Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries (London and New York, 1956), 11-30; R.F. Hunnisett, 'What is a plea roll?', *Journal for the Society of Archivists* 9:3 (1988): 109-114.

[82] May McKisack, *Medieval History in the Tudor Age* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971), 75: 'But historians like Matthew Paris in the thirteenth century, or the anonymous canon of Bridlington, in the fourteenth, who compiled books of documents to serve as appendixes to their work, were, almost without exception, writing contemporary, or near-contemporary, history; and such documents as they included were documents current in their own day, copies of which often found their way into the monastic scriptoria'.

[83] An invaluable modern guide to the records is Percy H. Winfield, *The Chief Sources of English Legal History* (New York: Burt Franklin, 1925).

[84] For printed extracts from one of Thomas Talbot's notebooks, BM Cotton Vespasian D.XVII, printed in A.G. Watson, *The Manuscripts of Henry Savile of Banke* (London: Bibliographical Society, 1969), 78-82.

[85] Bodl. MS Ashmole 799.ii. The account of the contents of this manuscript in W. H. Black, *A descriptive, analytical and critical catalogue of the manuscripts bequeathed unto the University of Oxford by Elias Ashmole*, 2 vols. (Oxford: OUP, 1845–66) is invaluable.

inheritance. Although he never published anything, the fact that his manuscripts were preserved among the papers of later antiquaries (including Ashmole) shows they were seen as sources of enduring value. We find similarly systematic attempts to take notes on the records later in our period, especially in the manuscripts of Simonds D'Ewes.[86] D'Ewes arranges his notes into different kind of sources, for example in an individual manuscript he might concentrate solely on charters. He also makes an effort to designate where his sources could be found, for instance labelling 'Chartae' which are 'In Turre' according to the Bundles in which they are bound.[87]

In this context it is clear why bringing some clarity to the records, in the form of guides to their use, would be very helpful to antiquaries. Although the Tower of London was the main repository of records, it was not the only one. Arthur Agarde, after a lifetime spent working with records, tried to bring some clarity to their organisation in his treatise of 1610: 'The Compendium of the Records in the Treasury, Compiled and Digested by Arthur Agarde, Esq.'.[88] Agarde's treatise gives an acute sense of the difficulty of preserving records.

---

[86] See D'Ewes' famous account of how he began to study the records: 'On Thursday, the 4th day of September [1623], in the afternoon, I first began studying records at the Tower of London, happening at first upon the charter by which Edward the Confessor confirmed Earl Harold's foundation of Waltham Abbey. From this day forward, I never wholly gave over the study of records; but spent many days and months about it, to my great content and satisfaction; and at last grew so perfect in it, that when I had sent for a copy or transcript of a record, I could, without the view of the original, discover many errors which had slipped from the pen of the clerk. I at first read records only to find out the matter of law contained in them; but afterwards perceiving other excellences might be observed from them, both historical and notional, I always continued the study of them after I had left the Middle Temple and given over the study of the common law itself. I especially searched the records of the Exchequer: intending, if God shall permit, and that I be not swallowed up of evil times, to restore to Great Britain its true history, - the exactest that ever was yet penned of any historian in the Christian world. To which purpose, and for the finishing of divers other lesser works, I have already made many collections, and joined some imperfect pieces of them together' (Sir Simonds D'Ewes, *The Autobiography and Correspondence of Sir Simonds D'Ewes*, ed. James Orchard Halliwell, 2 vols. (London, 1845), 235-6)

[87] BL Egerton MS 3806.

[88] Sir Francis Palgrave, ed., *Antient Kalendars and Inventories of the Treasury of His Majesty's Exchequer together with other documents illustrating the history of that repository*, 3 vols. (Record Commission, 1836), II.311-335.

Along with the dangers of rats, water and so on, he adds the very nadir: '*id est* misplacinge; it is an evill that riseth by th officer that produceth the record for the search or service, and it is an enemye to all good ordre, and the bringer in of all horror and inconvenience ammonge records' (314). He points out that many records cannot be considered 'public' (in our modern sense) because they are still kept in private hands. 'Mr *John Bingley*', Agarde says, 'keepeth all privie seales and inrolm^{ts} of patents and warrants for the issueing of treas^{e} and th accoumpts thereof from the tellors, whereof he hath a great number in bagges and presses in an office close by the Court of Receipt' (315). But Agarde does systematically analyse the four 'Threasuries' of the Exchequer: 'the Court of Receipt' (316), 'the newe Pallace of W*estm* over the little Gatehouse there' (322), 'the *ould Chappter House* of the Abbay of *Westm^{r}*' (329) and 'the *Cloyster* of the said Abbay of *Westm*' (332). This treatise remained in manuscript and was aimed at scholars who wished to learn their way around the Records.[89] A printed work, aimed at a wider audience, also sought to guide the perplexed around the complex world of the Records: that was Thomas Powell's *Direction for Search of Records* (London, 1622).[90] The work was aimed at the lawyer, or possibly the amateur lawyer who found himself involved in litigation. The address 'To the Reader' observes that '[t]he necessitie of this Subiect complaines it selfe in the Multiplicitie of Suites' (A3r). He anatomizes the Chancery, Tower and Exchequer Records, and given the confusing nature of the latter they take up

[89] See Elizabeth M. Hallam, 'Arthur Agarde and the Domesday Book', in C.J. Wright, ed., *Sir Robert Cotton as Collector: Essays on an Early Stuart Courtier and his Legacy* (London: The British Library, 1997), 253-261.
[90] This was expanded and republished as Thomas Powell, *The Repertorie of Records* (London, 1631).

most of the book. So there was a perceived practical need to bring some clarity and organisation to the proliferating world of medieval historical records.

A growing sense of the hierarchy of importance of certain records can be perceived. Then as now, the most famous single record was the Doomsday Book. The book was kept in the Exchequer Court of Receipt, and Agarde gives a description in his treatise on the Records: 'Two of the most auncyentest bookes of record in the Realme, made in Wiiliam the Conquerers time (called Domesdei,) in the xxth yeare of his raigne. Th one booke in quarto contayninge the description of Essex Norff [and] Suffolk, and in th other in folio, the like for all the Shires in England, from Cornwall to the river of Tyne' (316). It is apparent this was not only 'auncyentest' of the records, but also considered the most valuable because it was the most expensive to consult. Thomas Powell tells us that to search in the rest of the Court of Receipts there is a flat fee of eight shillings and two pence, and the copying of one sheet costs one shilling. But for the Doomsday Book there is a flat fee of six shillings and eight pence just to consult it, and it costs four pence *per line* to have it copied ('to be written in the old *Saxon Letter*').[91] Powell also describes the original purpose of the Doomsday Book: 'And this Booke was made for the reducing of the Estates of all the Lords Spirituall and Temporall, and Bodies Politique and Ciuill, that then were to hold immediately of the said *Conqueror*' (52). Recognising its particular value, and presumably also the expence of consulting it, Arthur Agarde also produced an abstract of the Doomsday Book, which survives in the British Library.[92] The abstract lists all the counties in England and provides information from the

[91] These prices are at Powell, *Direction for Search*, 53.
[92] BM Add MS. 74948

Doomsday Book about landholdings in each one. We have here a dynamic interaction between the centralized Records -- in fact, the most prized of all the Records in London -- and the regional information which they provide.[93]

The sense of the local is always created dialectically: there can be no sense of regions without a sense of the centre. As a concept of central records grew, so too concomitantly did the concept of regional records, and the particular difficulties of dealing with them. Recent studies have drawn attention to the need for local contacts when conducting research, but Philip Styles' study of William Dugdale's research practices remains unsurpassed in its close consideration of the need for contacts with the local gentry and officials.[94] Important heraldic and genealogical manuscripts were often the private possessions of the gentry, who were often not delighted to give them up to scholars. The reasons for this are well illustrated in a letter from one John Parsons to Simon Archer (13th July 1639), who was at that point helping Dugdale with his researches into Warwickshire history. Simon Archer must have requested a copy of some legal papers proving Parsons' title to his family's land. But Parsons writes back to say that unfortunately no such thing can be supplied: 'I haue not anie deede wch mencioneth anye the landes in your letter specified, yf at anye tyme anie such weare they weare imbezelled from my father, by his eldest brothers wiefe'.[95] Antiquarian activities in the regions could have dangerous consequences, unearthing the shaky claims of the local gentry to their

---

[93] Robert Cotton's work on the records was edited, expanded and published posthumously by William Prynne as Robert Cotton, *An Exact Abridgement of the Records in the Tower of London, From the reign of King Edward the Second, unto King Richard the Third* (London, 1657).
[94] Philip Styles, 'Sir Simon Archer: "A lover of Antiquity and of the lovers thereof"', in *Studies in Seventeenth Century West Midlands History* (Kineton: Roundwood Press, 1978), 1-41.
[95] Bod. MS Eng. Lett. b 1, fol.272r.

land. So it was very important for antiquaries to build up trust among local gentry to help get access to important historical records. The same was also true of the local clergy, who had access to resources which were particularly valuable for Henry Spelman. On 25th November 1635, Thomas Thorowgood wrote to Spelman to say he had discovered a 'MS. history or Chronicle of the Kingdome of the East-Angles', a 'thicke volume in folio' in the 'priuate study of the Register to the Archdeacon of Norw^{ch}'.[96] Local contacts among the gentry and clergy were vital to gain access to manuscripts not preserved in the main London archives or university libraries.

If there is a growing sense of the distinction between the central and regional archive in this period, so too is there a developing distinction between the public and private library. The two most intellectually robust cases for this developing distinction can be found in Colin Tite's work on the Cotton Library, and in Nigel Ramsay's work on the Cathedral Libraries.[97] Both Tite and Ramsay point to the contrast between the patterns of acquisition and use of books in Archbishop Matthew Parker's household, and later seventeenth century practices. When Matthew Parker sent out scholars to prepare catalogues of cathedral libraries, he was looking for books worth acquiring for his own collections. The catalogues of Cathedral libraries produced by Patrick Young are not put to the same use, but instead record books which scholars can go to the

[96] BM Add. MS 34600, fol.54r.
[97] Colin Tite, *The Manuscript Library of Sir Robert Cotton* (London: British Library, 1994); Nigel Ramsay, 'The Cathedral Archives and Library', in Patrick Collinson, Nigel Ramsay and Margaret Sparks, eds., *A History of Canterbury Cathedral* (Oxford: OUP, 1995), 341-407. Jennifer Summit, *Memory's Library: Medieval Books in Early Modern England* (Chicago: Chicago UP, 2008) offers some reflections on the relationship between libraries and early-modern ideas of memory, but it contains no new scholarship and adds almost nothing to our understanding of libraries.

libraries to consult.[98] Patrick Young made his catalogues available to scholars in London: some ended up in the collection of John Selden.[99] And Matthew Parker treated the manuscripts he did acquire as though they were his own possessions, marking them with red crayon. Robert Cotton, on the other hand, made a greater attempt to preserve manuscripts in the form in which they came to him. Although he had around half of his manuscripts rebound, or bound with other manuscripts in his collection, this did not, as Tite argues, reflect a sense that they were his exclusively his possessions. Rather, as Tite concludes, 'inspired maybe by the example of the medieval chronicles and annals on his shelve', Cotton was, 'endeavouring to provide something of an equivalent for his own time, thereby establishing an archive – as complete as he could make it – which he and others, men such as William Camden, might explore, in much the way that they quarried in the chronicles for the history of earlier times' (56-57). Cotton had already shown an interest in creating a national library in the famous letter, which he signed along with other scholars, to Queen Elizabeth suggesting such an institution be created.[100] In this context, it was significant too that Bodley's Library was referred to by scholars as the 'Public Library' at Oxford.[101] Bodley's

---

[98] On one of Young's catalogues see Teresa Webber, 'Patrick Young, Salisbury Cathedral Manuscripts and the Royal Collection', *English Manuscript Studies*, 1100-1700 2 (1990): 283-290.
[99] Now published: Ivor Atkins and Neil R. Ker, eds., *Catalogus Librorum Manuscriptorum Bibliothecae Wigorniensis made in 1622-1623 by Patrick Young Librarian to King James I* (Cambridge, 1944). This Selden manuscript did not come to the Bodleian in 1659, but was part of a large collection kept by Matthew Hale, and preserved at the Alderley estate of the Hale family. They were acquired in 1939 by James Fairhurst and from him came to the Bodleian. See Toomer, *John Selden*, 798.
[100] BM Cotton Faustina E.V, ff.89-90v. The other signatories were John Doddridge and James Ley.
[101] On the early history of the Bodleian, William D. Macray, *Annals of the Bodleian Library with a Notice of the Earlier Library of the University* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1890, 2nd edn.) remains by far the most valuable account. A more recent overview is Ian Philip, *The Bodleian Library in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983). And see also: R.A. Beddard, 'The Official inauguration of the Bodleian Library on 8 November 1602', *The Library* 3 (2002): 255-83; David Vaisey, 'The Legacy of Sir Thomas Bodley', *Bodleian Library Record* 17

stringent rules against borrowing books encouraged the sense that he was creating a repository for the use of scholars -- including scholars who had not yet been born -- rather than a personal collection.[102]

This not only shows how scholars thought about their books, but also because a sense of the public library encourages dialectically a sense of the boundary between the public and private collection -- a distinction which is related to the problems of regional and national scholarship we are exploring. Scholars were increasingly attempting to acquire catalogues of important public collections, both at home and abroad. William Dugdale's catalogues of public libraries in England survives in the Bodleian.[103] And Selden had several catalogues of major manuscript collections in Europe (even though he never travelled outside England), which he kept together in his library.[104] There is one particularly fascinating moment when a private collection comes to be conceived as a matter of wide public interest. This is the case of the dispersal of the 8000 volumes of the private library of John Selden, after his death in 1654. This library was already, in some sense, a collection to be compared to that of Cotton

---

(2002): 419-430; Mary Clapinson, 'The Bodleian Library and its Readers, 1602-1652', *Bodleian Library Record* 19 (2006): 30-46.

[102] Although books were sometimes borrowed from the collection. See Gerard Langbaine to Selden, November 20th 1653: 'Sr At an Anniversary Visitation of o^{r} pub: Library Novembr 8th: the Curators had occasion to be informed of two Greek Books (of Baroccius his Library, Hephaiston & Aeschylus) lent to one M^{r} Stanley, as at your instance, upon a supposall that you have like power to borrow any book of that donation as o^{r} good friend M^{r} Patrick Yong had, by the will of the Dono^{r} (W^{m}. Earle of PEmbroke) & consent of the Uni^{ty}'. (Selden Supra 109, fol.452v). A full account of the ways seventeenth-century scholars used the Bodleian collections would be enormously desirable.

[103] Bodl. MS Dugdale 48

[104] Selden's catalogues of European libraries are now to be found in: MS Arch. Selden B.4 (Marciana and Escurial Libraries), Arch. Selden B.6 (Palatine Library at Heidelberg, libraries in Vienna, Munich, the Vatican, Venice, Basel and Florence), Arch. Selden B.8 B (oriental manuscripts in the Ambrosian Library, Milan) and Selden Supra 121 (catalogues of the Greek and oriental manuscripts in the Tengnagel Collection in Vienna). See Selden Supra 111 (the library catalogue made at Selden's death), fol.115r for the room in which his European library catalogues were kept.

or indeed the Tower of London. In the bibliographical appendix to the *Historie of Tithes* (1618), Selden lists the repositories of '*The auncient* Records *and other* Manuscripts, *used in this* Historie of Tithes' (f2v).[105] Selden lists manuscripts in the Cotton collection, in the Office of Receipt of the Exchequer, the Office of the Kings *Remembrancer*, 'in the publique Librarie of *Oxford*' (f3r), as well as 'In my own hands' (f3v). So Selden's library is presented alongside other major collections in England.

After Selden's death, there was an interesting attempt to acquire his library by 'the Schoole and Almsehouse of Westminster', which has gone largely unnoticed by modern scholars.[106] There was surely little chance of this bid succeeding, but the way in which it is couched is telling. The draft letter is addressed to John Vaughan, one of Selden's executors, from the 'Gouernors of the Schoole...of Westminster'. The subject of the letter is the 'placing for that most famous Library of a private person, if indeed he can be reputed private in whome all learned men had an interest'. Recognising Oxford as their main rival, they go on to pursue the argument that Selden's library is a public resource and should therefore be kept in London, near Parliament. This would not only be to 'the advancement of ye Commonwealth of learning', but would also allow urgent matters of public debate to be settled: 'if the question of Mare Clausum fall out

---

[105] On the development of bibliography in early-modern England see Richard Sharpe, 'Thomas Tanner (1674-1735), the 1697 Catalogue, and Bibliotheca Britannica', *The Library* 6 (2005): 381-420.

[106] The letter to Selden's executors is now in Westminster Abbey Library, WAM 9827. It is likely that the impulse behind the letter came from Richard Busby, because the letter concludes with the argument that the School is the perfect place for the repository of 'Orientall authors', 'In w^{ch} the Schoole by a kind of <happy> prognosticating procedure, for some yeares before y^{e} death of that great Rabbin m^{r} Selden...has beene not only hopefully initiated, but arrived to a great vnderstanding and proficiency in those languages'. Busby was responsible for introducing the study of Arabic to Westminster School, on which subject see Toomer, *Eastern Wisedome and Learning*, 265-268.

againe to bee disputed by y^{e} sword or pen, must y^{e} Parliament...send to y^{e} forge of y^{e} vniuersity to sharpen those tooles and weapons y^{t} may be vsd on that occasion'. And they suggest this was an argument which Selden had himself made about another library: 'And was not some such thing, or app^{r}hension thereof the cause that M^{r} Selden was so zealous to move in Parliament y^{t} y^{e} B^{p} of Armaches library might be plac't at Westminster rather than at either of the vniuersityes'. Simultaneously, however, the governors are keen to stress that this must remain *Selden*'s collection, which would not be possible in the Bodleian (as they argue): 'whereas at Oxford they must be throwne into an heape where they and their donors name and memory will be drowned'. So in this case we can see the oscillation between the demands of a private and public collection. it may be that the same collection could be conceived as both private *and* public, but this certainly seems to a response that is attuned both to a particular library, and to the broader conception of a library's purpose in this period.

Having considered how records and collections were conceptualized in the period, we can now turn to the correspondence between Henry Spelman and Jeremy Stephens to think about how they were used in practice. The correspondence between the two men largely took place in the 1630s, and so focusses on Spelman's research for his *Concilia*, his volume of documents relating to the history of the British church in the Anglo-Saxon and early Norman period.[107] Stephens worked closely with Spelman in acquiring documents relating to early church Synods. His main research was done in Oxford and Cambridge, especially the former, and he worked closely with several different

[107] The bulk of Spelman's surviving correspondence can be found in three large folio volumes: BM Add. MS 34599-34601. Many of Spelman's own drafts are preserved in BM Add. MS 25384.

scholars there. On 11 July 1632, Stephens wrote to Spelman concerning the search in Oxford for a manuscript of the 'Councell of Norw^{ch}'.[108] Stephens has asked Brian Twyne, who encloses a note to Spelman about the book where the Council of Norwich material can be found.[109] However, that book itself cannot be located. It was originally in the possession of Thomas Allen, and Twyne has told Stephens that Allen's books passed to Cotton, Digby and Sir Thomas Aylesbury. He goes on to say he has consulted 'the publique library' (i.e. the Bodleian) for 'Councells', but has turned up nothing 'for your purpose'. Stephens continues to work within these Oxford networks for Spelman. On the 15th July 1635, Stephens wrote to Spelman to tell him that 'Mr Twjne shewed me the Lincolne Councell of Grosttead, w^{ch} he found in a volume of his epistles'. Stephens also describes using 'Dr: Iames catalogue' to help search 'in Merton College library & elswhere, but the bookes are lost or gone' (154r). James' catalogue is the *Ecloga Oxonio-Cantabrigiensis*, which catalogues the medieval manuscripts in Oxford and Cambridge College Libraries.[110] Stephens also made use of this volume to find a relevant manuscript in Cambridge. On the 30th June 1634 Stephens wrote to say that 'I am promised at Cambridge that I shall shortly haue an extract of this Synods & constitutions, mencioned in Do^{r}: James Catalogue of Bennet College'.[111] On the 19th July 1635 Stephens was again writing to say he had the

---

[108] BM Add. MS 34599, fol.140r.
[109] See Bodl. MS Twyne 22 for the story of Twyne's attempt to take Camden's Oxford Professorship of History. Brian Twyne deserves a full study. In the meantime see: Strickland Gibson, 'Brian Twyne', *Oxoniensia* 5 (1940): 94-114; R.F. Ovenell, 'Brian Twyne's Library', *Oxford Bibliographical Society* (1950): 1-42. For Twyne's copies of astronomical and astrological treatises for Selden see Bodl. MS Selden Supra 79.
[110] On James see Paul Nelles, 'The Uses of Orthodoxy and Jacobean Erudition: Thomas James and the Bodleian Library', *History of Universities* 22 (2007): 21-70.
[111] BM Add. MS 34600, fol.14r-14v. St Bennet's College is now Corpus Christi, Cambridge. James' catalogue also caused some interest in continental Europe: Pierre Dupuy received a copy in

help of Brian Twyne to find relevant materials, this time an Anglo-Saxon Glossary: 'There is an old Glossary among the MS. of Ls Kenelme Digby, w^{ch} mr Twine shewed me, & he thinkes it would be vsefull to yow' (fol.38r). He is also still pursuing the Council of Norwich: he finally receives a copy of this Synod on the 20th September 1635, but he is not satisfied with the quality of the transcription ('the copy must be transcribed againe', fol.52r). The manuscript is later examined (letter 29th November 1635) by Spelman and Stephens' friend, Dr Morris, the Professor of Hebrew in Oxford in the 1630s.[112] Morris has spent a lot of time 'putting in the margine, the forme of the words, as they are obscure in the MS' (fol.56r). Stephens also works to subcontract some of this enormous work of transcription, by finding an amanuensis for Spelman who would 'attend him' and copy materials for him. On the 11th July 1632, Stephens sent to Spelman the writing samples of several different Oxford graduates for his inspection.

This correspondence provides a vivid illustration of the business of scholarship in our period. Stephens moves between several different kind of manuscript collection: the private collections of Allen and Digby, the college libraries (where Thomas James' work was a guide), the 'publique Library' of Oxford. And within this network he relies on the help of experts. Brian Twyne, in particular, was assembling a vast manuscript collection of materials relating to the history of Oxford. He was the perfect guide for Stephens and Spelman through the interconnected scholarly archives of the Universities in the 1630s. It also suggests some of the ways scholars got around practical, geographical

---

January 1618 from the diplomat and former student of Camden, Sir William Becherus (Thomas Smith, ed., *Camdeni...Epistolae*, 211).

[112] For more on Morris see the end of this section.

difficulties when conducting their research. Spelman was based in London, and even in Oxford he required not only someone based physically in the city to help him transcribe material, but also someone connected to the networks of manuscript movement and exchange to discover what was available to be transcribed. When preparing a massive history of the Councils in Britain, local knowledge of modern intellectual culture was invaluable. The other comparable correspondence is that between Selden and Gerard Langbaine in the 1640s, when Langbaine was transcribing large quantities of material for Selden from the Bodleian.[113] But although Langbaine will often comment on the material he has transcribed, he does not tend to initiate new discoveries in the way Stephens does for Spelman. The traffic is much simpler, which makes the Spelman-Stephens correspondence all the more important and revealing.

The other important transition taking place in antiquaries treatment of manuscript collections in this period is the growing sense of earlier antiquaries' papers as themselves constituting scholarly archives. This was particularly true of John Leland's papers.[114] Stephens and Spelman's correspondence is again revealing. On the 19th July 1635, Stephens reports to Spelman that he was been in Oxford, 'according to my purpose & perused Lelands collectanea'.[115] Stephens describes quite carefully what Leland's *Collectanea* are: 'I find to be his extractions & notes out of diuers authors, & chronicles, as he mett wth them in the librarys of the religious houses, during the space of his six yeeres travayle'

---

[113] The bulk of the Selden-Langbaine correspondence can be found in Selden Supra 109, fol.394r-472v, and most of the letters touch on both manuscript transcriptions Langbaine was preparing for Selden, and on matters of university policy. For Langbaine's own notes from Bodleian manuscripts, especially the Barrocci collection, see Bodl. MS Langbaine 14.
[114] On their movement after Leland's death see the definitive study, Oliver Harris, '"Motheaten, Mouldye, and Rotten"' and James P. Carley, 'The Manuscript Remains of John Leland, "The King's Antiquary"', *TEXT: Transactions of the Society for Textual Scholarship* 2 (1985): 111-120.
[115] BM Add. MS 34600, fol.38r.

(38r).[116] These papers had only recently arrived in the Bodleian, donated by William Burton. The fact that Stephens assumes Spelman will not know the contents of Leland's *Collectanea* shows that such earlier antiquarian manuscripts were often still obscure even to the most important and well-connected scholars of the day. In the letter to John Rous which Burton prefixes to John Leland's *Itinerary*, when he donates the manuscript to the Bodleian, he promises the next volumes soon, although 'I cannot prefixe the definitive time, by reason of the present vse w^{ch} I nowe have, & hereafter shall have of them'.[117] So Burton's decision to donate them to the Bodleian is also tempered by the fact that he is making use of them himself, which implies some sense of ownership over the manuscripts. He was, however, always happy to make copies available to those who asked.

One who did so was John Selden. Only Burton's reply to Selden survives, which Robert Cotton bound together with his own Leland autograph manuscripts.[118] It is dated 11th January 1618 (i.e., probably in old style and hence actually 1619). Burton thanks Selden for the copy of the 'Matriculus Ecclesiarum in Archidiac. Leicest' he has sent him.[119] Selden has requested

---

[116] On Leland's preservation of documents from monastic houses see James P. Carley and Pierre Petitmengin, 'Pre-Conquest manuscripts from Malmesbury Abbey and John Leland's letter to Beatus Rhenanus concerning a lost copy of Tertullian's works', *Anglo-Saxon England* 33 (2004): 195-223.

[117] See the flyleaf to MS Bodl.470. The letter is dated 1632 and addressed from Burton's estate at Lindley, Leicestershire.

[118] BM Cotton Julius C.VI. The letter to Selden is at fol.243r. On this manuscript see T.C. Skeat, 'Two "Lost" Works by John Leland', *The English Historical Review* 65 (1950): 505-508.

[119] Copy of MS Cotton Nero D.X, fols.140r-154r, the 'Matriculus Ecclesiarum in Archidiac. Leicest'. Selden himself makes use of this manuscript in History of Tithes (London, 1618), 385, where in the margin he cites it as '5. Hen. 3. in Matricul. Ecclesiar. Archdiac. Leic. in Biblioth. Cottoniana'. Colin Tite (in *Records of Sir Robert Cotton's Library*, 138) points out that Selden's date for the manuscript is the same as that supplied on fol.140r. Tite also suggests that the marginal annotation on page 142, 'Peclynton', may be by Selden; this material may have been relevant to Burton's interest in the village of 'Peckleton', for which see BM Add.MS 6046, fols.146v-147r. William Burton thanks Selden for this treatise in *The Description of Leicesters*hire (London,

several materials from among Leland's papers -- 'S^{t} Neoti monasterij Chronicon', 'Godmancest^{r}', 'Dictionarium Britannicolatinum' and 'Dictionarium LatinoSaxonicum'. What seems most helpful here in ascertaining what Selden would have known about Leland's manuscripts at this point is that Leland's material on Godmanchester appears in the *Collectanea* immediately after Leland's material on St Neots: it is very unlikely to be a coincidence that Selden requested immediately consecutive material from Leland's manuscripts. This must mean that Selden had either (a) seen Leland's manuscripts himself at this point; (b) had received a detailed breakdown of their contents already, presumably from Burton; (c) had seen other copies of Leland's manuscripts, possibly those that Stow made in the 1590s.[120] Regardless of how Selden knew about Leland's papers, what is clear is that the Leland archive was being treated as itself a scholarly resource in the early seventeenth century.[121] Selden continues and develops his use of the works of earlier antiquaries in his own

---

1622), 9: 'the transcript whereof, was sent to mee by the iudicious and worthily admired Iohn Selden, of the inner Temple, Esquire: which Tract was made 1220. 5.H.3. Hugh Walleis then Bishop of Lincolne, the Title whereof, is. Matriculis domini Hugonis Episcopi Lincoln. de omnibus ecclesiis in Archdiaconatu Leicest. 1220'. See Toomer, *John Selden*, 289, f.171. So this tells us that Burton received this Matriculus, and could begin using it for his research into Leicestershire, by late 1617 or early 1618.

[120] Stow's copies were probably the ones used by Francis Thynne in BM Cotton Cleopatra C.iii, fols.58v-77v. For Thynne's manuscripts see the superb overview in David Carlson, 'The Writings and Manuscript Collections of the Elizabethan Alchemist, Antiquary, and Herald Francis Thynne', *Huntington Library Quarterly* 52:2 (1989): 203-272.

[121] But see also William Dugdale's vivid warning against relying on earlier antiquaries' transcriptions, in a letter to Simon Archer, 15th May 1638: 'And herewith all lett me be bold to give you this caution, that to depend on any mens collections or transcripts with out compareinge them with the originalls, will but deceive you, have they bin never soe judicious. My selfe can instance and shew you by experience out of some of the laborious gatheringes of Mr. Thynn, sometymes Lancaster, and Mr. Charles his successor, nay Sr Richard St George, and Glover Somerset himselfe, which I have had recourse to, that there is noe trust to them; for besides a world of grosse mistakes in names of men and places which (not for want of heed) they have passed, they have here and there gleaned accordinge to their fancye, and left behinde them as materiall thinges as they have taken…For each man knowes his owne end in what he doth, but not another's; like as you see the costliest worke in stone or tymber not reared by him that framed it, is not soe good as the rough Quarryes or Tree, to him that shall have occasion to build therwith after his owne fashion' (William Dugdale, *The Life, Diary and Correspondence of William Dugdale*, ed. William Hamper (London, 1827), 183).

later antiquarian works. We have already discussed the notes he provided to Twysden, in which he prints copious extracts from Leland's *De Scriptoribus*.[122] And Selden also acquired Bale's bibliographical notebook, which lists works written by British medieval writers.[123] Selden also acquired and made use of Laurence Nowell's Anglo-Saxon Dictionary, the first of its kind, which had already passed through the hands of William Lambarde, who had developed Nowell's work on Anglo-Saxon.[124]

Writing history by consulting unpublished materials might seem obvious to the modern historian, but it was far from automatic in the sixteenth century. One explanation for the growing interest in manuscripts from the medieval past, at least in a British context, is that the dissolution of the monasteries, and the attendant destruction of books, led to a desire to salvage and publish what survived.[125] Although this seems undeniably true, it is far from the whole story. Making use of unpublished manuscripts in the writing of history was a phenomenon across Europe, even in Catholic countries, where there was no similar dissolution of monastic archives. Arnaldo Momigliano's essay on ecclesiastical history points towards a more sophisticated answer.[126] He argued that Eusebius was the first historian to combine the citation of unpublished manuscripts with the writing of history. When ecclesiastical history reemerged

---

[122] It is possible that the Leland manuscripts were among those Selden had copied for him by Gerard Langbaine in the Bodleian.
[123] Selden Supra 64. This book remains an invaluable scholarly resource: see Reginald Lane Poole, Mary Bateson, Caroline Brett and James Carley, eds., *Index Britanniae Scriptorum* (Woodbridge: D.S. Brewer, 1990).
[124] The manuscript is now Bodl. Selden Supra 63.
[125] Extensively discussed by historians: e.g. Margaret Aston, 'English Ruins and English History: The Dissolution and the Sense of the Past', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 36 (1973): 231-255; Nigel Ramsay, '"The Manuscripts flew about like Butterflies": The Break-Up of English Libraries in the Sixteenth Century', *Lost Libraries: The Destruction of Great Book Collections since Antiquity* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004), 125-144.
[126] Arnaldo Momigliano, 'The Origins of Ecclesiastical Historiography', in *The Classical Foundations of Modern Historiography* (Oxford: OUP, 1990), 132-152.

in the sixteenth century, it did so in this Eusebian form: the divisions within the Reformed and Counter-Reformed churches necessitated the citation of accurate and persuasive evidence to prove their doctrinal arguments. We see in this in the massive citation of manuscript material in the two great projects to write the history of the church in the sixteenth century church, the one a project in the Protestant Churches and the other in Catholic Rome. The first was undertaken by a group that became known as the 'Magdeburg Centuriators', led by Matthias Flaccius Illyricus.[127] The manuscripts he and his team collected later became a founding collection of the Wolfenbüttel Library.[128] The Catholic response to this history was compiled by Cesare Baronio, who was assisted by a massive correspondence network, in which French scholars were particularly important.[129] These massive documentary histories provided a model for English scholars to imitate.[130] It is also this context which explains Cardinal Barberini's deep regret that the English managed to acquire the Barrocci manuscripts, Greek manuscripts which were felt by, among others, the Patriarch of the Greek

---

[127] On the work of the Magdeburg Centuriators see: Gregory B. Lyon, 'Baudouin, Flacius, and the Plan for the Magdeburg Centuries', *Journal of the History of Ideas* 64 (2003): 253-272 and Anthony Grafton 'Where was Salomon's House? Ecclesiastical History and the Intellectual Origins of Bacon's New Atlantis', *Die Europäische Gelehrtenrepublik in Zeitalter des Konfessionalismus*, ed., Herbert Jaumann (Wolfenbüttel, 2001), 21-38. On their contacts with English scholars see Norman L. Jones, 'Matthew Parker, John Bale, and the Magdeburg Centuriators', *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 12:3 (1981): 35-49.

[128] Wolfgang Milde, 'The Library at Wolfenbüttel, from 1550 to 1618', *The Modern Language Review* 66 (1971): 101-112. For more on the Magdeburg Centuriators use of, and conception of, libraries, see Paul Nelles, 'The Renaissance Ancient Library Tradition and Christian Antiquity', in R. de Smet, ed., *Humanists and their Libraries* (Leven: Peeters, 2002), 151-71.

[129] See the essays collected in Luigi Gulia, ed., *Baronio e le sue Fonti* (Sora: Centro di Studi Sorani "Vincenzo Patriarca", 2009), especially Jean-Louis Quantin, 'Baronius et les Sources d'au-delà des Monts la Contribution Française aux Annales', 53-101. There are also useful essays on Baronio in Romeo de Maio, Luigi Gulia, Aldo Mazzacane, eds., *Baronio Storico e la Controriforma* (Sora: Centro di Studi Sorani "Vincenzo Patriarca", 1982).

[130] See the important essay on Isaac Casaubon's response to Baronius, François Laplanche, 'A Propos d'Isaac Casaubon: La Controverse Confessionnelle et la Naissance de l'Histoire', *History of European Ideas* 9:4 (1988): 405-22.

Church, Cyril Lucaris, to be extraordinarily valuable for the study of Church history.[131]

In this context, it is no suprise that the greatest English project to publish records from the medieval past centred on the history of British, Irish, Anglo-Saxon and early Norman involvement in Church Councils: Henry Spelman's *Concilia, Decreta, Leges, Constitutiones in Re Eccelsiarum Orbis Britannici* (London, 1639).[132] Spelman's work was part of a wider attempt to edit and publish the Councils of the church which was taking place across the whole of Europe.[133] Stephens informed Spelman on the 11th July 1632 of the publishing of French Councils: 'Ther is an edition lately of the French Councells in. 3. vol: by Sirmondus, from whence somwhat perhaps may be gathered, for the ordering & polishing of yours'.[134] James Ussher had already informed Spelman (April 2nd 1628) that Jacques Sirmond was working on the French Councils, and advised Spelman to write to Peiresc and ask him to request 'the Jesuites Sirmondus' to send Spelman 'diverse other monumentes of this kinde'.[135] Although it is important to understand there is a confessional dimension to the study of manuscripts, this example does show that confessional divides were hardly

---

[131] See William Macray, *Annals of the Bodleian Library* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1890), 73. On encounters between England and the Greek Church see Hugh Trevor-Roper, 'The Church of England and the Greek Church in the Time of Charles I', *From Counter-Reformation to Glorious Revolution* (London: Secker and Warburg, 1992), 83-111. On the attempt to establish a Greek College in Oxford in the late seventeenth century see E.D. Tappe, 'Greek College at Oxford, 1699-1705', *Oxoniensia* 19 (1954): 92-111.

[132] The only comparable work to publish so many primary source documents from British archives happened to come out in the same year: James Ussher, *Britannicarum Ecclesiarum Antiquitates* (Dublin, 1639). An essential companion to studying Spelman's *Concilia* is the most recent edition of the same documents: Arthur West Haddan and William Stubbs, eds., *Councils and ecclesiastical documents relating to Great Britain and Ireland*, 3 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1869-1878).

[133] Henri Quentin, *Jean-Dominique Mansi et les grandes collections conciliaires* (Paris, 1900) is still the only survey of this subject.

[134] BM Add MS 34599, fol.140r.

[135] BM Add. MS 25384, 15r.

absolute in the Republic of Letters. Contact between English and French Jesuit scholars were manifold: Richard Montague, who we already encountered as a respondent to Selden's *History of Tithes*, had sent a manuscript of Basil to the Jesuit Fronton du Duc, and the latter thanked Montague effusively for the manuscript in the published edition.[136] Another French editor, Christophe Justel, who had published (in Paris) an edition of Councils in Africa in 1615, was also in touch with Spelman.[137] On 4th February 1638 Spelman responded to Justel's request for manuscripts from English church history by telling him he planned to publish an edition of such records.[138] When the edition finally came out Spelman sent Justel a copy, along with a note which advised Justel to seek out James Ussher's just-published *Britannicarum Ecclesiarum Antiquitates*.[139] Spelman's *Concilia* not only sat beside works of European Church history on scholars' bookshelves. It was also produced within the same networks of intellectual exchange within which a scholar like Baronio had worked a generation before.[140]

There is one series of Spelman letters which illustrates well the connection between manuscripts, British history, and the history of Christianity. Spelman wrote to Stephens on the 5th July 1633 to tell him about a 'vetustus' manuscript of the Octoteuch (first eight books of the Bible), which did not have

---

[136] Jean-Louis Quantin, 'Les Jésuites et l'érudition anglicane', *XVIIe siècle* 237 (2007): 691-711, esp. 699-700. For du Duc's praise of Montague see Basil of Caeserea, *Opera omnia*, ed. Fronton du Duc, 2 vols. (Paris, 1618), I.¶iiir: 'cum a viro doctissimo Richardo Montacutio ad nos ex Anglia missa est editio Graeca Frobeniana anni 1551. cum manuscriptis codicibus collata, et in margine multis varijs lectionibus et emendationibus illustrata, exceptis solis aduersus Eunomium et Asceticis libris, quibus et Latinam editionem nostram addiderat anni 1602.'

[137] Christophe Justel, ed., *Codex Canonum Ecclesiae Africanae. Chrstiophorus Ivsetllus ex MSS. codicibus edidit, Graecam versionem adiunxit, & notis illustrauit* (Paris, 1615).

[138] BM Add. MS 34600, fol.169r.

[139] BM Add. MS 34600, fol.187r. The letter is dated from 13 November 1639.

[140] On the later seventeenth century development of the discipline of diplomatic, see Alfred Hiatt, 'Diplomatic Arts: Hickes against Mabillon in the Republic of Letters', *Journal of the History of Ideas* 70 (2009): 351-373.

the conventional divisions of the Bible into chapters and verses.[141] These leads Spelman to think historically about the division of English Biblical manuscripts into those units. He points out that Stephen Langton (1150-1228), Archbishop of Canterbury in the early thirteenth century, seems to have been the first to establish the Bible's modern divisions. He points out that Robert Estienne's edition of the Bible uses Langton's divisions. But what Spelman wants to do is delve deeper into the history of Biblical manuscripts: how did the Jews divide up the Old Testament?[142] For this information he plans to consult 'Mauritius noster', who was John Morris, Hebrew Professor at Oxford from 1626 to 1648.[143] Morris first appears in the Stephens-Spelman correspondence the years before Spelman wrote his letter on the Octoteuch, on 29th May 1632, when Stephens 'imparted to him your noble intencions & labour in Collecting the Councells'.[144] Stephens consults Morris on Spelman's behalf, and on the 8th December 1633 Stephens wrote back to Spelman with the results of Morris' analysis. Morris confirms the material about Langton and Estienne, and adds that 'the old Testament was distinguished in the Hebrew, into verses very aunciently, before the Talmud, & constantly retajned among them'.[145] Stephens asks Spelman to donate the manuscript to the Bodleian ('bestow it on the vnjuersity library'), because there it could be put to 'good vse for Collation' with another Bodleian manuscript 'partly agreeing wth yours', and one in the All Souls Library, which is 'cutt & mangled'. Stephens also encloses Morris' response (dated 28th

[141] The letter survives in Queen's College, Oxford. See Queen's MS 280, fol.280r-281r.
[142] A debate raged in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries over the antiquity of the Hebrew vowel-points, on which subject see: Richard A. Muller, *After Calvin: Studies in the Development of a Theological Tradition* (OUP, 2003), ch.9.
[143] See Feingold, 'Oriental Studies', 456. I am grateful to Professor Feingold's advice on Morris' biography.
[144] BM Add. MS 34599, fol.136r.
[145] BM Add. MS 34599, 159v.

November 1633). Morris explains that he has begun collating Spelman's manuscript with the two other Oxford Bible manuscripts: 'I haue viewed the two Ms. bibles, one in the publique library, the other in Alsoules College, and haue noted in part, the agreeement & diuersity wth the learned S^{r} Hen: Spelm: Ms.' Morris is uncertain why the manuscripts disagree, 'vnlesse it proceed from the humore of severall Amanuenses'.[146] Morris explains that 'The distinction of the auncjent Hebrew copies into verses was before the Talmud: and the Jewes (some of them) say, was done by Ezra, & the associates in the great Synagogue: & some other refer their originall to Moses'. But the division of the Chapters does not date from the Jews because 'the Jewes comonly diuide, the law into as many sections, as there be sabbaths in a yeere, & follow this calculation'. This example draws together and develops many of the aspects of early modern scholars' interest in manuscripts that we have been discussing. We see the intersection of manuscript history with the history of religion: Spelman's interest in manuscripts is encouraging him to think about the historical particularity and situatedness of the biblical text. And we also see the way British historical research (discovery of manuscripts, work on the Archbishop Stephen Langton) intersects with the broader world of Hebrew scholarship. In 1635, Morris was helping Stephens and Spelman with British historical matters, by examining the manuscript of the Synod of Norwich.[147] The tools needed to pursue Oriental philology and British antiquarianism were similar. And finally, this example gives a sense of the interconnection between antiquaries, stationed outside the academy, and Oxford scholars, whereas earlier scholarship has often assumed

[146] BM Add. MS 34599, 162r.
[147] BM Add. MS 34600, 56r.

(wrongly) that the universities were hostile to new approaches to historiography.[148]

(iv) Epigraphy and Numismatics

Although I am trying to put a great deal more emphasis on textual and philological antiquarianism than on antiquaries' use of visual evidence, it is certainly true that epigraphs and coins were beginning to be integrated into antiquarian works.[149] Indeed, approaches to epigraphs and coins were being pioneered by philologists.[150] Inscriptions provided evidence of archaic Latin terminology and style.[151] They could provide information for antiquarians -- and this was true especially of Justus Lipsius -- who were engaged in reconstructing the customs, military practices, and social world of the Roman Empire.[152] For political historians, inscriptions provided valuable evidence about public life: the battles and victories of various emperors, for instance.[153] Inscriptions could also

---

[148] For more on this, see the section on 'Institutions and Antiquarianism' below.
[149] For European antiquarians' use of visual evidence see Peter Burke, 'Images as Evidence in Seventeenth-Century Europe', *Journal of the History of Ideas* 64 (2003): 273-296; Francis Haskell, *History and its Images: Art and the Interpretation of the Past* (New Haven: Yale UP, 1993); and the very sophisticated account in Ingo Herklotz, *Cassiano dal Pozzo und die Archäologie des 17. Jahrhunderts* (München: Hirmer, 1999). Burke's overview rightly places emphasis on the advances of numismatics in the later seventeenth century, particularly on the impact of Ezechiel Spanheim's *Dissertatio de Praestantia et Usu Numismatum Antiquorum* (Rome, 1664).
[150] A good overview of this subject is Ginette Vagenheim, 'L'épigraphie: Un aspect méconnu de l'histoire de la philologie classique au XVIIe siècle', *Les cahiers de l'humanisme* 1 (2000): 89-115.
[151] For a superb overview of early epigraphy see William Stenhouse, *Reading Inscriptions and Writing Ancient History: Historical Scholarship in the Late Renaissance* (London: Institute of Classical Studies, 2005), and especially on this subject, page 53, where Stenhouse shows Antonio Agustín's 'philological concerns were paramount'.
[152] See, for instance, Jan Papy, 'An Antiquarian Scholar between Text and Image? Justus Lipsius, Humanist Education, and the Visualization of Ancient Rome', *Sixteenth Century Journal* 35:1 (2004): 97-131.
[153] Jan Verbogen, 'Martinus Smetius et Angelo Colocci. Une collection romaine d'inscriptions antiques au XVIe siècle', *Humanistica Lovaniensia* 34 (1985): 255-272.

be useful to the study of the history of Roman Law.[154] But there were also various intellectual problems unique to the study of inscriptions with which scholars in continental Europe were beginning to grapple.[155] Ambrosio de Morales listed thirteen different kinds of evidence he used to prepare his *Las antiguedades de las ciudades de España*, and the final entry on 'Piedras antiguas de Romanos escritas en latin' is by far the longest, suggesting the complexity of this kind of work.[156] The style of engraving of an inscription's text could be used to date the inscription. The whole monument in which an inscription was carved needed to be taken into account to understand the inscription's purpose. In other words, inscriptions were not solely treated as free-floating texts, bits of language that just happened to be engraved on stones rather than written in books. And furthermore it was becoming apparent that inscriptions needed to be set into the broad context of other inscriptions, and that therefore a massive effort was needed to gather all surviving inscriptions together. Such an undertaking required a network of scholarly correspondents who were willing to contribute their findings to a single scholar, or group of scholars, willing to publish a comprehensive work. And that work then needed to be organised in a way that made inscriptions accessible to scholars who wanted to use them. This comprehensive gathering of known inscriptions was achieved by Janus Gruterus, a Dutch scholar, whose work was published by the Commelins in Heidelberg.[157] Joseph Scaliger provided a celebrated series of indexes to the work, which

---

[154] On the study of Roman law see Paul Vinogradoff, *Roman Law in Medieval Europe* (Oxford, 1929). For inscriptions as legal sources see William Stenhouse, 'Georg Fabricius and inscriptions as a source of law', *Renaissance Studies* 17 (2003): 96-107.
[155] William Stenhouse, *Reading Inscriptions*, especially chs. 2 and 5.
[156] See the 'Discorso general de las Antiguedades' in Ambrosio de Morales, *Las antiguedades de las ciudades de España* (Alcala, 1575).
[157] Janus Gruter, ed., *Inscriptiones antiquae totius orbis Romani* (Heidelberg, 1603). On Gruter's life see the biography in Colette Nativel, ed., *Centuriae Latinae* (Genève: Droz, 1997).

organized and made available inscriptions to antiquarians, philologists and other kinds of historian.[158] And Gruterus's list of scholars who had contributed inscriptions, published at the front of his work is a who's-who of the whole European scholarly world, a network which stretched from the southern European epigraphists, such as Antonio Augustin and Onofrio Panvinio, to British scholars like Camden and Robert Cotton.[159]

British antiquarians' work on epigraphy needs to be contextualized within this broad European context, but how did their work respond to its developments, and what did British scholars contribute to it? Camden and Cotton's research trips to collect inscriptions around the Scottish border have been well documented in recent years.[160] Their researches were aided by a network of local antiquaries and wealthy patrons, who both helped Cotton and Camden to locate primary sources and to transport the stones to Cotton's estate at Connington.[161] And Camden was also kept informed of the discovery of inscriptions by his correspondents around the country: Francis Godwin, Bishop of Llandaff, told him about Welsh monuments; Roger Dodsworth sent Camden Yorkshire inscriptions long after the *Britannia* had been published in its final form in 1607; and, famously, the Headmaster of Appleby School, Reginald

---

[158] Anthony Grafton, 'J.J. Scaliger's Indices to J. Gruter's *Inscriptiones Antiquae*: A Note on Leiden University Library MS Scal. 11', *Lias* 2 (1975): 109-113.
[159] On Panvinio see Jean-Louis Ferrary, *Onofrio Panvinio et les antiquités romaines* (Rome: École française de Rome, 1996) and on Agustín see Michael H. Crawford, ed., *Antonio Agustin between Renaissance and Counter-Reform* (London: Warburg Institute, 1993).
[160] See: Leslie W. Hepple, 'Sir Robert Cotton, Camden's *Britannia*, and the early history of Roman Wall studies', *Archaeologia Aeliana* 5th ser. 27 (1999): 1-19; Leslie W. Hepple, '"The Museum in the Garden": Displaying Classical Antiquities in Elizabethan and Jacobean England', *Garden History* 29:2 (2001): 109-20; David McKitterick, 'From Camden to Cambridge: Sir Robert Cotton's Roman inscriptions, and their subsequent treatment', and Glenys Davies, 'Sir Robert Cotton's Collection of Roman Stones: A Catalogue with Commentary', both in *Sir Robert Cotton as Collector*, 105-128 and 129-167.
[161] A good account of the sources Camden used for his discussion of Hadrian's Wall -- literary as well as physical -- can be found in Eric Birley, *Research on Hadrian's Wall* (Kendal: Titus Wilson & Son, Ltd., 1961), 7.

Bainbrigg kept Camden up-to-date on his archaeological work on Hadrian's Wall.[162] So a network of scholars wrote to Camden, and Camden, in his turn, helped to disseminate their researches to the wider European scholarly community. In 1589 Camden began a correspondence with Janus Gruterus. In the early 1590s they tended to talk about Latin poetry in their letters more than inscriptions, but in 1592 Gruter informed Camden of his decision to try to publish a collection of inscriptions ('Estque animus mihi intra annum alterum dare Inscriptionum editionem').[163] Camden continued to keep Gruter informed about the progress of the *Britannia* and to supply him with new editions, and many of Camden's inscriptions are reproduced in Gruter's *Inscriptiones Antiquae*. The inscriptions Camden noted in the margins of his copy of the *Britannia* also provided the source for some inscriptions Selden published in his *Marmora Arundelliana*. Except in *Marmora*, Selden does not go out of his way to gather up inscriptions from sites around England in the way Camden does: it is indicative of Selden's approach that he publishes inscriptions which Camden had already noted.[164] Selden of course also interpreted the Marmor Parium inscription when

---

[162] Letters containing inscriptions from Francis Godwin to Camden can be found at Cotton Julius C. F.vi, fol.297r-v and 299r, and Camden puts them to use in Camden, *Britain*, 637. A letter containing an inscription from Dodsworth to Camden is found in MS Smith 1 inserted between pages 578 and 579. For the work on Hadrian's Wall which Bainbrigg sent to Camden see BM Cotton Julius F.vi and the classic study of this manuscript, Francis Haverfield, 'Cotton Julius F. vi. Notes on Reginald Bainbrigg of Appleby, on William Camden and on some Roman inscriptions', *Transactions of the Cumberland and Westmorland Antiquarian and Archaeological Society* 11 (1910–11): 343-378. More recently on Bainbrigg there is J.N. Edwards, 'Reginald Bainbrigg, Westmorland Antiquary', *Transactions of the Cumberland & Westmorland Antiquarian & Archaeological Society* 3 (2003): 119-125 and Ben Edwards, 'Reginald Bainbrigg, *scholemaister*, and his stones', in N.J. Higham, ed., *Archaeology of the Roman Empire: A tribute to the Life and Works of Professor Barri Jones* (Oxford: Archaeopress, 2001), 25-33.

[163] Camden, *Epistolae*, 47.

[164] For the inscriptions Selden publishes see: MS Smith 1, 56-58 (Camden's own copy of the *Britannia*) and Selden, *Marmora Arundelliana* (London, 1628), 56-58, e.g. 'In Brigantum item agro, ante annos aliquot reperta tria, quae sequuntur, debemus V.Cl. Guilielmi Camdeni...collectaneis quibus Britanniam suam augere destinauerat' (56). Camden's own copy of the *Britannia* was, in 1628, in the possession of Robert Cotton. It is possible that the *Britannia* then went into Selden's own library, because in the catalogue made of Selden's library at his

it arrived at Arundel House, but the work of actually acquiring such stones was left to ambassadors in the Middle-east, such as Thomas Roe.[165]

British antiquaries' approaches to inscriptions were primarily philological. We can see Camden, in his own copy of the *Britannia*, not only noting inscriptions but also emending their Latin when parts of the stones were worn away or illegible.[166] This sort of emendation in the *Britannia* is generally sensitive to the material form in which an inscription is preserved. For instance, when considering an inscription in Cornwall, Camden muses on two possible readings of the inscription, arguing it 'should be read thus, *DONIERT: ROGAVIT PRO ANIMA: unlesse it please you to give this conjecture, that those little pricks after DONIERT are in the reliques of the letter E: and then to read it after this maner, DONIERT EROGAVIT as if he had given and bestowed upon those religious men, that peece of land, for his soule' (192). In the section on Sussex, Camden gives a vivid sense of the mimetic relationship between fragmented stones and the memorials for the dead they bear (again in Philemon Holland's translation): 'But behold the verses them selves, imperfect though they bee, and gaping as I may so say, with the verie yawning joints of the stones'. Inscriptions could be gathered out of secondary sources as well as from primary observation. Camden records that in a copy of William of Malmesbury preserved in Lord Burghley's library, William has carefully transcribed an inscription. This is

---

death, Selden Supra 111, fol.130v, we find: 'Camdeni Britannia Lond: 1607: fol: (wth seurall loose papers of Mr Camdens notes att the Latter ends'. It is unclear why this book never came to the Bodleian, although some of the books listed in Selden Supra 111 may have been taken by his executors. This book then came into the hands of Thomas Smith, then Thomas Hearne, and finally into its present location in the Bodleian.

[165] On Thomas Roe's work collecting books and inscriptions in the Middle-East, see the following letters in Thomas Roe, *Negotiations* (London, 1740): 'To the Archbishop of Canterbury' (618) and 'To the Duke of Buckingham' (619).

[166] Bodl. MS Smith 1, 647.

particularly worth noting, Camden observes, because in the other copies of William of Malmesbury he has consulted this passage is missing.[167] Camden also visited the collections of local antiquaries to collect inscriptions from stones in their possession. In the section on Somersetshire, Camden records visiting one Robert Chambers and recording inscriptions from stones in his garden. Camden also saw that inscriptions could be particularly useful when viewed in the context of literary sources for the history of Roman Britain, especially the Antonine Itinerary.[168] So in the section on Cheshire, we find Camden discussing his struggles to identify the location of the 'Cangi', 'an ancient nation of Britaines', which Camden would have read about in Tacitus' *Annals*, a subject which he has discussed with Lipsius. The most useful piece of evidence Camden has found is a 'monument [which] seemeth to have been erected for a victorie over the Cangi' (611), although even this is not decisive proof of their location. Matters of specific local history can be divined from a combination of classical texts and inscriptions. Inscriptions are invaluable sources for discerning matters of local history.

Inscriptions also bred an interest in the history of British scripts. Henry Spelman and the Danish scholar, Olaus Wormius, were fascinated not by Latin inscriptions, but by runes and the ancient British languages they preserved. In a

---

[167] Camden, *Britain*, 215.

[168] For work on the Antonine Itinerary in the Renaissance see MS Smith 99, fols. 66-89 (Robert Talbot's annotations on the Antonine Itinerary, the earliest in British scholarship). William Burton (not the brother of Robert Burton, but the scholar who would produce an edition of the British sections of the Antonine Itinerary) has written a preface to this work, in which he thanks, among others, Thomas Barlow for his advice on the Antonine Itinerary. Camden had also made use of Talbot's work. He wrote to Thomas James on 6th December 1599 that he had 'lately [...] happened vppon Talbots notes in *Antonini Itinerarium*' (G.A. Wheeler, ed., *Letters Addressed to Thomas James, First Keeper of Bodley's Library* (Oxford: OUP, 1933), 19). For modern scholarship on the subject see A.L.F. Rivet and Kenneth Jackson, 'The British Section of the Antonine Itinerary', *Britannia* 1 (1970): 34-83.

letter Spelman sent to Wormius in 1632, Spelman expressed excitement about the possible connection between runic inscriptions in England and the Danish language. Spelman hoped that Wormius would be moved to publish a book on 'literatura Runica', comparable to the work of Bonaventura Vulcanius.[169] On 11 November 1634, Wormius sent a long letter to Spelman discussing the runes which Camden had illustrated in his *Britannia*, and the help they might possibly provide for our understanding of the origin of language.[170] And in November 1636 Wormius sent Spelman a whole treatise about runes.[171] Two important points emerge from this correspondence. One is that epigraphy did have an archaeological dimension for British scholars in the early seventeenth century: there was a sense of the importance of preserving the context of discovery (i.e. the carved script) as well as simply abstracting the text from its original context. The other is the particular importance of international contacts to British scholars when dealing with problems of northern European history. Because the peoples of Anglo-Saxon and later Britain did not confine themselves to modern national boundaries, their fragmented cultures couldn't be decoded by scholars isolated in their own country. These northern European exchanges would be invaluable in the later seventeenth century, allowing scholars like Charleton and Aubrey to challenge Inigo Jones' theory that Stonehenge was a Roman temple.[172]

---

[169] BM Add. MS 34599, fol.146r. For Vulcanius' work on 'Gothic' language see Vulcanius, ed., *Gothicarum et Langobardicarum rerum scriptores aliquot veteres* (Leiden, 1618).
[170] BM Add. MS 34600, fol.19r.
[171] BM Add. MS 34600, 75r-84v.
[172] See Ingo Herklotz, 'Excavations, Collectors and Scholars in Seventeenth-Century Rome', in Ilaria Bignamini, ed., *Archives and Excavations: Essays on the History of Archaeological Excavations in Rome and Southern Italy from the Renaissance to the Nineteenth Century* (London: The British School at Rome, 2004), 55-88, who concludes that 'modern excavation techniques...did not spring from classical, but rather prehistoric, archaeology, and certainly not from Italy, but from northern Europe' (60). On Aubrey and the Stonehenge debate see William Poole, *John Aubrey and the Advancement of Learning* (Oxford: Bodleian Library, 2010), 174-196.

It is worth also saying a word about numismatics, a very closely related, but still distinct, discipline to epigraphy in the late sixteenth century.[173] John Cunnally has drawn attention to the fact that coins were not always conceived as historical evidence by Renaissance scholars. They acted as images of *viri illustri* from the past, objects either to encourage emulation of great deeds or the rejection of evil ones.[174] Ingo Herklotz has pointed out how innovative it was for Cesare Baronio to use coins as evidence in ecclesiastical history.[175] A great deal of scholarly work on numismatics did not take place through first-hand observation of coins, but through consulting images in the collections of Hubert Goltzius and Adolphus Occo.[176] Selden, for instance, drew on Goltzius' work in the revised version of *Titles of Honor* to illustrate the kinds of diadems worn by the royalty of Macedonia.[177] But in this work we also see Selden making use of the coin collection of Robert Cotton to illustrate the crowns worn by Anglo-Saxon kings.[178] Selden also drew on his own coin collection, as G.J. Toomer points out, from which he illustrates a Jewish coin in *De Iure Naturali*.[179]

---

[173] See the essays collected in M.H. Crawford, C.R. Ligota and J.B. Trapp, eds., *Medals and Coins from Budé to Mommsen* (London: The Warburg Institute, 1990).
[174] John Cunnally, *Images of the Illustrious: Numismatic Presence in the Renaissance* (Princeton, 1999).
[175] Ingo Herklotz, 'Historia Sacra und mittelalterliche Kunst während der zweiten Hälfte des 16. Jahrhunderts in Rom', in *Baronio e l'arte. Atti del convegno internazionale di studi*, eds., Romeo De Maio (Sora: Centro di Studi Sorani "Vincenzo Patriarca", 1985), 21-74.
[176] Hubert Goltzius, *C. Iulius Caesar Sive Historiae Imperatorum Caesarumque Romanorum Ex Antiquis Numismatibus Restitutate Liber Primus* (Bruges, 1563) and Adolphus Occo, *Imperatorum Romanorum Numismata a Pompeio Magno ad Heraclium* (Augsburg, 1601).
[177] John Selden, *Titles of Honor* (London, 1631), 161.
[178] *Titles of Honor* (1631), 175. The 1614 first edition of *Titles* scarcely draws on numismatic evidence at all, and although this evidence is expanded in *Titles* (1631), Selden's research for the edition primarily focussed on documentary history: see his notes for *Titles* (1631) in Lincoln's Inn, Hale MS 11. 'Seldeni Collectanea, precipuè in ordine ad Titulos Honorum'. There is an invaluable guide to the Lincoln's Inn manuscripts: Joseph Hunter, ed., *A Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of the Honourable Society of Lincoln's Inn* (London, 1838). I am grateful to Gerald Toomer's advice on the Lincoln's Inn Selden collections.
[179] See John Selden, *De Iure Naturali et Gentium* (London, 1640), 197. See Toomer, *John Selden*, 36 for this observation.

But it is Camden, more than any other British antiquary, who tries to apply debates in European scholarship to the problems of dealing with British coins. One of the most significant debates in European numismatics was over the purpose of coins: were they used in day-to-day money exchanges, or were they created for special ceremonial occasions?[180] Camden summarizes this debate: 'Whether all these kinds of coine went commonly currant as monie, from one to another and in ordinary trafficke and exchange, or were at the first part, for some speciall use and purpose, is a question debated among the learned' (100). He goes on to conclude that the money was originally coined in order to pay tax to the Roman empire. Camden has various kinds of evidence drawn from Tacitus and elsewhere, but the clinching evidence is the word 'TASCIA' engraved on coins: 'which word among the Britans, betokeneth a Tribute Penye, as Master David Powell, a man most skilfull in the British language hath enformed me: and is derived perhaps of the Latine Taxatio. For, the Britans acknolwedge not X. for their letter' (97).[181] So here we have Camden drawing on the network of British scholars and local expertise to solve problems which have been inspired by his reading in the Latin scholarship of Europe. But it is also significant that there are areas of European scholarship on numismatics that Camden does not venture into. One very important strand of early-modern numismatics, which modern scholars call metrology, is the attempt to discover the value of coins in their original context. Guillaume Budé's famous work, 'the philological masterpiece of the early Cinquecento', his *De Asse*, sparked off this line of thought, and drew

---

[180] Sebastiano Erizzo, *Discorso sopra le medaglie antiche* (Venice, 1571) argues that coins were in fact commemorative medals.
[181] David Powel published the standard work on Welsh history: David Powell, ed., *The Historie of Cambria, now called Wales* (London, 1584).

praise from scholars all over Europe, including in England.[182] But Camden does not venture into these issues: there are limits to a work even of the magnitude and importance of the *Britannia*. But Camden does explicitly situate his work in the context of the international Republic of Letters. He describes a specific kind of coin which he used to feel was only found in Britain: 'peeces of gold, silver, and brasse of sundry fashions, and as different in poise: all of the most part of the one side hollo: some without letters, others with expresse inscriptions of letters' (97). However, he realized this was not an indigenous production when '*Nicolaus Fabricius de Petrisco*, a right young Gentleman of Provance in France, one for such antiquities, and old Medals or peeces of money, passing skilfull and of iudicious insight, verie lately had shewed me the like found in France'.[183] British history needs to be seen in the context of the European-wide history of the Roman empire. Material evidences in Britain both point to peculiar moments in local history -- the Welsh word 'TASCIA' -- and to the ways British history is subsumed within the supra-national history of the Roman Empire.

Networks and Institutions

The first part of this chapter has tried to unpack the new methodologies British antiquaries were making use of. Inevitably, this has involved much discussion of

---

[182] The quotation is Roberto Weiss, *The Renaissance Discovery of Classical Antiquity* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1969), 177. For Leland and More's praise of Budé see James Carley, 'John Leland in Paris: the Evidence of his Poetry', *Studies in Philology* 83 (1986): 1-50.

[183] On Peiresc's work on numismatics see Peter N. Miller, 'Peiresc and the Study of Islamic Coins in the Early Seventeenth Century', Alan G. Stahl, ed., *The Rebirth of Antiquity: Numismatics, Archaeology and Classical Studies in the Culture of the Renaissance*, (=Princeton University Library Chronicle, Winter, 2008), 315-387 and Peter N. Miller, 'The Antiquary's Art of Comparison: Peiresc and Abraxas', in Ralph Häfner, ed., *Philologie und Erkenntnis: Beiträge zu Begriff und Problem frühneuzeitlicher "Philologie"* (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 2001), 57-94.

individuals, and individuals' participation in networks of intellectual exchange (regional and international) or in institutions of learning, like the Universities. Methodology and context cannot be separated out. New scholarly approaches and discoveries were only partly generated in scholars' studies; often they came from comparative intellectual exchanges across national boundaries, of the kind we have seen take place between Wormius and Spelman.[184] Scholars did not work in airless, context-free environments: they required a means of support, a nurturing environment for their scholarship, which in turn shaped the kind of works which scholars produced. So this section does not introduce altogether new considerations. Instead, it looks at similar materials through adjusted lenses, which help to bring different aspects to the fore. Networks of intellectual exchange, and the particular sites and institutions which link together those networks, are now our focus.

(i) Antiquaries in the Republic of Letters

There has been a huge growth in work on the Republic of Letters over the last thirty years.[185] But the troublesome side-effect of this has been a broadening

---

[184] On this topic generally see Anthony Grafton, *Worlds Made by Words: Scholarship and Community in the Modern West* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP, 2009).

[185] See Paul Dibon's important essays collected in his *Regards sur la Hollande Du Siècle D'Or* (Naples: Vivarium, 1990), especially 'La Hollande du XVIIe Siècle et la Communication Intellectuelle', 3-29;'Communication in the Respublica Literaria of the 17th Century', 153-170; 'Communication Épistolaire et Mouvement des Idées au XVIIe siècle', 171-190. Françoise Waquet, 'Qu'est-ce que la République des Lettres? Essai de sémantique historique', *Bibliothèque de l'École des chartes* 147 (1989): 473-502 offers a now classic discussion of the term. The argument is developed at greater length in Hans Bots and Françoise Waquet, *La république des lettres* (Paris: Belin, 1997). See also H. Jaumann, 'Respublica Litteraria/Republic of Letters. Concept and Perspectives of Research', in H. Jaumann, ed., *Die Europäische Gelehrtenrepublik im Zeitalter des Konfessionalismus* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2001), 11-21. On issues of conduct in the later seventeenth- and early eighteenth-century Republic of Letters see Anne Goldgar, *Impolite Learning: Conduct and Community in the Republic of Letters, 1680-1750* (New Haven: Yale UP, 1995). Also on the later seventeenth-century Republic of Letters see Maarten Ultee, 'The Republic of Letters: Learned Correspondence, 1680-1720', *The Seventeenth Century* 2 (1987): 95-

of the term to an extent that it has begun to lose any conceptual purchase on real scholarly networks.[188] Far and away the most important recent contributions to the conceptualization of the Republic of Letters (that I know of) are two essays by Noel Malcolm, one on Hobbes' place in the Republic of Letters and the other on Athanasius Kircher's correspondence.[189] The latter brings particular clarity to the matter. Malcolm argues that there are three facets to the Republic of Letters, which are not always present in correspondence networks characterized as being part of that community. One is that the Republic is characterized by 'multidirectional flows of information', i.e. person A writes to person B, who passes information on to person C, who might then write back to person A, etc. Secondly, the Republic's correspondences were inter-confessional: 'One of the key features of the Republic of Letters was its inter-confessional nature. Protestants and Catholics communicated more or less equally; theological topics were not altogether excluded from debate, but the participants tended to avoid the stamping grounds of controversial theology, discussing shared worries (such as Socinianism) and shared interests (such as new publications in biblical

---

112. Specifically on historians' correspondence see Krzysztof Pomian, 'De la lettre au périodique: la circulation des informations dans les milieux des historiens au XVIIe siècle', *Organon* 10 (1974): 25-43. Very important on medicine and the Republic of Letters, which also includes a discussion of the impact of the Thirty Years War on intellectual exchange, is Ian Maclean, 'The Medical republic of Letters before the Thirty Years War', *Intellectual History Review* 18 (2008): 15-30.

188 Robert Muchembled, ed., *Cultural Exchange in Early Modern Europe*, 4 vols. (Cambridge: CUP, 2006-7) is filled with great examples, but disappointingly does not bring much conceptual clarity to this field.

189 Noel Malcolm, 'Hobbes and the European Republic of Letters', in *Aspects of Hobbes* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2002), 457-54 and Noel Malcolm, ''Private and Public Knowledge: Kircher, Esotericism, and the Republic of Letters', in Paula Findlen, ed., *Athanasius Kircher: The Last Man Who Knew Everything* (New York and London: Routledge, 2004), 297-308. Also valuable on issues of inclusion/exclusion in the Republic of Letters is David Norbrook, 'Women, the Republic of Letters, and the Public Sphere in the Mid-Seventeenth Century', *Criticism* 46 (2004): 223-240, and see in particular his discussion of Malcolm, who 'cautions against anachronism in turning the republic of letters into a Habermasian public sphere. While this caution is appropriate, it can also be argued that the whole modern discourse of "civic humanism" is to a degree anachronistic, born of twentieth-century political concerns, but with that taken into account it has still proved heuristically valuable, quite apart from what might be defended as a utopian dimension' (236).

scholarship)'. Thirdly, if the Republic can be said to have an ideology, Malcolm argues, it rests on 'a distinction between the shared-private world of the scholars and the public world outside them' (301). Limits to freedom of thought might be necessary in the public world, but scholars might also feel they are not needed when corresponding among one another. '[T]he rules of action that applied in the public, political world might have to differ from the ones they themselves adhered to in their personal and intellectual dealings with one another', Malcolm explains, and 'some of the things set aside by them as 'indifferent' (such as customary laws, religious practices, and social conventions) might be necessary components of authority and stability in the public realm'. This analysis offers a powerful framework for thinking about the relationship between English scholars and the Republic of Letters.

To find 'multidirectional flows of information' in British scholar's correspondence with the broader Republic of Letters the obvious place to look is towards English scholars' encounters with Peiresc.[188] Even a scholar like Selden, who had an international reputation and whose works had a rich afterlife in the Republic of Letters, rarely took part in multidirectional knowledge exchanges, except in his correspondence with Peiresc.[189] More typical are his exchanges with the Danish scholar Marcus Meibomius, to whom he provided manuscript materials relating to the history of music; or with Salmasius, with whom his correspondence mainly focussed on the exchange of a manuscript of Vettius

[188] On this subject see the classic article: Linda van Norden, 'Peiresc and the English Scholars', *Huntington Library Quarterly* 12 (1949): 369-389. For a general treatment of Peiresc in the Republic of Letters see Peter N. Miller, *Peiresc's Europe: Learning and Virtue in the Seventeenth Century* (New Haven and London: Yale UP, 2000). On Peiresc's networks in the Mediterranean see Peter N. Miller, 'Peiresc, the Levant and the Mediterranean', in Alastair Hamilton, Maurits H. Van Den Boogert and Bart Westerweel, eds., *The Republic of Letters and the Levant* (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 103-122.

[189] On Selden's correspondence with Peiresc see Toomer, *John Selden*, 823.

Valens.[190] Spelman's correspondence, similarly, is primarily unidirectional, except when the more complex case of Peiresc is introduced. But Camden is a different case. Camden was by far the most well-known English scholar within the Republic of Letters, and the most well-connected, too. When Camden was sick, Thomas Smith commented, it was 'quasi Reip. literariae salus pariter quoque periclitaretur'.[191] Camden's correspondence does involve multidirectional knowledge exchanges and crosses confessional boundaries, and this is not simply a function of the fact he happens to be corresponding with the most sociable savant in Europe.

One strand of his correspondence is particularly telling in this respect, and has received little or no discussion. This strand of his correspondence centres on Franciscus Sweertius, a Dutch scholar and compiler of some of Lipsius' work. The subject is Camden's abiding interest in new philological scholarship on the Antonine Itinerary. In 1606, Camden received from Sweertius the edition of the Antonine Itinerary edited by Andreas Schottus, 'cui universa Antiquariorum natio plurimum debet' (to whom the universal nation of Antiquarians owes a great deal).[192] This was the edition which Schottus had published in 1600, with notes by Hieronymus Surita. Camden goes on to say that he has heard Paulus Merula's *Cosmographiae* had incorporated variant readings on the Antonine Itinerary from a manuscript owned by Marcus Welser.[193]

---

[190] For Selden's letters to Meibomius see Selden Supra 109, fols.280r-291r. Meibomius sent a gift copy of his *Antiquae Musicae Auctores Septem. Graece et Latine* (Amsterdam, 1652) to Selden with the following inscription: 'ILLUSTRI VIRO IOANNI SELDENO OB TRANSMISSOS MSS. MUSICOS HOC GRATI ANIMI TESTIMONIUM PERPETUUM ESSE OPTAT MARC. MEIBOMIUS. AEDIBUS MAJIS, 1652'.
[191] Thomas Smith, 'Vita', xviii: 'it was as if the health of the Republic of Letters was also endangered'.
[192] Andreas Schottus, ed., *Itinerarium Antonini Augusti, et Burdigalense, quorum hoc nunc primum est ed., illud ad diuersos codice emendatum, & H. Suritæ comm. explicatum* (Cologne, 1600).
[193] Paulus Merula, *Paulli...Merulae Cosmographiae generalis libri tres* (Leiden, 1605).

Camden asks Sweertius if he could contact Welser directly for him to ask about this manuscript.[194] So here we have Camden reading a reference in a book and deciding to follow this up by attempting to locate the physical manuscript, and so asking Sweertius to make contact with a third scholar on his behalf. Camden wrote in early 1607 to Merula himself. He explains that the new edition of his *Britannia* is about to go to press ('jam denuo prelum subitura') and so he needs to know about the variant manuscript as a matter of some urgency. It doesn't seem that Merula replied -- or, at least, the reply does not survive and he did not reply quickly enough to be acknowledged in the *Britannia*.

But despite the sense of urgency, Camden's interest in new scholarship on the Antonine Itinerary does not end with the final folio edition of the *Britannia*.[195] In July 1614 he is back in touch with Sweertius. Sweertius sent him an advanced copy of Aubert le Mire's history of the Cistercian order; he also sent Miraeus' greetings to Camden.[196] Sweertius also enclosed a letter from Heribertus Rosweydus, a Jesuit and 'maximus antiquitatis [...] indagator'. Sweertius wrote again on the 22nd October 1614, this time enclosing a book by Heribertus Rosweydus -- his defence of Baronius against Casaubon -- and greeting another Jesuit on Camden's behalf, Andreas Schottus.[197] Camden's work, too, is popular with Jesuits -- or so Sweertius says on 16th March 1616, when he describes his sole copy of Camden's *Annales* being repeatedly borrowed, 'legit & perlegit', by members of the Society of Jesus. Sweertius also tells Camden that

---

[194] Thomas Smith, ed., *Camdeni...Epistolae*, 72.
[195] It seems to me very likely that Camden always contemplated returning to the *Britannia* to publish another revised edition.
[196] Aubertus Miraeus, *Chronicon Cisterciensis Ordinis* (Cologne, 1614). There may well be surviving letters between Miraeus and Camden.
[197] Herbertus Rosweydus, *Lex talionis xii tabularum cardinali Baronio ab I. Casaubono dicta, retaliante H. Ros-weydo* (Antwerp, 1614).

Heribertus Rosweydus has his own manuscript of the Antonine Itinerary, and he has collated it with two others. He includes a short letter from Rosweydus, in which the latter offers to make his collations available to Camden. In exchange, the letter implies, Rosweydus is interested in information about the 'Martyrologium Bedae' and other manuscripts from medieval England.[198] Sweertius forwards these transcripts of variant readings in June 1616 ('Habes in hac charta complicata variantes lectiones a P. Heriberto Roswey transcriptas'). On the 15th March 1616, Andreas Schottus, a Jesuit philologist, contacted Camden directly about the Antonine Itinerary. He claims credit for the survival and publication of Surita's annotations to the Itinerary, which would have perished without his help in publishing them. He also points out that the Aldine edition of the Itinerary is defective: 'folium deprehendi trajectum' (I have noticed a folio is missed out).[199] He also, crucially, mentions he does not know if there are any manuscripts of the Itinerary in the Royal Library in Paris ('Si in Regia sit bibliotheca equidem nescio'). So Camden's interest in manuscripts of the Antonine Itinerary has not only led to complex knowledge exchanges between scholars, but those exchanges have taken place across confessional boundaries.

The crucial next development in Camden's search for Itinerary manuscripts comes as he attempts to follow up on the blank that Schottus had drawn on whether there were any relevant documents in the Paris Royal Library. The librarian there, Pierre Dupuy, wrote to Camden on 4th June 1617 to tell him that there was such an exemplar of the Antonine Itinerary. Dupuy supplied copies of the variant readings 'ex codice Regio pervetusto' at the

---

[198] Thomas Smith, *Camdeni...Epistolae*, 161-162.
[199] This edition is: *Pomponius Mela. Iulius Solinus. Itinerarium Antonini Aug. Vibius Sequester. P. Victor de regionibus urbis Romæ. Dionysius Afer De situ orbis Prisciano interprete* (Venice, 1518).

beginning of September 1617. But Dupuy feels that this manuscript does not offer many significant variants from the printed editions. At this point, the correspondence we are tracing divides into two streams. On the one hand, there is Dupuy's correspondence with Camden, in which he keeps Camden up-to-date on the work of Nicolas Bergier on the Antonine Itinerary and the Peutinger Tables, which would result in the first scholarly history of Roman roads.[200] Dupuy's correspondence is by no means only limited to this topic, but it does continue to feature. In the other stream, the one involving Sweertius, Schottus and so on, the whole topic of the Itinerary drops out. Schottus discusses a wide-range of things with Camden: the family history of the Schotts and their English and Scottish roots, his work on editing Basil and the work that Richard Montague had already undertaken on that Father, and a manuscript in Lincoln College, Oxford, which contains a work called '*De contemptu mundi*, siue *Paupertas*. Pr. *Optatus mihi dies*'.[201] This correspondence illustrates the way a single philological discussion can extend to encompass a wide range of scholars, and the way that discussion can easily morph into something complexly multi-directional. It is also particularly significant that this correspondence takes place with Jesuits, even with Jesuits who were attacking Camden's friend Isaac Casaubon.

How were the letters of scholars from the Republic of Letters themselves conceived? International correspondence within the Republic of Letters was itself seen as a scholarly resource, something the surviving correspondence

---

[200] Nicolas Bergier, *Histoire des grands chemins de l'Empire Romain* (Paris, 1622).
[201] This last is a manuscript he has read about in Thomas James, *Ecloga Oxonio-Cantabrigiensis* (London, 1600), 39, codex 22.

between Camden and Lipsius illustrates very well.[202] One Camden letter and one Lipsius letter attracted particular interest because the subject was such a fraught one among historians. They deal with the subject of the birthplace of Constantine the Great: was he born in Britain? He was actually born in Naissus, now in southern Serbia, but although Camden was wrong to believe Constantine was born in Britain, there were lots of very sophisticated reasons for him to believe he was. This fiercely complex debate arises from difficulties caused by successive emperors with similar or the same name (all variants on 'Constant' or 'Constantine'). Added to this, the sources for late antique history were nowhere near as thoroughly available and well-studied as the sources for earlier Roman history, partly because there was a far smaller book-market for Greek editions of texts, and because parallel texts were complex to be produced and tempted scholars simply to publish a Latin translation.[203] Camden's letter on this subject was published by Thomas Smith, along with Lipsius' response.[204] He was responding to the arguments that Constantine was not born in Britain which Lipsius had made in his *De Admiranda Magnitudine Romana*.

Camden's arguments fall into two broad sections: the first deal with the problem that the ecclesiastical historians Cedrenus and Nicephoros do not agree Constantine was born in Britain; and the second set of arguments, the longer

---

[202] See also Joost Depuydt, '"Vale, Verum Antiquae Historiae Lumen": Antiquarianism in the Correspondence between Justus Lipsius and Abraham Ortelius', in G. Tournoy, J. de Landtsheer and J. Papy, eds., *Iustus Lipsius Europae Lumen et Columen: Proceedings of the International Colloquium Leuven 17-19 September 1997* (Leuven: Leuven UP, 1999), 34-46.
[203] On the Greek book-trade in England see Kirsty Milne, 'The Forgotten Greek Books of Elizabethan England', *Literature Compass* 4:3 (2007): 677-687. The most important English contribution to Byzantine history would possibly have been John Gregory's edition of John of Antioch (Malalas), an historian preserved in a unique MS in Oxford, MS Baroccianus 182. However, Gregory only got as far as completing the notes for this project, which are now Bodl. MS Rawl.D.1083. For more on Gregory see Feingold, 'Oriental Studies', *History of the University of Oxford*, 482-3.
[204] Thomas Smith, ed., *Camdeni...Epistolae*, 64-68.

section, respond to Lipsius' use of the evidence of Julius Firmicus Maternus' *Matheseos*.[205] He begins by agreeing with Lipsius' rejection of Dacia (Nicephorus' identification) as Constantine's birthplace ('ut vanitatis manifestum ipse rejicis'), but he concentates more fire on Cedrenus, who claimed Constantine was born in Bithynia (now modern northern Turkey). Camden goes on to argue that Cedrenus cannot be right that Constantine was born when his father was on the way to fight in Diocletian's first campaign against the Persians, because that would mean he were born around 286, and hence would only have been 20 years old when he became emperor. This would contradict the evidence of Eusebius and Sextus Aurelius Victor, who, Camden argues, are more reliable historians because they lived closer to the times of the events described ('Quo autem quisque tempore antiquior, & rei gestae loco propior, majorem & potiorem fidem mereatur' (64)). The second argument, against Julius Firmicus Maternus' (correct) evidence that Constantine was born in Tarsus has two parts. It was shown in the late nineteenth century that the *Matheseos* was written in the very last year of Constantine's reign, in May 337.[206] However, Camden argued that it was not in fact a source contemporary with Constantine's reign, but was written in the reign of his son, Constans. Camden points out that the work's preface is addressed to Mavortius Lollianus, who was consul in the 19th year of Constans' reign ('ex Fasti manifesto constat'). That is Camden's first argument against Lipsius' use of Firmicus' evidence. The second is that Firmicus is not actually referring to Constantine the Great when he says he was born in Tarsus. He was

---

[205] For Renaissance editions of Byzantine historians see Karl Krumbacher, *Geschichte der Byzantinischen Litteratur von Justinian bis zum Ende des Oströmischen Reiches* (Munich, 1897).
[206] See Theodor Mommsen, 'Firmicus Maternus', *Hermes* 29 (1894): 468-472. This is a satisfying connection between one great modern scholar and a great sixteenth-century scholar.

actually referring to his son Constans. Camden compares the published edition of Firmicus, which he argues is corrupt, with two manuscripts, one 'ex Bibliothecâ Collegii Lincolniensis Oxoniae' and the other belonging to 'Thomae Alani Mathematici Oxoniensis', whose book collection was used by many scholars in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century.[207] Both manuscripts refer to the 'Divi Constantini filius' having been born in Tarsus, i.e. the son of Constantine the Great, in this case Constans. Modern scholarship has shown that although Camden was actually right that the manuscript tradition reads 'Constantini' here, it should be emended on the basis of context to 'Constantii', i.e. so that the 'Constantii filius' refers to Constantine the Great.[208] Camden then goes on to provide further contextual evidence that Constans would make more sense here than Constantine, as well as anticipating an objection from Lipsius that Firmicus does not refer to Constantine the Great as having sons, but instead refers to '*Caesares & Dominos*'. Camden argues that Firmicus actually uses 'erratica nomina' and finds another example where Firmicus does refer to Constantine's sons ('*invictissimi Caesares & Domini, qui posterorum posteris imperent*').

Lipsius' response argues that Firmicus had indeed *published* ('edidisse') his work in the reign of Constans, but had actually written the work a long while before ('scripsisse diu ante'), which is the correct reading of Firmicus' preface to the *Matheseos*. He also points out another of Firmicus' references to '*Dominum atque Imperatorem Constantinum*', as well as arguing that the evidence of the date of Lollianus consulship is both wrong ('Fasti...obscuri aut defecti') and

---

[207] Thomas Allen's library is now largely part of the Digby collection in the Bodleian.
[208] T.D. Barnes, 'Two Senators under Constantine', *The Journal of Roman Studies* 65 (1975): 40-49 offers a useful summary of this issue.

irrelevant anyway, because it merely says he had been '*ordinarium Consulem designatum*'. The death of Constantine in May 337 intervened and prevented Lollianus becoming Emperor, and that is the precise moment at which the book was dedicted to Lollianus. Incidentally, Lipsius was right to reject the idea that Constantine was born in Britain--this actually comes from Geoffrey of Monmouth -- but he too was wrong in his identification of his birthplace, as we sall in a moment. Lipsius' closes his letter with great praise for Camden's erudition otherwise, and says simply he must make his own mind up on this issue ('Sed tui judicii res esto'). Camden does make up his own mind, and continues to disagree with Lipsius. He argues that Constantine was certainly born in Britain, an opinion which he shares 'with that great Historiographer Baronius, the common opinion of all other writers with one consent, beareth witnesse: unlesse it be one or two Greeke authors of late time, and those dissenting one from the other, and a right learned man, grounding upon a corrupt place of Iul. Firmicus' (74). This exchange has all the characteristics of antiquarian correspondence in the Republic of Letters which we have been tracing. Philological arguments, along with manuscript evidence, are exchanged. Scholars feed responses to one another into their published works. British history is analysed using sources whose own complex histories originate in the near east. It is perhaps the very emblematic nature of this correspondence which goes on to make it important to later scholars.

Thomas Smith preserved an interesting letter from James Ussher to the Earl of Bath, Henry Bourgchier, dated May 28th 1638. Bourgchier was a very important go-between for antiquaries, especially for Ussher, bringing news of

developments in antiquarian circles in London to the Irish scholar.[209] On this occasion, Ussher has asked Bourgchier to get him a copy of a letter: 'You were pleas'd on my behalfe to write to Sr. Tho: Cotton for Mr Cambdens Epistle unto Lipsius de patria Constantini. That wch I have beginneth thus. *Ex quo admiranda illa tua, te dignissima, in lucem prodierunt.* and beareth the date 18th Aug. An. 1604. if there be any other besides this, you shou'd do me a great pleasure to impart it unto me'.[210] Ussher certainly did acquire Lipsius' response to Camden too, and copied it in his own hand following the scribal copy of Camden's letter. This manuscript is now part of Ussher's *Collectanea* in the Bodleian Library.[211] Ussher printed these letters as part of his massive work on British history (especially on the origins and response to Pelagianism in Britain), which came out in 1639, *Britannicarum Ecclesiarum Antiquitates* (1639).[212] What seems most telling about this issue is that Ussher knew that (a) Camden was wrong; and (b) the evidence Ussher had himself presented before the letters conclusively solved the debate. Ussher's arguments first of all establish that Tarsus (the place Lipsius believed Constantine to have been born in) was a misreading in several manuscripts for Naisus ('Verum codices manuscripti pro *Tharso* habent hîc *Naisum*', 183). He then draws on Ptolemy and, crucially, on *De Administrando Imperio* by Constantine Porphyrogenitus to locate Naissus, and hence to show where Constantine was born. After he has shown that both Camden and Lipsius were wrong, he prints their correspondence. Rather than being sources of information about scholarship, these letters are included as sources about

[209] See Thomas Smith, ed., *Camdeni Epistolae*, 217-218 for an example of the kind of role Bourgchier played in circulating information between antiquaries.
[210] Bodl. MS Smith 21, page 13.
[211] MS Add.C.296, fol.89r-90v.
[212] The letters are at pages 185-192.

scholars and the history of scholarship. That is an important shift and heralds the developing tendency in the later seventeenth towards memorializing the earlier heroes of the Republic of Letters, often in elegiac terms which suggest the modern Republic has declined since the great days of Scaliger, Casaubon and Selden.[213] Ussher also puts this correspondence into the broader context of the history of scholarship, to show that it is not only British scholars who have believed Constantine was born in Britain. He lists eminent names, of whom the most important was Cesare Baronio, whose arguments Camden had himself cited.[214] Selden's had already intervened in this debate, on the side of Camden, in his 'Illustrations' to Drayton's *Poly-Olbion* (1612).[215] But in his notes on Eutychius, he emphatically endorses Ussher's identification of Naissus as the correct birthplace. He does, however, mention that for other views one can still read the 'dissertationes... eruditas Guilielmi Camdeni & Justi Lipsi'.[216] This debate -- although its answer has been found -- has itself become a part of the history of the Republic of Letters, and so is an object of interest and study in its own right.

(ii) Regional Networks

By the late sixteenth-century, England was crisscrossed by an overlapping network of antiquaries working on particular regions of local history.[217] These

---

[213] See Paul Dibon and Françoise Waquet, *Johannes Fridericus Gronovius: pèlerin de la république des lettres* (Geneva: Droz, 1984), viii.
[214] Ussher, *Ecclesiarum*, 192.
[215] *Poly-Olbion*, 129.
[216] John Selden, ed., *Eutychii Aegyptii, Patriarchae Orthodoxorum Alexandrini* (London, 1642), 184.
[217] For an excellent guide to regional antiquarianism, to which this section is very much indebted, see Jan Broadway, *'No historie so meete': Gentry culture and the development of local history in Elizabethan and early Stuart England* (Manchester: Manchester UP, 2006). Her work is especially strong on the midlands antiquaries.

were networks which centred on particular counties or localities, but tended to extend to connect with other regional centres, and to connect to antiquaries in London too. Connections with previous generations of antiquaries were important too: the study of local history was a cumulative process, and important sources were often collected by one generation but the sources were then destroyed or lost before the next could get access to them. It is worth sketching out here briefly the major centres of antiquarian activity. One group was the West Country antiquaries: Robert Glover (1543/4-1588), Richard Carew (1555-1620), John Hooker (1526-1601), Henry Lyte (1529-1607) and Thomas Lyte (1568?-1638), Sir William Pole (1561-1635), Tristram Risdon (c.1580-1640) and Thomas Westcote (1567-1637).[218] In the north of England there were antiquarian circles in Cumberland and Westmorland, including Reginald Bainbrigg (1545-1613) and John Denton (?1561-1617).[219] William Howard (1563-1640) was a significant collector and patron within this northern region; he was also, like several antiquaries, a Catholic, which influenced the nature of the circles in which he was able to participate.[220] Roger Dodsworth (1585-1654) was at the centre of a circle of Yorkshire antiquaries, which included Richard Gascoigne (1579-1661).[221] Charles Fairfax (1597-1673), a member of the

---

[218] Robert Glover helped Camden with research for the *Britannia.* On Glover's own collections see P. M. Selywn, '"Such speciall bookes of Mr Somersettes as were sould to Mr Secretary": the fate of Robert Glover's collections', in James Carley and Colin Tite, eds., *Books and collectors, 1200–1700: essays presented to Andrew Watson* (London: British Library, 1997), 389-401. For an overview of the West Country circle see J. Youings, 'Some early topographers of Devon and Cornwall', *Topographical Writers in South-west England*, ed. M. Brayshay (1996), 50–61.

[219] J. Wilson, 'The First Historian of Cumberland', *The Scottish Historical Review* 8 (1910-11): 5-21; D.J.W. Mawson, 'Another important copy of John Denton's manuscript', *Transactions of the Cumberland and Westmorland Antiquarian and Archaeological Society* 78 (1978): 97-103.

[220] H.S. Reinmuth, 'Lord William Howard (1563-1640) and his Catholic associations', *Recusant History* 12 (1973): 226-34.

[221] For Dodsworth's copies of Gascoigne's materials see, e.g., Bodl. MSS Dodsworth 117, 124, 127, 135. On Dodsworth's circle more generally see N. Denham-Young and H. Craster, 'Roger Dodsworth and his Circle', *Yorkshire Archaeological Journ*al 32 (1934): 5-32.

powerful parliamentarian family, was based in Yorkshire; he was an important manuscript collector, who left many of his manuscripts to the Bodleian.[222] Kent was a particular centre of historical research, spurred on, perhaps, by the initial success of William Lambarde (1536-1601). He was joined by Sir Edward Dering (1598-1644), Richard Kilburne (1605-1678), John Philipot (c.1589-1645) and William Somner (1598-1669).[223] Norfolk and Suffolk were served by Thomas Browne (1605-1682), William Le Neve (*bap.*1592-1661) and Robert Reyce (1555-1638). Henry Spelman was also from Norfolk and, despite the international reach of his correspondence, wrote a good deal on local history.[224] The interactions between the midlands antiquaries were particularly rich. In Leicestershire, William Burton (1575-1645) was the most important figure, but he had close links with the Warwickshire antiquaries. The Warwickshire circles were both particularly well-developed and have been closely studied by modern historians. William Dugdale (1605-1686) was a titanic figure amongst this group, but crucial to his research were figures like Sir Simon Archer (1581-1662), Kenelm Digby (1603-1665), Henry Ferrers (1550-1663) and Samuel Roper (d.1658).[225] Sir Thomas Shirley's (1590-1654) family history

---

[222] See Bodl. MS Fairfax 28, a twelfth-century manuscript of Geoffrey of Monmouth, which Fairfax owned. There are notes from Selden's annotations to *Poly-Olbion* (pages 18 and 167) on fol.iii. On the Fairfax manuscripts see W.J. Connor, 'The Fairfax archives: a study in dispersal', *Archives* 11:50 (1973): 76-85.

[223] On Dering see C.E. Wright, 'Sir Edward Dering: A Seventeenth-Century Antiquary and his "Saxon" Charters', in Cyril Fox and Bruce Dickens, eds., *The Early Cultures of North-West Europe* (Cambridge: CUP, 1950). For his transcript of the *Textus Roffensis*, a manuscript with ramifications for the history of Kent, see Bodl. MS Top.Kent.e.6.

[224] Especially *The History and Fate of Sacrilege* (London, 1698).

[225] On Dugdale and this circle, see the essays collected in Christopher Dyer and Catherine Richardson, eds., *William Dugdale, Historian, 1605-1686: His Life, his Writings and his County* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2009). On Elizbeth K. Berry, *Henry Ferrers see Henry Ferrers : an early Warwickshire antiquary, 1550-1633* (Oxford: Dugdale Society, 1965).

encompassed a great deal of local midlands history.[226] Cheshire had Daniel King (?1616-?1661), David Rogers (1609-37) and William Smith (c.1550-1618). There were also figures whose research and affiliations centred on London. John Stow (1525-1605) is the obvious example, but important figures like Sir John Borough (d.1643), Scipio Le Squyer (1579-1659) and John Nordern (1548-1625?) were all primarily London figures. So were Camden and Cotton. While Selden spent most of his career in London, he was proud of his Sussex roots and incorporated them into his works.[227] Some antiquaries were less closely associated with their local communities than they were with antiquaries from London. Sampson Erdeswicke (c.1538-1603) is the obvious example here. Well known for his recusancy, Erdeswicke could not take part in the politics of the local community to the same extent other antiquaries did. But he did maintain a correspondence with Camden and was thanked by him in the *Britannia*.[228] As is the case with William Howard, antiquaries were usually tolerant of recusancy.[229] Here we can see the interconfessional logics of the international Republic of Letters being turned inwards to the English regions.

In our discussion of manuscripts we have already mentioned the need for local contacts with gentry and the church when antiquaries were trying to acquire manuscripts. Similarly, regional antiquaries needed the help of men like Cotton (with access to his own library) or Agarde (with access to the records) to

---

[226] Richard Cust, 'Catholicism, Antiquarianism, and Gentry Honour: The Writings of Sir Thomas Shirley', *Midland History* 23 (1998): 46-47, 40-70.
[227] In the chapter on Knighthood in *Titles of Honor* (1614), Selden is discussing the evidence from Sussex records and slips in a mention of 'Selkeden (the hamlet which now is *Selden*, by Eclesdon)' (321).
[228] Camden, *Britannia*, 439.
[229] Although Cotton seems to have ignored the letters he received from the Catholic exile, antiquary and intelligencer, Richard Verstegan. See VERSTEGAN CORRESPONDENCE. On Verstegan generally see Paul Arblaster. *Antwerp & the World: Richard Verstegan and the International Culture of Catholic Reformation* (Leiden: Leuven University Press, 2004).

help gain access to manuscripts in London. When Selden was working on *Historie of Tithes*, Cotton underlined relevant passages in his manuscripts to help Selden.[230] His correspondence testifies that Cotton provided similar services to antiquaries around the country.[231] But perhaps most important contacts of all for local antiquaries were with their local officials, the feodaries. The feodaries were appointed in each county under the Court of Wards. As Philip Styles explains, it was 'their duty to give evidence of the King at inquisitions post mortem, to survey and rate lands found to be held by a ward of the crown to assign out of them the widow's dower and to act as receiver of rents'. The feodaries therefore often possessed a 'book of tenures' -- transcripts of records of land ownership -- which were invaluable to antiquaries. Two of the feodaries in Warwickshire, Humphrey Colles of Hampton-in-Arden and Edward Chamberlayne of Astley Castle were related to Simon Archer, who was in turn a key correspondent and conduit of information to William Dugdale.[232] For Dugdale, his connection with Sir Simon Archer provided his *entrée* into the socially more exclusive world of gentry scholars, and it was through Archer that Dugdale was introduced to Spelman, and hence to Dodsworth. So for an aspiring scholar like Dugdale, links to those higher up on the social scale could be invaluable.

There was a particularly heavy focus on genealogy in many of the county histories produced in the regional circles we have been describing -- more even than in Camden's *Britannia*, whose claims about genealogical history met with

---

[230] See Montague, *Diatribae*, 21: Cotton 'did marke out with blacke leade in his Manuscripts, all places concerning Tithes, with one marke, as other passages with another'.
[231] e.g. Sir Simon Archer wrote to Cotton on 27th April 1629 asking ('Though Vnknowne vnto you') for a 'Coppie of Roules bookes concerning the antiquities of Warwickshiere' (Cotton Julius C.iii, fol.4r).
[232] See Philip Styles, *West Midlands*, 16 and Jan Broadway, *'No Historie So Meete'*, 119.

derision and furious hostility.[233] This was understandable in a primarily gentry community, focussed on issues of inheritance and the legitimacy of family land claims.[234] But it also perhaps meant that the audience for county histories was primarily local as well. It is significant that, after Richard Carew's *Survey of Cornwall*, only one county history was published before the Civil War. This was William Burton's *Description of Leicestershire* (1622), and part of the reason for publication may have been that it told the history of the Duke of Buckingham's estates, who was then the most powerful nobleman in England.[235] In the early-seventeenth century, regional chorographies were primarily a manuscript genre. These manuscript histories did circulate to other antiquaries: on the 3rd June 1636, Dugdale wrote to Sir Simon Archer saying he expected soon to receive 'the booke of Staffordshire, pen'd by Mr. Erdswicke'.[236]

Regional chorographies share many structural features in common, so let us take one example to illustrate their general features. This work is Robert Reyce's *Breviary of Suffolk*, which he completed in 1618, and which survives in a manuscript fair-copy, possibly designed as a gift for Robert Reyce's patron, Sir Robert Crane.[237] The longer title of Reyce's work summarizes its contents: 'a plaine and familier description of the Country, the fruits, the buildings, the people and inhabitants, the customes, the division politicall, and ecclesiasticall,

---

[233] Ralph Brooke, *A Discouerie of diuers errors published in print in the much commended Britannia* (n.p., 1594).
[234] On the importance of antiquarianism to settling land disputes in the Cotton family see Roger B. Manning, 'Antiquarianism and the Seigneurial Reaction: Sir Robert and Sir Thomas Cotton and their Tenants', *Historical Research* 63 (1990): 277-288.
[235] And even Burton never managed to publish the revised version. For his correspondence relating to this edition see BM Cotton MS Julius C.iii, fol.51r and BM MS Harley 374, fol.105r.
[236] William Dugdale, *The Life, Diary and Correspondence of Sir William Dugdale*, ed. William Hamper (London, 1827), 155.
[237] BM Harley MS 3873. For biographical material on Reyce see C.G. Harlow, 'Robert Reyce of Preston, 1555-1638', *Proceedings of the Suffolk Institute of Archaeology* 32 (1973): 43-70.

houses of Religion, with all their severall valuations, the chiefest men of learning as of Divines, privy Councellors, Martiall men, and Navigators of former times, with severall of the things of memorable note, and observation within this County of Suffolk' (11r). Most chorographical histories begin by saying something about the etymology of the county's name, and Reyce gestures towards this convention while eschewing it. '[I]t were vanity well reproveable to bee curious in Etimologizing', he argues, and concludes simply that 'lett it therefore suffice to vnderstand, that so soon as ever the inhabitants of this land, were reduced into any regular distinction, this County received the name of Suffolk, and such as here dwelled were by the Saxons (then Lords over all) termed the people in the south, as scituated south-ward from the County of Norfolk, since which time it hath evermore reteyned that name' (12r). Reyce then moves on to describing the county's geography, its climate, and its borders with other counties, and its rivers (a focus of Camden's in his *Britannia*).[238] But the county has experienced great 'Discommodities' by being located at a 'far distance from their court', and so lawlessness and exploitation by petty officials were rife, at least until the 1590s (15r). He praises the learning of the ministry, and then describes the economic lifeblood of the county: 'the excellent commoditie of clothing', due to the availability of high-quality wool (16r). The climate of the country and its natural resources (including livestock) are described in detail, and Reyce laments the lack of any natural mineral resources (17r). Reyce's treatise turns from economic and geographical matters to describe the local nobility and the roles of the gentry in local government. The ecclesiastical administration is described. And detailed accounts are offered of

[238] Harley MS 3873, 12r.

various famous people from the region ('the learned men', 'the States men', 'the Martiall men'). Physical monuments in churches are described. The history concludes with long genealogies of important local families.

The important difference between a work like Reyce's and a work like the *Britannia*, as mentioned at the outset of this chapter, is that Reyce's chorography does not try to participate in the debates of Latin scholarship in the Republic of Letters. To mash together Reyce's and Camden's work under the heading of 'chorography', despite the fact they have much in common, is ultimately confusing. Camden's work acted as a central point in this complex and regionally dispersed network, and Camden himself became a locus for British antiquarian work. His correspondence with antiquaries around the country attests to this. As has recently been well-analysed by Angus Vine, Camden incorporated information into the successive revisions of the *Britannia* that had been sent to him by friends such as Francis Godwin, Bishop of Llandaff.[239] Another example here could be James Ussher's long letter to Camden. Ussher had sent Camden a long letter on the 30th October 1606, in which he provided a great deal of material for Camden on Irish history. The central section of the letter, written in Latin by Ussher, is incorporated virtually verbatim into the 1607 *Britannia*.[240] Camden adds one or two quotations -- a reference from William of Malmesbury to Ireland's fame and a sentence on Alexander Bicknor's attempt to establish a University -- but the bulk of this section is Ussher's work. Camden acknowledges this at the section's conclusion: 'Thus much of *Dublin*, for the most part of which I

---

[239] Vine, *In Defiance of Time*, 85-99.
[240] As noted in Rudolf B. Gottfried, 'The Early Development of the Section on Ireland in Camden's *Britannia*', *English Literary History* 10:2 (1943): 117-130, 126-127. The sections of Ussher's letter incorporated by Camden are printed in Thomas Smith, *Camdeni...Epistolae* (London, 1691), 80-82. Compare Camden, *Britannia* (1607), 751-752.

acknowledge my selfe beholden unto the diligence and learning of Iames *Vsher* Chancellor of S. Patrickes Church, whose variety of knowledge and judgement, are far above his yeeres' (93-94). By 1607, the *Britannia* had become the collaborative record of local antiquarian research across Britain and Ireland.

There have been attempts to link local chorographies to new developments in Baconian science, natural history, and the observation of facts.[241] This seems to me an anachronistic back-projection from the natural histories of Robert Plot in the later seventeenth-century, which surely owe a great deal to the earlier chorographic tradition, but have been shaped by very different Baconian and Royal Society influences.[242] Rather, as should be apparent from the overall thrust of the present argument, such histories seem to me to be part of currents of humanist scholarship that can be traced back to Italy in the fifteenth century.[243] There is occasionally an impulse in works of antiquarianism to set the history of Britain into broader geological time, not in the philological way in which Camden does this (by tracing the etymology of Gomer), but in terms of the physical evidence from local geography. The clearest example of this is in the work of George Owen of Henllys, the Welsh geologist-antiquary who wrote both a description of Pembrokeshire and a treatise on local marl deposits. In his *Description*, observation of the composition of the soil provides opportunity to contextualize Pembrokeshire within the history of the world.

---

[241] Barbara J. Shapiro, *A Culture of Fact: England, 1550-1720* (Ithaca and London: Cornell UP, 2000). In chorography Shapiro sees a new focus on evidence: 'Within its mixture of civil and natural history, chorography became an important vehicle through which the legally derived concepts of witnessing and evaluation of testimony were transmitted from human events and actions to natural phenomena, natural events, and experiment' (66). See instead the much more thoughtful and subtle account in Stan A.E. Mendyk, *'Speculum Britanniae': Regional Study, Antiquarianism, and Science in Britain to 1700* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1989).
[242] Michael Hunter, *John Aubrey and the realm of learning* (London: Duckworth, 1975).
[243] Paula Findlen, *Possessing Nature: Museums, Collecting, and Scientific Culture in Early Modern Italy* (Berkeley and London: University of California Press, 1994).

'Another matter I will note here as a strange and rare thing', Owen begins, 'that is shells of fishes, as oyster shells, mussel shells, cockles, limpets and other shells of sea fish found digging of marl, and this upon high hills where the marl is found, three or four miles from the sea, and this twenty foot deep under the earth, so that of necessity these shells must have remained there since the flood of Noah, being now 3909 years since'. Owen's thinking about fossils here can be traced back to Eusebius; it is very different from the kind of detailed collection, classification and observation of fossils carried out by Robert Hooke in the later seventeenth century.[244] This is the same impulse behind Camden's discussion of the origin of Britain's inhabitants, but approached through physical rather than philological evidence. Geological observations could also be drawn from philological ones in the sixteenth-century: John Twyne argues that the word 'Britain' is derived from Welsh 'Brit', meaning 'broken off', and hence deduces that Britain was originally connected to mainland Europe.[245] George Owen goes on to note that his observations of the marl 'confirms the opinion of the common people that the marl is the fatness and clammy substance of the earth', formed by 'the beating and washing of the flood'.[246] Owen is able to contextualize the observations of the 'common people' within a Biblical historical framework, but

---

[244] On Renaissance geology see: Paolo Rossi, *The Dark Abyss of Time: The History of the Earth & the History of Nations from Hooke to Vico* (Chicago, 1984); Clarence J. Glacken, *Traces on the Rhodian Shore: Nature and Culture in Western Thought from Ancient Times to the End of the Eighteenth Century* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967). On later seventeenth century developments see: Rhoda Rappaport, *When Geologists Were Historians, 1665-1750* (Cornell, 1997) and William Poole, *The World Makers* (Oxford: Peter Lang, 2009).

[245] John Twyne, *De Rebus Albionicis* (London, 1590): 'Vox enim Brit, sicut ego accepi a veteris Britannicae linguae gnaris, non solum quod colore differt, sed etiam idem fere quod Guit, id est, locali interstitio separatum significant' (B5r). Lambarde's annotated copy of *De Rebus* has recently been acquired by the Beinecke Library in Yale from the private library of James Stevens Cox, and is now call number Osborn pa65. I am extremely grateful to William Poole for pointing out the existence of this fascinating book to me.

[246] George Owen of Henllys, *The Description of Pembrokeshire*, ed. Dillwyn Miles (Dyfed: Gomer Press, 1994), 191-2.

the observation itself is not some evidence of a new scientific empiricism, but is continuous with the many other kinds of local observations, drawn from folk-tradition, to be found in regional chorographies.[247]

Ingo Herklotz has observed, in one of his many profound discussions of antiquarianism, that a category of evidence was beginning to emerge, particularly in classical history, of 'living witnesses' to the past, peoples who themselves preserve in fossilized form the primitive livelihoods and customs of the past.[248] This kind of evidence is rarely found in chorographical history writing about England, but it is made use of when writing about Ireland. Walter Raleigh's *History of the World* includes a good example of this use of living witness. Ralegh's *History* is really not a critical, philological or antiquarian history; it is primarily a synthesis of secondary materials to create a world chronology in the vernacular, something which had never been done in modern times.[249] But Ralegh was connected to circles of antiquaries, and he was certainly not ignorant of their work.[250] Ralegh is describing the kinds of boats used in the ancient world (part of a wider discussion of Noah's Ark). And he observes that 'in the time of the *Romans*, the *Brittans* had a kinde of Boat (with which they crost the Seas) made of small twigs, and couered ouer with leather: of which

---

[247] Keith Thomas, *The Perception of the Past in Early Modern England* (London: University of London, 1983).

[248] 'the "living survival" of the archaeological past, that is, rites and customs of the so-called Barbarian peoples outside the boundaries of European civilization' (Ingo Herklotz, 'The Academia Basiliana. Greek Philology, Ecclesiastical History and the Union of the Churches in Barberini Rome', in Lorenza Mochi Onori, Sebastian Schütze, Francesca Solinas, eds., *I Barberini e la Cultura Europea del Seicento: Atti del convegno internazionale Palazzo Barberini alle Quattro Fontane, 7-11 dicembre 2004* (Roma: De Luca Editori D'Arte, 2007), 147-54, 150.

[249] The pitiful work on Ralegh's *History of the World* does not merit summary. However, W. Oakeshott, 'Sir Walter Ralegh's library', *The Library*, 23 (1968): 285–32 is suggestive for future research.

[250] Although the sources which suggest Ralegh was a member of the Society of Antiquaries are eighteenth-century in origin and almost certainly unreliable, Linda van Norden points out that Ralegh was a member of similar circles to the antiquaries: see her discussion of Gough's list of the members of the College of Antiquaries, in van Norden, 'The Elizabethan College', 220ff.

kinde I haue seene at the *Dingle* in *Ireland*, and elsewhere'.[251] This encodes an extraordinary conception of historical fossilization: the idea that the present customs of the Irish date back to those of the most ancient inhabitants of Britain. It is not an accident that Ralegh is here drawing on his experience in Ireland, which was felt to have far more in common with primitive early civilizations than the rest of Britain. 'Living witness' is itself a locally specific form of evidence.

(iii) Institutions and Antiquarianism

This chapter has emphasized throughout that antiquarian scholarship was not created in a vacuum. Nurturing environments were needed for scholars, from their first education onwards. The freedom to pursue scholarship required some sort of steady income. We have already encountered many of the environments in which scholarship was fostered, especially in the earlier discussion of antiquaries' use of libraries and manuscripts. This section will offer a more systematic and synthetic treatment. We will begin with the Universities, or more specifically Oxford University. This section cannot but draw extensively on the extraordinary researches of Mordechai Feingold into the study of the Humanities, Sciences and Oriental Languages at Oxford during the seventeenth-century.[252] It would be hard to do the same thing for Cambridge -- especially in the absence of a comparable Anthony Wood figure for that

[251] Walter Ralegh, *History of the World* (London, 1614), 134-135.
[252] See Mordechai Feingold, 'The Humanities, 'The Mathematical Sciences and New Philosophies' and 'Oriental Studies', in T.H. Aston, ed., *The History of the University of Oxford: Volume IV: The Seventeenth Century*, ed., Nicholas Tyacke (Oxford: OUP, 1984-; 8 vols.), 211-357, 359-448, 449-503.

university -- although such a project would be enormously desirable.[253] What we do have for Cambridge, but not for Oxford, is Elisabeth Leedham-Green's edition of the book-lists contained in probate inventories of students and scholars at Cambridge.[254] These lists give an invaluable insight into what was being read in the late sixteenth-century. This section will also consider the Inns of Court as a scholarly environment, especially focussing on the case of John Selden. Many scholars took holy orders or were patronized by high-ranking members of the clergy, so it is important to think about the relationship between the church and scholarship. Finally, this section will touch on the collaborative societies which were specifically formed by antiquaries, and try to put those societies in a broader intellectual context.

Antiquarian and scholarly religious history were not part of the undergraduate studies at Oxford. This has often led to the further conclusion, as Feingold points out, that the universities were hostile to new forms of historical thinking.[255] Feingold describes that the undergraduate emphasis was on the reading of classical historians, and the *ars historica* genre could be used as a guide for this sort of reading. Even the Camden professorship of history was not designed as a research professorship in the modern sense. The early Oxford professorships -- the Savilian Professorships in Astronomy and Geometry, as well as the Camden Professorship -- were designed to offer extra teaching to undergraduates in subject areas where college teaching might not be

---

[253] Work on the history of Cambridge has tended to focus on the survival of traditional Aristotelianism, e.g. Lisa Jardine, 'The Place of Dialectic Teaching in Sixteenth-Century Cambridge', *Studies in the Renaissance* 21 (1974): 31-62; W. Costello, *The Scholastic Curriculum at Early Seventeenth-Century Cambridge* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP, 1958).
[254] Elisabeth Leedham-Green, *Books in Cambridge Inventories: Book-Lists from Vice-Chancellor's Court Probate Inventories in the Tudor and Stuart Periods*, 2 vols. (Cambridge: CUP, 1986).
[255] Feingold, 'The Humanities', 327-329.

sufficient.[256] This is why Degory Wheare's lectures focussed on Florus, an epitomator of Roman history: epitomes were suggested reading for undergraduates.[257] When the university was debating about the subject on which the lectures should focus, Camden was quite explicit that they should be 'most useful and profitable for the younger students'.[258] And Fulke Greville's lectureship was explicitly designed for lectures in civil and ecclesiastical history which would not be given by a 'critical antiquary'.[259] The furore over Isaac Dorislaus' lectures was largely a matter of Dorislaus' lack of understanding of the differences between academic cultures in the Netherlands and Cambridge, added to problems of factional division in Cambridge between Arminians and Calvinists.[260] But Greville was far from hostile to antiquarianism: he got Camden

---

[256] Mordechai Feingold, 'Patrons and Professors: The Origins and Motives for the Endowments of University Chairs – in Particular the Laudian Professorship of Arabic', in G.A. Russell, ed., *The 'Arabick' Interest of the Natural Philosophers in Seventeenth-Century England* (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 109-127.

[257] Wheare's focus on Florus has drawn hostile comments, e.g. H. Stuart Jones, 'The Foundation and History of the Camden Chair', *Oxoniensia* 8-9 (1943-44): 169-192, 177: 'it is doubtful whether he was well equipped for the post to which Camden had appointed him'. But it seems likely that Camden was very happy with Wheare's performance, as Kevin Sharpe concludes in his excellent overview of this lectureship: 'the inaugural lectures did not disappoint Camden. Camden's confirmation of Wheare's appointment, inserted in the convocation register, refers to Wheare as recommended by letters of scholarly men "and afterwards by experience and dissertations on history now completely observed by myself"' (Kevin Sharpe, 'The Foundation of the Chairs of History at Oxford and Cambridge: An Episode in Jacobean Politics', *History of Universities* 2 (1982): 127-52, 133).

[258] MS Bodl. 241, unpaginated.

[259] For documents relating to Greville's lectureship see Ronald Mellor, 'Tacitus, Academic Politics, and Regicide in the Reign of Charles I: The Tragedy of Dr. Isaac Dorislaus', *International Journal of the Classical Tradition* 11:2 (2004): 153-93 and Norman Farmer, 'Fulke Greville and Sir John Coke: An Exchange of Letters on a History Lecture and Certain Latin Verses of Sir Philip Sidney', *Huntington Library Quarterly* 33 (1970): 217-236.

[260] P. Alessandra Maccioni and Marco Mostert, 'Isaac Dorislaus (1595-1649): The Career of a Dutch Scholar in England'. *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society* 8 (1984): 419-70 stays close to the sources, but tends to assume that Dorislaus' lectures were much more 'radical' than they seem to have been. Dorislaus' lectures were vigorously defended by Samuel Ward and, despite Margo Todd's claim that Ward was 'difficult to place...along the political spectrum' it seems he was no friend to Parliamentarians in the early 1640s (see Margo Todd, 'Samuel Ward', *ODNB*).

his post as Clarenceux at the Herald's Office in 1597.[261] However, there is no reason whatsoever to conclude from this undergraduate programme of education that the universities were hostile to antiquarianism. Far from it. Because antiquarianism was such a fundamentally philological enterprise, the study of languages and grammar were as crucial preparation for antiquarian scholarship as the study of history. This connection between philology and history is apparent in the candidates to succeed Brian Twyne for the Camden professorship, who included John Gregory, the distinguished Hebraist and commentator on Scripture, and Gerard Langbaine, whose wide interest in manuscripts encompassed Greek and Anglo-Saxon learning.[262] Many of the leading antiquaries in the sixteenth- and seventeenth-centuries studied at Oxford. Robert Talbot, whose work on the Antonine Itineraries was of great importance to later scholars, was a Fellow of New College for five years from 1523.[263] Humphrey Lhuyd, the Welsh antiquary and correspondent of Abraham Ortelius, stayed at Brasenose long enough to take his Master of Arts degree (I.129). Laurence Nowell, one of the first scholars of Anglo-Saxon scholar, studied at both Oxford and Cambridge (I.146). Thomas Stapleton, the translator of Bede and Catholic controversialist, began his career studying with the antiquary John Twyne at the free grammar school in Canterbury, before becoming a fellow of New College from 1544 (I.253). Despite his primarily local affiliations and the local reach of his work, Sampson Erdeswicke studied as a

---

[261] See Thomas Smith, 'Vita', xx. Camden in turn dedicated his edition of various medieval historians to Greville: William Camden, ed., *Anglica, normannica, hibernica, cambrica, a veteribus scripta* (Frankfurt, 1603).
[262] Feingold, 'The Humanities', 347-348.
[263] Anthony Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses*, I.87. The citations that follow in this paragraph are from the same work, unless otherwise stated.

Gentleman Commoner at Brasenose in 1553-1554, where, as Wood says, 'he laid the foundation of some learning that advanced him to greater in future times' (I.275). Richard Knolles, who not only wrote an immensely popular history of Turkey, but also translated the whole of Camden's *Britannia*, was elected a Fellow of Lincoln College (I.310).[264] William Camden attended several Oxford Colleges: he started off at Magdalen, transferred to Broadgates Hall, and took his degree at Christ Church (I.408-409). When he attended the funeral of Thomas Bodley in 1613 the degree of Master of Arts was offered to him -- presumably in recognition for his extraordinary scholarship (I.410).[265] While at Oxford, Camden also made an antiquarian acquaintance of some importance, with Richard Carew, the Cornish antiquary. Both studied at Broadgates Hall and would go on to be members of the Society of Antiquaries. He also corresponded during the 1580s and 1590s with many of the most distinguished scholars in Oxford -- the brothers Henry and Thomas Savile, and Henry Cuffe, the philologist who wrote a commendatory poem for the *Britannia*.[266] Around the time of the publication of the final folio edition of the *Britannia*, Camden was corresponding with a young fellow of Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge, who had antiquarian interests.[267] Thirty five of the fellows of the Society of Antiquaries had attended Oxford and Cambridge.[268] This list could go on. But suffice it to say that an antiquary like John Stow, who never studied at one of the universities,

---

[264] Knolles' translation remained in manuscript, and can now be found at Bodl. MS Ashmole 849. On its title-page one Richard Simon has noted that the manuscript was 'found <in> [Camden's] owne library lockt in a cupboard as a treasuer he much esteemed'.
[265] See Thomas Smith, 'Vita', vii.
[266] On the early travels of Henry and Thomas Savile see Mark L. Sosower, 'Greek Manuscripts Acquired by Henry and Thomas Savile in Padua', *Bodleian Library Record* 19 (2006): 157-184.
[267] Thomas Smith, ed., *Camdeni...Epistolae*, 110-111, 136.
[268] Linda van Norden, 'The Elizabethan College of Antiquaries' (Ph.D. thesis, University of California at Los Angeles, 1946), 269.

was the exception rather than the rule.[269] Oxford was a nurturing environment for antiquaries.

It was also vital for their research. We have already touched above on the growing importance of the Bodleian and College Library manuscript collections to Spelman and Selden. These collections were put to use by other antiquaries too. A central point of correspondence here was Thomas James, whose correspondence shows he consulted collections for Camden. Camden thanks him effusively in the *Britannia* for copying Alexander Elsebiensis for him, a 'rare Author and hard to be found; out of whom Thomas James of Oxford (a learned man and a true lover of bookes who wholy addicted to learning, and now laboriously searching the Libraries of England, to the publicke good purposeth that (God blesse his labour which will be to the great benefit of all Students) hath copied out very many notes for me' (693).[270] Through his visionary and reforming Chancellorship of the University, William Laud also tried to cultivate resources for the study of antiquities. His manuscript bequests are famous for their Greek and Oriental contents, but he also donated manuscripts relating to British history. His first gift of manuscripts contained 46 English books, and his third bequest includes 12 English and Anglo-Saxon manuscripts. His second bequest is particularly interesting for his donation of a large collection of coins to

---

[269] For Stow see the essays in Ian Anders Gadd and Alexandra Gillespie, *John Stow (1525-1605) and the making of the English past: studies in Early Modern Culture and the History of the Book* (London: British Library, 2004).

[270] On 6th December 1599, Camden asked James to look into manuscripts of the 'Exameron Angliae and notabilia Britsoliae and Worcester, if there be any especiall observations, as also in the historicall Epitome of Alexander Elsebiensis' (G.W. Wheeler, ed., *Letters addressed to Thomas James, first Keeper of Bodley's Library* (Oxford: OUP, 1933), 19). And on 22nd January 1619 Camden wrote to James asking him to copy a manuscript of Manilius for Johannes Caspar Gevartius in Paris (20). Wheeler's edition is inadequate because it prints only vernacular letters. Many more James letters are preserved in Bodl. MS Ballard 44. For letters between Bodley and James see G.W. Wheeler, ed., *Letters of Sir Thomas Bodley to Thomas James, first Keeper of the Bodleian Library* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1926).

the University. This large coin collection is divided into several parts, and the fifth section is made up of coins which illustrate the whole of British history, 'sub Romanis, Saxonibus, Danis, Normannis, sub heptarchia et monarchia a Julio Caesare insulam hanc invadente,' right up to the present day and the rule of 'pientissimum et justissimum principem, Carolum ejus nominis primum, nunc regum pacatissime moderantem'. Laud not only donates the coins, but justifies their usefulness to historians: 'per ea difficiliora quaedam historicorum loca melius intelligere, et quandoque de historiarum veritate etiam in rebus cognitu necessariis judicare possitis'.[271] Laud also arranged for the donation of Kenelm Digby's collection to the Bodleian. Digby's collection included manuscripts and books belonging to Thomas Allen, who himself cultivated the work of antiquarians.[272] The evidence of Cambridge book-lists also shows that antiquarian works were widely owned. Andrew Perne's substantial library contained Bale's *Scriptoribus illustrium maioris Brytanniae catalogus*, Guillaume Bude's *De Asse* (on numismatics), John Caius' work on the history of Cambridge (*De antiquitate Cantabrigiae*), Camden's *Britannia* (one of the octavo editions), David Powell's standard treatment of Welsh history (*The historie of Cambria, now called Wales*) and William Lambarde's *A Perambulation of Kent*. John Nidd, who was the librarian at Trinity College from 1642 to 1645, and a fellow from 1647 to his death in 1659, had amassed a library with strong medical collections. But Nidd also owned Lambarde's *Perambulation*, Alexander Neville's historical

---

[271] William Laud, 'An Historical Account of All Material Transactions Relating to the University of Oxford From Arch-Bishop's Laud's Being Elected Chancellor to the Resignation of that Office', in W. Scott and J. Bliss, eds., *The Works of the Right Reverend Father in God William Laud*, 7 vols. (Oxford, 1847-60), V.112, V.225,V.137 and V.136.

[272] R.A. Beddard, 'Thomas Allen and John Selden and the 1616 edition of Fortescue's *De Laudibus Legum Angliae*', *Book Collector* 53 (2004): 533-541.

poem, *De furoribus Norfolciensium Ketto duce* (1575) and an atlas by John Speed.[273] Wheelock, possibly slightly obsequiously, describes the antiquarianism-mania that was gripping Cambridge in 1640: 'mr Camden yor councels, & my Lord of Armachs booke are now the only bookes here studied'.[274] Oxford and Cambridge were far from hostile to antiquarian research.

The Inns of Court were a natural destination after study at one of the Universities.[275] The Inns have been seen in twentieth century scholarship as one of the centres and driving forces behind antiquarianism in the late sixteenth- and early seventeenth-centuries.[276] Linda van Norden summarized the preponderance of lawyers among antiquaries, especially among the members of the Society of Antiquaries: 'Broughton, Doderidge, Ley, Patten, and Tate became judges. Davies, Fleetwood, Hakewill, Spelman, Whitelocke put their legal education at the service of crown and country. Bourgchier, Broughton, Davies, Doderidge, Fleetwood, Hakewill, Holland, Lambarde, Ley, Savile, Tate, and Whitelocke practiced law as a profession'.[277] There are several obvious reasons for this association between legal study at the Inns of Court and antiquarianism. One is that a knowledge of legal records was essential for the pursuit of antiquarian scholarship, and the Inns were the best environment to cultivate an acquaintance with them.[278] John Baker has argued that the Inns were a

---

[273] For Perne and Nidd's libraries and biographies see Elisabeth Leedham-Green, *Books in Cambridge Inventories*.
[274] The letter is dated 31 March 1640 and can be found at BL Add. MS 34601, fol.4r.
[275] The best introduction to the Inns of Court is Robert Megarry, *Inns Ancient and Modern: A Topographical and Historical Introduction to the Inns of Court, Inns of Chancery, and Serjeants' Inns* (London: Selden Society, 1972).
[276] The classic account remains J.G.A. Pocock, *The Ancient Constitution and the Feudal Law: a Study of English Historical Thought in the Seventeenth Century* (Cambridge: CUP, 1957).
[277] Linda van Norden, 'Elizabethan College of Antiquaries', 281-2.
[278] For an excellent early twentieth-century assessment of Selden's work on legal history see Harold Dexter Hazeltine, 'Selden as legal historian: A Comment in Criticism and Appreciation',

repository of oral tradition, a place in which students could begin to understand their way around the Year Books by having a previous generation's knowledge delivered to them. The Inns, Baker argues, 'were passing on a largely oral systematic tradition which breathed sense and order into the otherwise almost impenetrable obliqueness of oral pleading. Every legal historian who has tried to understand medieval law from the year books alone will know how essential it must have been to attend the course in person'.[279] The Inns were also as much a meeting place and an environment in which students could pursue their own studies as they were institutes of legal education. William Lambarde, for instance, was able to receive tutoring in Anglo-Saxon while at Lincoln's Inn.[280] When Selden arrived at the Inner Temple in 1604, the Inns were very much the intellectual centre of London, and most likely gave Selden the opportunity to meet Robert Cotton and William Camden.[281] Selden's preface to the *Historie of Tithes* (1618) -- written *after* he had already begun to be attacked for the book's contents -- defended the association between 'philology' and the Inns of Court.[282] '[W]hat hath a *Common Lawyer* to do (so they murmur) with writing of Tithes', Selden says, and answers that 'I would their discretions also would designe out

---

Festschrift Heinrich Brunner zum Siebzigsten Geburtstag, dargetracht von Sehülern and Verehrem (Weimar, 1910), 579-630.

[279] John Baker, 'The Third University of England', in *The Common Law Tradition: Lawyers, Books and the Law* (London and Rio Grande: The Hambledon Press, 2000), 3-28, 25.

[280] Anthony Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses*, I.147: 'When [Laurence Nowell] abode in Lincolns In,, in the lodgings of one of his brethren, who was a Counsellor of note there, he was a tutor in those studies to *Will. Lambard*, the antiquary of Kent, who was esteemed the second best in them, and made use of his assistance and notes when he compiled his book, *De priscis Anglorum legibus*'.

[281] David S. Berkowitz, *John Selden's Formative Years: Politics and Society in Early Seventeenth-Century England* (Washington: Folger Shakespeare Library, 1988), 20-31.

[282] On the publication of the *Historie of Tithes* see Mark Bland, '"Invisible Dangers": Censorship and the Subversion of Authority in Early Modern England', *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America* 90 (1996): 151-93. For an interesting bibliographical comparison see Richard Serjeantson and Thomas Woolford, 'The Scribal Publication of a Printed Book: Francis Bacon's *Certaine Considerations Touching...the Church of England* (1604)', *The Library* 10 (2009): 119-156.

to whom it belongs more to write the Historie of Tithes, then to a *Common Lawyer*' (XVII). Selden warms to this subject, and puts English legal scholars (especially himself) into the company of the philologists and legal historians of the sixteenth century, especially the French school: . 'I know there haue been and are many common Lawiers of other States being strangers to [Philology] that they are all to be reputed of her chiefst Darlings...witnesse in France those euer honord names, Bude, Cuiacius, Brisson, Tiraquell, Pithou, Pasquier, Le Thou, Aerault, Breterie, Sauaron, and others; in the Empire, Gruter, Freher, Ritterhuse; in the vnited Prouinces, Groot, Heuter, and the like elsewhere.' (XVIII-XIX).[283] The scholarship of English lawyers -- and that means, primarily, antiquarian scholarship -- deserves to be placed among this illustrious continental European company.

So the Inns were a vital intellectual environment within which antiquarianism could be cultivated. But mention of Selden's defence of the *Historie of Tithes* naturally invites the question of the extent to which the Church was hostile to antiquarianism. A great deal of Richard Montagu's invective against Selden focussed on his perceived denigration of the Church's philological learning. Montagu concludes one his criticisms of Selden's argument with a taunt at what he sees as Selden's implicit dismissal of clerical erudition: 'If a Lazie ignorant Clergy-man may sometime be able to pull a great Philologer by the eare, I hope, men may be pardoned, that, out of their owne profession, be not so skilfull in all poynts'.[284] Montagu explicitly links modern philology with the Inns, saying that Selden 'left *Logick* too soone at Vniuersity, to haunt *Philologie* at

---

[283] On the French legal historians see Donald R. Kelley, *Foundations of Modern Historical Scholarship: Language, Law and History in the French Renaissance* (New York and London, 1970).
[284] Montagu, *Diatribae*, 38.

Innes of Court' (49). In a letter to John Cosin concerning the possible sequel to his *Diatribae*, Montagu promises he 'shall never faile the Church of England, but usque ad aras do my best to uphold the doctrine and discipline ther'.[285] The furore generated by *Historie of Tithes* does seem to have been partly due to hostility between clerical and secular erudition.[286]

But this is very far from the whole story. Kristine Haugen has used the suggestive term 'ecclesiastical polyhistor' to describe early seventeenth-century English scholars.[287] She defines this term, with reference to Morhof's *Polyhistor* encyclopedia, as 'roughly someone who knows everything. The English polyhistors studied many different aspects of the ancient world; their methods involved the collection and reconciliation of vast amounts of information and their ultimate aim was to construct an account of antiquity that completely integrated classical and Judeo-Christian sources' (17-18).[288] This gets at something very important about early-modern English scholarship, antiquarianism very much included, which is that although very few of the most important scholars had taken holy orders, ecclesiastical scholarship was probably more important to English scholars than to scholars anywhere else in Europe. English scholars never produced great editions of classical texts in the manner of French or Italian philologists. Vast editorial projects were aimed more at patristic writers and at the Bible itself than at the classical world. According to Mark Pattison, Isaac Casaubon was ruined by his move to England

---

[285] George Ornsby, ed., *The Correspondence of John Cosin*, 2 vols. (Durham, Publications of the Surtees Society, 1869-1872, vols.52 and 55 of this series).
[286] For a full account of the responses to *Tithes* see G.J. Toomer, 'Selden's *Historie of Tithes*: Genesis, Publication, Aftermath', *Huntington Library Quarterly* 65 (2002): 345-78.
[287] Kristine L. Haugen, 'Richard Bentley: Scholarship and Criticism in Eighteenth-Century England', (Ph.D. thesis, Princeton University, 2001).
[288] On Morhof see Françoise Waquet, ed., *Mapping the World of Learning: the Polyhistor of Daniel Georg Morhof* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2000).

and the English focus on ecclesiastical history. The work of responding to Baronius literally killed him.[289] Although this is an attractive idea, a more accurate view may be that Casaubon was finally able to pursue ecclesiastical erudition in England to an extent that was not possible in Geneva or Paris.

Clergymen were often more than keen to support the kind of philological, antiquarian learning this chapter has been describing. Camden's early antiquarian pursuits after he left university were supported by Dean Gabriel Goodman and his nephew Godfrey Goodman, later Bishop of Gloucester.[290] Camden was also selected as one of two historians at James I's 'College of Divines', Chelsea College: '[i]n this College also were to be maintained two Historians, to record and publish all Matters worthy of Remark in this Church and State'.[291] Bishop Lancelot Andrewes was a particular friend of antiquarian learning, and was associated with the Society of Antiquaries (although he declined to attend their meetings because they clashed with 'our Translation time').[292] Even Selden had friends and supporters among the Bishops. He worked with Laud -- probably an association encouraged by their shared interest in oriental languages -- and was close to Lancelot Andrewes and, especially, to John Williams, Bishop of Lincoln.[293] Williams was not only an early patron of Selden's, but also called upon Selden's legal help when he was embroiled in litigation in

---

[289] Mark Pattison, *Isaac Casaubon 1559-1614* (London, 1875). Anthony Grafton has thrillingly contextualized (and critiqued) Pattison's work as tragically divided between German and English modes of nineteenth-century scholarship. See Anthony Grafton, 'The Messrs. Casaubon: Isaac Casaubon and Mark Pattison', in *Worlds Made by Words*, 216-230.
[290] Thomas Smith, 'Vita', in *Camdeni...Epistolae*, vii-viii.
[291] Thomas Smith, 'Vita', xlix.
[292] The letter is printed in van Norden, 'Elizabethan College of Antiquaries', 166.
[293] When Andrewes died, Selden wrote to Cotton, rather callously, to emphasize the importance of retrieving his Armenian dictionary, which he had previously lent to Andrewes (BM Cotton MS Julius C.iii, fol.342r).

Star Chamber.[294] Jeremy Stephens was keen for Spelman to arrange for the full cooperation of the Church hierarchy with his work on the history of sacrilege. Spelman kept putting off arranging to meet with Laud to discuss the work, but the whole exchange implies they were aware that conflict over erudition with the ecclesiastical establishment was certainly possible, but could be avoided if managed carefully.[295] Before publication of his *Concilia*, Spelman sent the manuscript for Ussher for careful scrutiny on philological and religio-political issues. Ussher commented on one passage: 'I think our Clergye will be very much displeased with this passage; and count them selues to be as much endammaged thereby, as they were before pleasured by your book De non temerandis Ecclesijs'.[296] He also advised Spelman to 'communicate' the work 'to my L. of Canterbury and not to publish it wthout his speciall approbation' (fol.133r). Spelman and his circle were keen to tread carefully with delicate matters relating to the history of the early church, and the latter part of this thesis will offer plenty of illustrations of why early church history was particularly sensitive. But there was no necessary conflict between the church and antiquarianism, so long as tact, caution, and careful cultivation of the appropriate contacts were maintained.

Antiquaries were also keen to organize themselves into more or less formal societies from the late sixteenth-century onwards. There is most famously the Society of Antiquaries, founded in the same year Camden published

---

[294] See the heartfelt letter from Williams to Selden in BL Harley MS 7001, fol.110r. Williams also arranged for Selden to be given the office of 'Auditor to the Deane and Chapter of Westminster', to which he was appointed on 4th December 1622. Selden kept the office only as a sinecure. See Westminster Abbey Library WAM 9622.
[295] See e.g. BL Harley 7001, fol.70r.
[296] BL Add. MS 34600, fol.142r.

his first edition of the *Britannia*.[297] A group of four scholars in the midlands in the 1630s -- Edward Dering, Christopher Hatton, Thomas Shirley and William Dugdale -- drew up a list of twenty aims that this group of 'Students of Antiquity' would pursue.[298] Both these societies came out of a common recognition that antiquarian research into British history needed to be approached collaboratively. The midland's antiquaries' rules were designed to prevent pointless duplication of one another's work. The first rule insists on the total pooling of their shared knowledge: 'That every one do helpe and further each others studyes and endeavours, by imparting and communicating (as time and other circumstances may permit) all such bookes, notes, deedes, rolles, &c. as he hath, for ye expediting whereof, and...each to send other a p[er]fect inventory and catalogue of all such notes, bookes, collections, &c. as they now have' (6). Although the founding of such societies has normally been seen in isolation, it has perhaps helpful to see this sort of community as part of the proliferation of collaborative research and the establishment of learned societies throughout Europe.[299] The Magdeburg Centuriators have already been mentioned in this context, and it was a particular characteristic of ecclesiastical erudition in early-modern Europe that it was pursued in collaboration rather than isolation. Thomas James at the Bodleian Library attempted to establish a team of scholars to comb through English libraries looking for patristic manuscripts that could

---

[297] Far and away the best account of this Society remains Linda van Norden, 'The Elizabethan College of Antiquaries'. See also her invaluable study of the dates of foundation and termination of the society in 'Sir Henry Spelman on the Chronology of the Elizabethan College of Antiquaries', *Huntington Library Quarterly* 13 (1950): 131-160.

[298] L.B.L., 'An Early Society of Antiquaries', *Notes and Queries*, Series I, Vol.XI (January 6, 1855), 5-6.

[299] On the Society of Antiquaries as a precedent for the Royal Society, see Mordechai Feingold, 'The Origins of the Royal Society, Revisited', in Margaret Pelling and Scott Mandelbrote, eds., *The Practice of Reform in Health, Medicine and Science, 1500-2000* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005), 167-183, 175-76.

help correct Catholic misreadings.[300] The Amsterdam Polyglot Bible required a collaborative group of scholars stretching between Holland and Spain.[301] And such collaborative endeavours were not only a phenomenon in Protestant Europe. Ingo Herklotz has recently uncovered the history of Rome's Academia Basiliana, a group under the patronage of Cardinal Barberini who were to research the history of the Greek Church, especially in the light of the overtures made by Cyril Lukaris to the Reformed churches of western Europe.[302] Even the project to write the history of Britain was originally conceived by Abraham Ortelius as part of a wider scheme to write the history of the whole of Europe.[303] Viewed in this broad international context, the Society of Antiquaries seems less an avatar of nationalism -- or an early outgrowth from it -- than a characteristic product of late sixteenth-century learned culture.

Overlapping and mutually supporting networks of institutions -- the university, the Inns of Court, the church and learned societies -- provided the institutional context in which antiquarian scholarship was developed. Learned culture in this period certainly had its failures to set beside its successes, and Edmund Bolton's frequent attempts to establish an 'Academy Royal' is a good example of a learned project that never came to fruition.[304] Another was the Herald's Office, which should have been the ideal institution to foster antiquarian

---

[300] Neil Ker, 'Thomas James's Collation of Gregory, Cyprian and Ambrose', *Bodleian Library Record* 4 (1952): 16-30.
[301] We await the full study of the Antwerp Polyglot by Theodor Dunkelgrün. In the meantime, see the inadequate account in R. J. Wilkinson, ed*., The Kabbalistic scholars of the Antwerp Polyglot Bible* (Leiden: Brill, 2007) and Alastair Hamilton's review in *Quaerendo* 38 (2008): 398-409.
[302] Ingo Herklotz, 'The Academia Basiliana'.
[303] In Holland 1570, Lucas de Heere had produced a beautifully illustrated history of England, entitled 'Corte beschryuinghe van D'Enghelandsche geschiedenissen vergadert uut de beste Chronycschryuers'. This is now BM Add MS 28330.
[304] Although Bolton was always a beleaguered figure, and personal failings may have sabotaged this project as much as institutional opposition.

research, but was so riven by infighting that it seemed to have been as much a burden for scholars as a viable means of support.[305] It seems to me that far too great an emphasis has been placed on the very slender evidence that the Society of Antiquaries was unable to reconvene because of James' 'mislike' to suggest that antiquarianism was somehow anti-establishment or ideologically opposed to the monarchy. Some antiquaries, like Selden, certainly sided with Parliament in the 1640s, but most did not, and even in the case of Selden his decision is difficult to interpret.[306] Some of the works antiquaries undertook gained new and more politically challenging resonances during the Civil War.[307] When *The Several Opinions of Sundry Learned Antiquaries touching the Antiquity, Power, Order, State, Manner, Persons and Proceedings of Parliament* was printed in 1658, the emphasis on Parliament's extreme antiquity had taken on very different resonances than it would have had for John Doddridge, a client of Prince Henry, in the early seventeenth-century.[308] Aristocratic patronage was immensely important to antiquaries: Lord Burghley supported Camden, the Catholic William Howard helped Camden and Cotton on their tour of the Scottish border, and the

---

[305] Sir Anthony Wagner, *Heralds of England: A History of the Office and College of Arms* (London: H.M.S.O., 1967). A new history of this institution and its impact on the history of English scholarship is hugely desirable.

[306] The best available account of Selden's decision to side with Parliament is Richard Tuck, '"The Ancient Law of Freedom": John Selden and the Civil War', in John Morrill, ed., *Reactions to the English Civil War 1642-1649* (London: Macmillan, 1982), 137-61, 238-41. Tuck concludes that it was Selden's fidelity to the law, which he felt had been broken by Charles, that led him to support Parliament. A full study of Bodl. MS Selden Supra 124 would help to deepen our understanding of this issue. Selden's Erastianism and anti-clericalism are an important aspect of this decision, and both await a full study.

[307] Pauline Croft, 'Sir John Doddridge, King James I, and the Antiquity of Parliament', *Parliaments, Estates, and Representation* 12 (1992): 95-107.

[308] For a summary of these debates on parliament's history see E. Evans, 'Of the Antiquity of Parliaments in England: Some Elizabethan and Early Stuart Opinions', *History* 23 (1938-39): 206-21.

Earl of Arundel was a supporter of Selden.[309] Antiquaries were part of the networks and institutions which sustained scholarship in the early-modern period and although sometimes they came into conflict with those structures, more or less wilfully, their work was not viewed as inherently subversive.

(iv) Antiquarian Readers

Who was reading antiquarian books? And how were they doing so? These large questions have really not begun to be answered, although the evidence of annotated books provides a great deal of insight into how readers were approaching antiquarian works.[310] This short section is based primarily on a survey of copies of the *Britannia* in libraries in Oxford and at the British Library; it would be most valuable at some stage to extend this survey to other libraries.[311] The *Britannia* acted as a conduit for Continental scholarship to Britain. It also acted as a focal point for research into British history. It is therefore unsurprising that we find the physical copies of the book acting themselves as centres for research, notebooks in which new discoveries relating to British can be stored to be made use of later. This is how Camden used his own copy of the *Britannia*, as has already been mentioned above. The 1607 *Britannia* was Camden's final edition, but either he harboured an ambition of one

[309] Selden lists Arundel's library among the most important collections in England in 1622: 'that great store, in those so well furnished Libraries of Sir *Robert Cotton* and of *Bennet* Colledge in Cambridge, besides diuers of singular worth in his Maiesties Librarie at Saint *Iames*, in that of the Archbishop of *Canterburie*, of the Earle of *Arundell*, the publique one at *Oxford*, with Mr. *Clarenceux*, Mr. *Allen* of Gloucester-hall, and in some other Libraries of lesse note in *Oxford*, *Cambridge*, *London*, and elsewhere in this Kingdome' (John Selden, 'To My singular good Friend, Mr. Augustine Vincent', in Augustine Vincent, *A Discoverie of Errovrs In the first Edition of the Catalogue of Nobility, Pvblished by Ralphe Brooke, Yorke Herald, 1619* (London, 1622), a1r-v.)
[310] This seems a better way of approaching the issue of readership than the one taken by Angus Vine, *In Defiance of Time*, 183-199, which irrelevantly focusses on one of Selden's published works, the 'Illustrations' to Drayton's *Poly-Olbion*.
[311] Ann Blair, 'Note Taking as an Art of Transmission', *Critical Inquiry* 31 (2004-2005): 85-107 provides an excellent overview of Renaissance note-taking practices.

day returning to revise and add to the work, or he simply did not conceive the work as finished, or perhaps even finishable. So his copy contains letters notifying him of newly discovered archaeological sites or inscriptions interleaved between the pages. These notes are precisely related to the geographical location of the discovery. In the section on 'Cumberland', for instance, a noted is interleaved announcing 'I receiued this morning a ston from my lord of Arundell sent him from my lord william it was the head of a Cross at Bewcastle'.[312] Recognising that inscriptions themselves have continuing living histories, Camden has noted when one has been moved to a new location. By an inscription from the Isle of Wight which Camden's printed text records being in Lord Burghley's collection, he notes in the margin of his copy: 'Iam in aedibus D.9. Cottoni Coningtonianis'.[313] Camden's own copy of his book therefore becomes a record of the gradually evolving understanding of British local history.[314] Camden also used it to store material relating to the controversy over Constantine's birth-place (discussed above), interleaving, for instance, a sheet containing 'E Panegyrico Libanij ad Constantium Chlorum' (i.e. Constantine the Great's father) written in Greek.[315]

The most interesting copy of the *Britannia* in Oxford is John Selden's copy of the 1607 Folio edition.[316] This is in some respects surprising. Selden was not a heavy annotator of his books, and this *Britannia* is one of the two books heavily annotated by him in his collection that has yet come to light.[317] The annotations

---

[312] Bodl. MS Smith 1, between pages 644 and 645.
[313] Bodl. MS Smith 1, 196.
[314] Interestingly, Camden adds nothing to the sections on Ireland and Scotland.
[315] Bodl. MS Smith 1, between pages 52 and 53.
[316] Bodleian shelfmark: C.1.4. Art.Seld.
[317] The other is his copy of the 1587 Rome Septuagint: *Vetus Testamentum iuxta Septuaginta Ex Auctoritate Sixti V. Pont. Max. Editum* (Rome, 1587). The Bodleian shelfmark is: D 1.14 Th.Seld.

in the *Britannia* are exceptionally neat by Selden's standards. They seem likely to have been made around 1612-1614 because there are close links between the notes and the research for the 'Illustrations' to *Poly-Olbion* (1612) and to *Titles of Honor* (1614). For instance, Selden notes at the bottom of page 51, by passages relating to the birthplace of Constantine, the correct reference to Lipsius' discussion of this topic (''Lips. de magnitud. Rom. lib.4. cap. 11.), which Selden would himself touch on in the 'Illustrations'.[318] And there are also incidental identifications throughout of inscriptions with their number in Janus Gruterus' edition. But primarily the notes relate to work on *Titles*. For instance, Selden has extensively annotated the passage on page 121 relating to 'Barones'. The notes Selden makes in the margin have such a close relationship to his discussion of the title of 'Baron' in *Titles* that he must have had his copy of the *Britannia* by him when he was writing that section. Selden's marginalia record mentions of the word 'Baro' in the Scholiast on Persius ('com. ad Persium'), in the 'Glossar. Latino-Arabic. edit in Thesaur. ling. Vulcanij', and in Pierre Pithou's *Adversaria* ('Pythaeum in Adversar'). All of these references are used in the first edition of *Titles*, in a very short space one, after the other.[319] This shows us something of how Selden conceived both Camden's *Britannia* and *Titles of Honor*. The *Britannia* was a reference work which could be used to organize material. It could also be supplemented: that was the purpose of *Titles*, or at least of the sections relating to British history, to add new material to the Camden's great achievement. It is suggestive that this whole way of working was abandoned later in Selden's career, which perhaps suggests that no one book acted as a

[318] See the earlier discussion of the debate over Constantine's birthplace.
[319] See *Titles of Honor* (1614), 259-60.

touch-stone for his later writing in quite the way Camden's *Britannia* did for his early antiquarian works.

Oxford's copies of the *Britannia* also testify to the European reach of the work. For instance, a copy of the *Britannia* published in Frankfurt in 1590 is now in the Bodleian, and on the title-page its owner has identified William Camden as a man to whom Britain owes a great deal. He also records that the book was purchased in Nuremberg in May 1644.[320] Another copy of the 1590 Frankfurt edition has a late sixteenth-century German binding.[321] A copy of the 1607 *Britannia*, now in Queen's College Library, has a particularly interesting series of owners.[322] The copy has three signatures: one belongs to Edward, 'Comitis Dorcestriae', who gave the book to the college; one is Brian Duppa's, bishop of Winchester and the vice-chancellor of the University from 1632-33; and one is that of a 'Robert Rainsford Salamanca'. The sequence of owners seems to have been Duppa, Rainsford, Edward and then Queen's. This Robert Rainsford, who identifies himself as 'Salamanca', and so we might suppose a graduate of their university, seems to be the author of the annotations in the book (all in the same hand). Where Camden mentioned the University of Salamanca, Rainsford has added a very long marginal note relating to the history of university, explaining that there were Professors of Hebrew, Arabic, Aramaic and Greek at the university! He has also carefully updated Camden's scholarship with reference to texts published after the *Britannia*, especially works relating to the Anglo-Saxon language such as Abraham Wheelock's update of Lambarde's edition of the Anglo-Saxon laws, and Franciscus Junius' work on northern European

[320] Bodleian shelfmark: Vet. D1 e.445
[321] Bodleian shelfmark: Broxb.93.23
[322] Queen's College Library shelfmark: QUE Upper Lib 53.G.20

languages.[323] Finally, it is also worth noting that a copy of the 1587 *Britannia* belonging to Edward Pococke, Oxford's first Professor of Arabic, survives in the Bodleian. Given the emphasis placed in the present chapter on the centrality of philology to antiquarianism, it is unsurprising to find one of the greatest philologists in Europe taking an interest in the work.[324]

[323] See pages 269, 81, 632.
[324] Pococke's copy is shelfmark: 8o C 32 Art.BS. There are some pencil underlinings throughout.

Chapter 2: Poetry in the Regions

Introduction: Spenser the Poet-Antiquarian

Most of this chapter is concerned with situating Ben Jonson within the multiple geographical and institutional contexts which emerge from studying his commendatory poetry. There are several reasons why Ben Jonson is a focus here. There is an oddness to thinking about 'Ben Jonson in the Regions', which this thesis argues we should not find so strange. Jonson is quintessentially the poet of the city: he is the writer of satirical epigrams which attack the mores of courtly and civic life, and his plays tend to take London and its religious or political problems as their subjects. There is no more metropolitan writer than Jonson. Therefore to reclaim his associations with the regions is more telling than it would be for Jonson's friends and contemporaries like William Browne, whose Cornish associations are famous, or like William Drummond, whose writings have recently been situated in the borderlands of southern Scotland.[1] Secondly, Jonson was the most prominent English writer of commendatory poems. This genre has hardly received any scholarly attention, but it is relevant to this thesis because it provides access both to the very specific regional communities of which Jonson was a part, and because it is a scholarly genre. Scholarly books were frequently accompanied with Latin poems praising their merits -- William Camden's *Britannia*, for instance, was celebrated by

[1] On Cornish identities more generally in this period see Mark Stoyle, *West Britons: Cornish Identities and the Early Modern British State* (Exeter: Exeter UP, 2002). On Drummond see John Kerrigan, *Archipelagic English* (Oxford: OUP, 2008), ch.4.

other scholars, including Henry Cuffe, Caspar Dornavius and Janus Gruterus.[2] Jonson is translating that genre into an English context, to an extent which no significant English poet had ever done before. In this he was comparable to his contemporary poet-scholar Samuel Daniel, but Daniel's verse epistles tended to be dedicated either to the nobility, or written for particular gift copies of his books, and hence much more informal -- like the poem he inscribed into the gift of his *Workes* for the Bodleian Library.[3] So as the introduction suggested, while the second part of this thesis moves from a consideration of scholarship to poetry, the distance between these two realms is not as far as it might seem. The main body of this chapter therefore provides the first full study of Jonson's commendatory poetry, and can be read as a stand-alone study in itself.

But Jonson's work does not does not emerge in a vacuum here. The sort of localism of his writing has clear precedents in earlier Tudor literature: in the way John Skelton worked reflection on patronage relationships into his poetry, or in the fusion of history and land-writing in the Latin poetry of John Leland and William Camden.[4] But the clearest predecessor to Jonson -- the poet who did the most to establish, in an English context, what it could mean to be a poet at all -- was Edmund

---

[2] William Camden, *Britannia* (London, 1607), **2r-**3r.

[3] On Daniel's occasional poetry the best study remains John Pitcher, 'Samuel Daniel's Occasional and Dedicatory Verse: A Critical Edition' (D.Phil. thesis, University of Oxford, 1978). For Daniel's poem dedicating his *Works* to the Bodleian library see Alexander B. Grosart, ed., *The Complete Works in Verse and Prose of Samuel Daniel*, 5 vols. (London: Hazell, Watson & Viney, 1885-1896), I.4-7. I am planning a full study of Samuel Daniel's work as a poet-scholar.

[4] On Skelton in the wider context of Tudor courtly patronage relationships see David Carlson, 'Royal Tutors in the Reign of Henry VII', *Sixteenth Century Journal* 22 (1991): 253-79; David Carlson, 'The Writings of Bernard André (c.1450-c.1522)', *Renaissance Studies* 12 (1998): 229-50. There is no really adequate study of the river-poetry of the Renaissance, but in the meantime see Wyman Herendeen, *From Landscape to Literature : the River and the Myth of Geography* (Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne University Press, 1986).

Spenser.[5] Spenser has always been the poet of nation-building, especially the poet of colonial conquest in Ireland. Some of the best recent work has both added considerable depth to this picture, and also suggested some of the ways in which we need to nuance it. Thomas Herron has pointed to Spenser's role as a 'planter' and hence to his attempts to capture in the georgic mode not only the landscape of Ireland but also the potentialities it offers for productive labour.[6] Recent archaeological work on the landscape of Spenser's own estate has suggested possible future avenues of research into Spenser's own attempts to write this particular local region.[7] Bart van Es has pointed to Spenser's uses of the multiplicity of Renaissance 'forms of history' -- chorography, antiquarianism, chronicle, and so on. History for Spenser, as van Es argues, was not simplistically the history of a single nation, but could be put to use to describe very specific regions, especially in the chorographic mode.[8] Much contemporary scholarship on Spenser has suggested that the building of patronage links were foremost in his mind during his publishing career, but Spenser's celebration of Camden suggests a slightly more nuanced picture.[9] There was an interest in history within the Leicester-Sidney faction of which Spenser was a part. But this was largely in *politique* history -- in Tacitus,

[5] A huge amount has been written on Spenser's establishment of a poet's 'career' in the English Renaissance. A good recent distillation and extension of this work is William A. Oram, 'Spenser in Search of an Audience: The Kathleen Williams Lecture for 2004', *Spenser Studies* 20 (2005): 23-47.
[6] Thomas Herron, *Spenser's Irish Work : Poetry, Plantation, and Colonial Reformation* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007), and see the bibliography to this book for the large quantity of work on Spenser and Ireland.
[7] Eric Kingelhöfer, 'Edmund Spenser at Kilcolman Castle: the archaeological evidence', *Post-Medieval Archaeology* 39 (2005): 133-154.
[8] Bart van Es, *Spenser's Forms of History* (Oxford: OUP, 2002).
[9] The best recent work on Spenser and patronage is Richard A. McCabe, 'Rhyme and Reason: Poetics, Patronage, and Secrecy in Elizabethan and Jacobean Ireland', in Richard McCabe and David Womersley, eds., *Literary Milieux: Essays in Literary History* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2008), 30-51.

Tacitism, which famously found fruit in the controversial work of John Hayward on Henry IV.[10] But Spenser's *Ruins* celebrated Camden, 'the nourice of antiquitie', and Camden was much more closely associated with Burghley -- and antiquarianism was a far greater preoccupation of Burghley's than of Leicester's. So Spenser's antiquarian interests help us to think outside the kinds of political factionalism that Spenser's works have been recently understood within.

In the sixteenth century there were many English humanists who, in the neo-Latin tradition, produced works of Latin literature (especially history and theology), and who also wrote Latin poetry, often of an occasional nature for very specific recipients.[11] In the late sixteenth-century, Spenser is translating that tradition into English, by writing not only a substantial body of poetry, but a scholarly work, the *View of the Present State of Ireland*. Although Nicholas Canny and others have tried to present the *View* as an agenda-setting intervention into political debate (and there is certainly a lot of truth in this), the status of the *View* as a work of scholarship has been far more neglected.[12] When Spenser's *View of the Present State of Ireland* was originally published in 1633, it was presented by James Ware as an antiquarian work, along with two other histories of Ireland, one by Edmund Campion and the other by Meredith Hanmer.[13] Around the period 1626-1627, Ware

[10] The classic treatment of this subject is Malcolm Smuts, 'Court-Centred Politics and the Uses of Roman Historians, c.1590-1630', in Kevin Sharpe and Peter Lake, eds., *Culture and Politics in Early Stuart England* (Stanford: Stanford UP, 1993), 21-43. An interesting manuscript related to this tradition has recently come to light in Genoa, for which see Patricia J. Osmond, 'Edmund Bolton's Vindication of Tiberius Caesar: A "Lost" Manuscript Comes to Light', *International Journal for the Classical Tradition* 11 (2005): 329-343.

[11] The best overview of this subject is David Carlson, *English Humanist Books : Writers and Patrons, Manuscripts and Print, 1475-1525* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1993).

[12] Nicholas Canny, *Making Ireland British, 1580-1650* (Oxford: OUP, 2001), ch.1.

[13] James Ware, ed., *The Historie of Ireland Collected by Three Learned Authors* (Dublin, 1633).

was closely connected to antiquarian circles in England, and was providing Irish manuscripts to Cotton and Selden. On 15th October 1626, Ware wrote to Selden with 'the inclosed charters of Creation, wch I procured to be transcribed out of the Chauncery Rolls here'.[14] But Ware's chief scholarly relationship was with James Ussher, to whom as an antiquarian Ware was the intellectual successor in mid-seventeenth century Ireland.[15] We can see them exchanging antiquarian documents in a manuscript of Ussher letters preserved in the Bodleian library. Ware is providing Ussher with the 'Annals wch [...] doe principally concerne Leinster: The booke also as I am informed being knowne by the name of... the Leinster booke'. In exchange, he made a request of Ussher: 'I have now a speciall occasion to vse my Vlster Annals and the Annals of Inisfallen, I intreate your grace to send them mee by this bearer'.[16] These are the networks within which Spenser's *View* was itself being

---

[14] Bodl. Selden Supra 123, fol.327r.

[15] See Joseph Leerssen, 'Archbishop Ussher and Gaelic Culture', *Studia Hibernica* 22-3 (1982-3): 50-58, 54: 'Ussher's importance for this gradually growing interest among the Anglo-Irish lies mainly in his mentorship of young Sir James Ware, and in the fact that the library of Trinity College, the most important depository for Irish manuscripts until well after the foundation of the Royal Irish Academy, initially owed much of its importance to his personal collections'. A full intellectual history of Trinity College, Dublin, is, in my view, the major desideratum for understanding the intellectual culture of seventeenth-century Ireland. In the meantime see Elizabethanne Boran, 'The Libraries of Luke Challoner and James Ussher, 1595-1608', in Helga Robinson-Hammerstein, ed., *European Universities in the Age of Reformation and Counter Reformation* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 1998), 75-115. Incidentally, although Ware and Ussher were both Protestants, albeit of slightly differing religious complexions, the inter-confessional nature of Irish antiquarianism is even more apparent than in England. See for instance: Colm Lennon, *Richard Stanihurst the Dubliner 1547-1618* (Blackrock: Irish Academic Press, 1981); William O'Sullivan, 'Correspondence of David Rothe and James Ussher, 1619-23', *Collectanea Hibernica* 36-37 (1994-1995): 7-49; Aubrey Gwynn, 'Archbishop Ussher and Fr Brendan O'Connor', in Franciscan Fathers, ed., *Father Luke Wadding* (Dublin: Clonmore & Reynolds, 1957), 263-83; Elizabethanne Boran, '"Propagating religion and endeavouring the reformation of the whole world": Irish Bishops and the Hartlib circle in the mid-seventeenth century', in Vincent P. Carey and Ute Lotz-Heumann, eds., *Taking Sides? Colonial and Confessional Mentalités in Early Modern Ireland* (Dublin: Four Courts, 2003), 165-184.

[16] Bodl. MS Rawlinson Letters 89, fol.113r. This immensely important historical manuscript, known in Gaelic as *Lebar na Núachongbála*, is now Trinity College Dublin, MS H.2.18. On this manuscript see R.I. Best, M.A. O'Brien and Osborn Bergin, *The Book of Leinster, formerly Lebar na Núachongbála*, 5 vols. (Dublin: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies, 1954-1983). A study of the uses both Ussher and Ware made of this manuscript is a desideratum. On Ware's manuscript collection see *Librorum*

read and exchanged. Ware notes in the margin of his edition of the *View* that the manuscript from which he has printed the work came, 'Ex *Bibliotecha*... Iacobi Vsserij *archiep*'.[17] Ware also supplements the *View* with his own notes, and with some of Spenser's own poetry. It is significant not just that Ware exerts sections of the *Faerie Queene* which describe the Irish landscape, but specifically sections which describe Irish rivers.[18] In doing so, he suggests the ways in which Spenser has modelled himself on an antiquarian-poet like Leland, who also wrote not only scholarly histories but also river poetry. And Ware's notes to the *View* contextualize the work within the antiquarian tradition. When the Bards are mentioned, Ware offers some gloss on this subject. 'The word signified', he says, taking the philologist's approach, 'among the Gaules a singer, as is noted by Mr *Camden*, and Mr *Selden*, out of *Festus Pompeius*, and it had the same signification among the Brittish'.[19] The most significant point to be made in the present context is that Ware is here citing Selden's annotations to Drayton's *Poly-Olbion*.[20] The whole project of the *Poly-Olbion* -- an antiquarian chorographic poem with scholarly notes -- was itself a product of the legacy of Spenser's synthesis of antiquarian and poetry, in English, but in a geographically complex regional context. By citing Selden-on-Drayton-on-Spenser, Ware is here feeding Spenser back into the tradition that Spenser had himself created.

Manuscriptorum in Bibiliotheca Jacobi Waraei Equitis Avr. Catalogus (Dublin, 1658) and William O'Sullivan, 'A finding list of Sir James Ware's manuscripts', *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy, section* C 97 (1997): 69-99.

[17] Edmund Spenser, *A View of the State of Ireland*, in James Ware, ed., *The Historie of Ireland*, ¶2v.

[18] Edmund Spenser, *View*, in Ware, ed., *Historie*, L1r-L2v.

[19] Edmund Spenser, *View*, in Ware, ed., *Historie*, 122.

[20] Michael Drayton, *Poly-Olbion* (London, 1612), 97.

There is further evidence to suggest that the *View* was being read as an antiquarian work in this period.[21] The manuscript of the *View* in the Bodleian, which survives among the Gough papers -- themselves primarily a collection of antiquarian manuscripts by one of the foremost eighteenth-century antiquaries -- was possibly a manuscript intended for publication in the late 1590s or early 1600s.[22] The title-page emphatically presents the *View* as a work of history, calling it 'Irelands Survey or A Historical Dialogue & View of ancient & modern times'. 'Survey' is a word suggestive of the kind of chorographical, regional histories we encountered in the first chapter: one thinks of Richard Carew's *Survey of Cornwall* for instance. The title-page goes on to describe the contents of the work, 'wherein is discoursed the Ancient Originall of the Irish Nation, and the severall Conquests Made of them, and of their first reduceing to Christianitie, Also the Antiquity of their Letters, Characters, & Learning'. These are the sorts of themes contained in the antiquarian works discussed in Chapter 1. And Spenser's work draws on the methodologies, especially the discussion of etymology and language history, that we traced in the previous chapter. Spenser uses a similar approach to identify the original inhabitants of Ireland to the one Camden had used in the *Britannia*: he analysed their place names. 'Many I thinke of the Brittaines themselves', came over to Ireland, 'of which though there be little footing now remaining, by reason that the Saxons afterwards, and lastly the English, driving out the Inhabitants thereof, did

[21] For a highly political reading of the reception of Spenser's *View* see Willy Maley, 'How Milton and Some Contemporaries Read Spenser's View', in Brendan Bradshaw, Andrew Hadfield, and Willy Maley, eds., *Representing Ireland: Literature and the Origins of Conflict, 1534-1660* (Cambridge: CUP, 1993), 191-208.

[22] Bodl. MS Gough Ireland 2. On the early printing of the *View* see, with caution: Andrew Hadfield, 'Was Spenser's View of the Present State of Ireland Censored? A Review of the Evidence', *Notes and Queries* 139 (1994): 459-63.

possesse and people it themselves'. It is possible to excavate the memory of these peoples by looking at the vestiges of the original place-names with which they described their environment: 'amongst the Tooles, the Birns, or Brins, the Cavenaghes, and other nations in Leinster, there is some memory of the Britans remayning. As the Tooles are called of the old British word Tol, that is, a hill Countrey, the Brins of the British word Brin, that is, woods, and the Cavenaghes of the word Caune, that is, strong, so that in these three people the very denomination of the old Britons doe still remaine'.[23] So there is good reason to see why the *View* was read as a work of antiquarian history in this period -- because it used the methodologies of antiquarianism.

It must also be admitted, however, that at least one major Gaelic historian did not think highly of Spenser's achievements as a historian. Geoffrey Keating, in his *Foras Feasa ar Éirinn*, his magisterial Gaelic history of Ireland which was circulated from around 1634, was dismissive of Spenser's work on Irish genalogies and history.[24] But Keating's dismissal was by no means universal. John Speed had already cited Spenser as a poet-geologist at the outset of *The Theatre of the Empire of Great Britaine*, quoting a passage from the *Faerie Queene* in which Spenser described a time when England was not an island, but was joined to the European

---

[23] Spenser, *View* in Ware, ed., *Historie*, 33. On the extent of Spenser's knowledge of the Irish language see Roland M. Smith, 'Spenser, Holinshed, and the Leabhar Gabhála', *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 43 (1944): 390-401.

[24] See Geoffrey Keating, *The History of Ireland*, ed., David Comyn and Patrick S. Dineen, 4 vols. (London: Irish Texts Society, 1902-14). On Keating see Brendan Bradshaw, 'Geoffrey Keating: Apologist of Irish Ireland', Bradshaw, Hadfield, and Maley, eds., *Representing Ireland*, 191-208; Bernadette Cunningham, *The World of Geoffrey Keating: History, Myth and Religion in Seventeenth-Century Ireland* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2000). On Ware's own connections with Gaelic antiquaries see Nollaig O Muraíle, *The Celebrated Antiquary Dubhaltach Mac Fhirbhisigh (c.1600-1671): His Lineage, Life and Learning* (Maynooth: An Sagart, 1996), ch.15.

mainland.[25] And James Ware had already cited the *View* in the second edition of his major work of scholarship, his Latin history of the Antiquities of Ireland, *De Hibernia & Antiquitatibus ejus Disquisitiones*.[26] In a section on the names given by the ancient inhabitants of Ireland to foreigners, especially their neigbhours ('De variis nominibus quibus veteres Hiberni Externos appellarunt, praesertim Vicinos'), Ware concludes that some vestiges of the ancient Gauls still remain in Ireland ('vestigia quaedam Gallorum veterum').[27] This is a view which he points out is shared by 'Edmundus Spenserus , in Dialogo inter Eudoxum & Irenaeum, de Statu Hiberniae', who had argued that the 'Menapiis Galliae veteris populis', were believed by Ptolemy to live in the south part of the island.[28] So here we have Ware citing Spenser, even before his publication of the *View*, as the kind of antiquarian-philologist described in Chapter 1, assembling and collating classical texts to discover the history of ancient Europe. This furthermore, militates against the idea that the presentation of the *View* as an antiquarian work by Ware in 1633 was only a device to distract attention from its potentially aggressive political message.[29] Ware was already reading the *View* as a piece of antiquarian scholarship.

Spenser was not solely seen as a poet-antiquarian when he was writing about Ireland. His poetry appealed to genealogists in the English regions, or at least this is suggested by the evidence of a fascinating manuscript in the Bodleian

[25] John Speed, *Theatre of the Empire of Great Britaine* (London, 1611), 1. Speed quotes *Faerie Queene*, I.x.5.
[26] Interestingly the citation does not appear in the first edition, published in 1624, which perhaps suggests Ware first encountered Spenser's *View* in manuscript sometime between 1624 and 1628.
[27] James Ware, *Jacobi Waraei Equitis Aurati De Hibernia & Antiquitatibus ejus Disquisitiones. Editio Secunda* (London, 1628), 35, 36.
[28] See Ware's edition of the *View*, 32-33.
[29] See Maley, 'How Milton and Some Contemporaries Read Spenser's View'.

Library.[30] Despite some impressive work on identifying early readers of Spenser, this manuscript never seems to have been discussed by Spenserians.[31] The manuscript is a miscellany of materials compiled by one John Ramsey. A huge amount about the intellectual world of Ramsey can be reconstructed from this manuscript, partly because he includes his 'Narratio de mea Progressione vita'. He was born in 1580, and was a member of the ' honorable famelye of ye RAMSEYS of Mounte Surrey' (fol.5r). His early education was spent at Wolverhampton in Staffordshire, at the hands of his 'most kinde & lovinge Tutor m^{r} Maddox' at the Free School.[32] His education was delayed by various interruptions, but he eventually matriculated at Peterhouse, Cambridge, on 5th December 1602. He describes his education in the fairly conventional humanist terms one would expect. He hoped other students would learn to 'speake lattin as a familiar language', and recommends thorough reading in the obvious classical poets and rhetoricians, as well as Erasmus' *De Copia*. Of the 'Mathematickes' he recommended the study of Strabo, Solinus, Mela', which suggests the close relationship between mathematics and geography in this period.[33] And the usual Latin historians are recommended -- Livy, Julius Caesar, Sallust, Tacitus and Quintus Curtius. But after only a year at Cambridge, Ramsey left to join James' new court in 1603. After this period as a courtier he

---

[30] Bodl. MS Douce 280. I am planning a full study of this manuscript, which deserves to be treated in far more detail than is possible here. Ramsey's entire library catalogue can be reconstructed, for example. The manuscript is clearly not bound in the order in which it was compiled by Ramsey: the foliation is very confused.

[31] On one regional circle of Spenser readers see Steven May, 'Henry Gurney, a Norfolk Farmer, Reads Spenser and Others', *Spenser Studies* 20 (2005): 183-223.

[32] See Gerald Poynton Mander, *The History of the Wolverhampton Grammar School* (Wolverhampton: Steens, 1913).

[33] For an overview of mathematical geography see Lesley B. Cormack, '"Good Fences Make Good Neighbors": Geography as Self-Definition in Early Modern England', *Isis* 82 (1991): 639-661.

entered the Inns of Court, as one might expect. Following the Palatine wedding in 1613, he travelled extensively in Europe, and even visited Jerusalem. The decision to make his way to the Palatine Court suggests an access of religious feeling, which seems to have expressed itself in a virulent anti-catholicism (on fol.11r we have 'y^{e} pestilent antichristian Pope'). A major transition in Ramsey's life is signalled by a change in handwriting in the manuscript: he moves from a rapid secretary into a shaky, almost childlike hand. He explains that in 1618 he was involved in a duel, and 'after I had giuen my Enimye his life, by an vnhappy blowe I loste y^{e} vse of my right hande w^{ch} makes me write now soe ill wth y^{e} lefte' (fol.7v). So here we have a man educated at the Inns of Court as well as Cambridge, clearly inspired by a forward European Protestantism, and with a love for humanistic learning.

He was also a reader of Spenser. He has copied 'Mother Hubberds Tale' into this book (22r-34v) and probably had copied, in an italic hand, with gothic script for the names of the Muses, Spenser's 'Teares of the Muses' (36r-43r). He has also copied a third long Spenser poem, 'The Visions of Petrarch', to which is added a Latin motto (from Seneca) not found in the original 1591 printing of the *Complaints*: 'Omnis commoditas sua fert incommoda secum'. Ramsey deserves recognition not only for copying these poems, but also for himself becoming a minor Spenserian-poet. Spenser's poems are followed by Ramsey's own pastoral poems, called things like 'The Sheepheardes commendation of his Nimph' (43v). Given the present context in which we are situating Spenser, it is unsurprising that the other of Ramsey's great interests is English history. Ramsey has written his own summary of Norman history, 'Of ye Auncient English nation', around which he noted:

'Richardus / Versteganus / in his restitution / of antiquetyes / of ye English / Nation'. It is doubly significant to see the anti-Catholic Ramsey reading not only an antiquarian work, but one written by one of England's most famous Catholic exiles. His interest is in Verstegan's philology: 'The grounde of our English is y^{e} Teutonicke tounge' (70v), he points out, a position by no means universally recognized within a culture which claimed a family linkage between English and Greek. And he is particularly interested in the etymology of surnames, which provide an opportunity for personal history to intersect with world-history. He notes the prominence of the letters 'ey' at the end of many English surnames: 'diuers of our Surnames of our ancient English famelyes, both honorable & worshipfull, doe ende as Ramsey. Sydney. Tilney. &c. whose possessions (whence their Surnames weare taken) weare scituate neare vnto Waters' (70v). Another of his fascinations is his own family history, which is suggested in his etymological thinking by the link he implicitly makes between 'Sydney' and 'Ramsey'. He goes to great effort to describe 'The genealogye of ye famelye of ye Ramseyes' (72r-76r). But the immediate context of his etymological and philological thinking -- the termination of surnames in 'Ey' -- leads Ramsey to situate England within the whole of Biblical history from the Fall of Babel onwards: 'Iaphet ye sonn of Noah had amonge other children a son Called Gomer, he was father to Ascena, & this Ascena was y^{e} father of Tuisco, y^{e} father & conductor of y^{e} Germanies from y^{e} Tower of Babell into Tuithland or germanye: from whence our ancestors y^{e} Englishemen came An^{o}: dom: 447^{o}. Reg: Vortiger.' (70v). This narrative is drawn from Verstegan, but it is significant that Ramsey is

capable of moving so swiftly from the history of his own surname to the history of the whole world and the place of the Teutonic peoples within that history.

It would be sad to subordinate John Ramsey entirely to Spenser. It is extraordinary in its own right to be able to reconstruct in such detail the intellectual cosmos of any figure born in the late sixteenth century, let alone one who made so little impact on the history of anything. But Ramsey's manuscript does illustrate very nicely the intimate connection, in the mind of at least one person, between local history and Spenserian poetry. In the case of Ramsey, the two interests go together. But this is also true of early seventeenth-century Spenserianism more broadly: one might also be tempted to say its defining characteristic is the association between poetry and antiquarianism. This helps to explain Richard Brathwaite's linking of Selden with William Browne, George Wither and Christopher Brooke in his satirical attack on contemporary poets who (so they claim): 'Sing what our (Swaines of old) could never doe'.[34] Drayton's antiquarian interests are far broader even than *Poly-Olbion*. William Browne received manuscripts of medieval English poetry from John Stow. And Christopher Brooke wrote historical poetry. Ramsey was part of that intellectual environment -- he might have even encountered it directly when he was at the Inns of Court. This literary world was also, as we shall now see, very much a world of which Jonson is a part. Let us turn now to Jonson's commendatory verses.

Ben Jonson in the Regions: A Study of his Commendatory Poems

[34] Richard Brathwaite, 'To the Poet-asters of Brittaine', *A Strappado for a Diuell* (London, 1615), 23.

Much attention has been paid to the importance of Jonson's own printed works, the care with which he supervised their arrangement and production, but little has been devoted to Jonson's contributions to other authors' books, his commendatory poetry.[35] Herford and the Simpsons' edition of Jonson tellingly group the commendatory poems under 'Ungathered Verse', echoing Jonson's dictum to Sir Thomas Roe, 'be always to thy gather'd selfe the same' (9). 'Ungathered Verse' invites contrast with Jonson's monumental gathering, his 1616 *Workes*. More recent critics have seen this book as part of the creation of an 'ideology of authorship', a key stage in the construction of single, authorial propriety which would lead to the 1709 Copyright Act.[36] And the 'gathered self', more widely in Jonson scholarship, has been a staple of readings of Jonson as politically authoritarian and centralizing: for example, Stanley Fish's argument that Jonson's poetry creates an elitist 'community of the same'; or that his Lipsius-influenced Stoicism encourages retirement from political controversy.[37] Bibliographical attention to the 1616 *Workes* has made the book seem less monumental, suggesting it exists in multiple bibliographical states with different purposes.[38] Recent work on Jonson's manuscripts and library have begun to recover the dispersed material traces of

[35] The only scholar to prepare a reference work for their study dismisses the poems as 'puffs'. Franklin B. Williams, 'Commendatory Verses: The Rise of the Art of Puffing', *Studies in Bibliography* 19 (1966): 1-14.
[36] Sara van den Berg, 'Ben Jonson and the Ideology of Authorship', in Jennifer Brady and W.H. Herendeen, eds., *Ben Jonson's 1616 Folio* (Newark: Delaware UP, 1991), 111-137 and Joseph Loewenstein, *Ben Jonson and Possessive Authorship* (Cambridge: CUP, 2002).
[37] Stanley Fish, 'Authors-Readers: Jonson's Community of the Same', *Representations* 7 (1984): 26-58; recently Paula Blank, 'Jonson's family values', in Amy Boesky and Mary Thomas, eds., *Form and reform in Renaissance England* (Newark: Delaware UP, 2000), 127-149. On Jonson and Lipsius: Robert Evans, *Jonson, Lipsius, and the Politics of Renaissance Stoicism* (Wakefield: Longwood Academic Press, 1992).
[38] Mark Bland, 'William Stansby and the Production of *The Workes of Beniamin Jonson*, 1615-16', *The Library* 20 (1998): 1-34, 28.

Jonson's intellectual associations.[39] This paper will build on the bibliographically 'ungathered' Jonson, showing the ways in which commendatory poetry embeds him in diverse, geographical, social and institutional associations, which are often politically engaged.

Jerome McGann has widened the term 'paratext' to include any physical feature of a book – the ink and paper on which it is printed – but conventional paratexts (dedications, title-pages, commendatory verses) remain unique witnesses to a book's social and collaborative origins.[40] Commendatory poems record where the book has come from, and where it is going. They can show that a book has not only emerged from a specific author, but from an author embedded in a wider milieu. Commendatory poems record the *geographical* space from which the volume emerges (e.g. London, Scotland); secondly, they record its *institutional* context (the court, Inns of Court, theatres etc.); thirdly, its *social* context (groups of antiquarians, lawyers, poets). Of course, all these associations overlap, but it is useful to begin with this simple framework. Commendatory poems can show a book is directed to an intended *readership* (possibly similar to the geographical, institutional, or social context of production); secondly, they offer the reader multiple ways of *reading* the text; thirdly, they may offer the book to *specific*

[39] E.g. Mark Bland, 'Jonson, Biathanatos and the Interpretation of Manuscript Evidence', *Studies in Bibliography* 51 (1998): 154-182. On Jonson's library see David McPherson, 'Ben Jonson's Library and Marginalia: New Information from Hatfield House', *SP* 71 (1974): 1-106. On Jonson's marginalia see Robert C. Evans, *Habits of Mind* (London: Associated UP, 1995).

[40] Jerome McGann, *The Textual Condition* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1991), 13-14 and Gerard Genette, *Paratexts*, trans. Jane E. Lewin (Cambridge: CUP, 1987). David Bergeron has surveyed Jonson's own paratexts to his plays, arguing they depart from praise for patrons to praise the reader (*Textual Patronage in English Drama, 1570-1640* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), 119-139).

individuals, as an object of patronage.[41] Commendatory poems were often clearly produced collaboratively, sharing specific tropes and locutions. Jonson's presence in a volume he commends is therefore not delimited by the title of his poem, and his signature at the end. The poems need to be read with an awareness of the dialogues with which they engage other paratexts, and the text itself, as well as the material form of the book. Jonson is the largest Renaissance contributor of commendatory poems, so he took the genre seriously.[42] And one reason to do so was that the contribution of commendatory verse, and the construction of the milieu from which a volume arises, is a political act.

One map drawn of the politics of literary communities in the early Stuart period has been particularly influential. David Norbrook has argued, following Whig and Marxist scholarship on the causes of the Civil War, Jonson and the 'Sons of Ben' opposed a loose grouping of 'Spenserian' poets – William Browne, Michael Drayton, Christopher Brooke and George Wither – who were broadly politically oppositional.[43] Norbrook sees the court (Jonson) and the country (Spenserians) as gradually becoming more divided in the lead up to the Civil War, and argues that the intellectual heritage of 1640s' republicanism was long and deep-rooted in England. The opposition between Jonson and the Spenserians is factional and ideological. The factional dispute can be summarized as a question of courtly patronage: 'The

[41] On Jonson's ability to adapt his books for several patrons, see Alison V. Scott, 'Marketing the Gift: Jonson, Multiple Patronage, and Strategic Exchange', *Parergon* 20 (2003): 135-159.
[42] He contributed to twenty-nine printed books in English, two printed books in Latin, and one manuscript.
[43] David Norbrook, *Poetry and Politics in the English Renaissance* (Oxford: OUP, 2002, rev. edn.), 173-223. Michelle O'Callaghan, *The "shepheards nation"* (Oxford: OUP, 2000) has expanded these arguments. Her more recent study, *The English Wits: Literature and Sociability in Early Modern England* (Oxford: OUP, 2007) does go some way towards presenting a more subtle picture of Jonson's relationship to Jacobean literary culture.

first…thing that divided [the Spenserians] from Jonson…was that he was in favour and they were not'.[44] Ideologically, the Spenserians' collections, such as *The Shepheards Pipe* and *The Shepherds Hunting* were collaborative enterprises, which adumbrate proto-Republican modes of political association; they were committed to creating a forum for public poetry, which would criticize the *pax Jacoba* on sectarian grounds, and would oppose encroachments on the English constitution by James and Charles. Norbrook argues that the Spenserians represent a country oppositional party in poetry, characterized by provincial loyalty, and an association of honest, uncompromised rhetoric with the country, as opposed to the vice and dissemblance of courtly intrigue.[45] Although Julie Sanders has reanalysed Jonson's communalism to suggest his drama implies proto-Republicanism, effectively switching his work to the opposite extreme in a polarized political environment, this chapter shall attempt to put pressure on the map of political and literary associations itself.[46]

Jonson's commendatory poems gather together literary communities by looking back over earlier associations to construct continuities between the past and present, before turning to the future to suggest ways in which those communities will develop. Analysing representative examples of Jonson's commendatory poems permits close attention to this technique. The diversity of Jonson's associations cuts across the division between Jonson and 'the

[44] Norbrook, *Poetry* 176.
[45] For a summary, see Martin Butler, *Theatre and Crisis 1632-1642* (Cambridge: CUP, 1984), 14-15. Norbrook is careful to point out that the Spenserians 'were by no means a monolithic, ideologically coherent group' (*Poetry* 176), but his approach to Stuart literary communities and their politics remains problematic even after such qualifications.
[46] Julie Sanders, *Ben Jonson's Theatrical Republics* (Houndmills: Macmillan, 1998).

Spenserians'; any attempt to reify 'opposition' in the early-modern period is doomed. Focusing on being 'in favour' or 'out of favour' draws on a concept of division between 'court' and 'country' which turns the court into a centralized *locus* of power, and simplifies geographically dispersed centres of patronage.[47] But dispensing with terms such as 'court' and country', as revisionists have argued, will not quite do: we need to be aware of the interactions between multiple centres of power.[48] Historicist critics have begun to read Jonson without Althusserian-influenced New Historicist models of centralized state power, which are anachronistic when applied to the early-modern period.[49] I shall here extend the approach of Martin Butler, who has situated Jonson's works in their local context, and shown that they are anxiously engaged with complex patronage relationships and factional disputes.[50] Secondly, the associations which Jonson is engaged in creating often feel the pressure of complex political issues, both factional divisions and ideological disputes. In particular, Jonson's model of turning back to the past to construct continuities with present communities is often politicized by the pressures placed on issues of custom and continuity in the early-Stuart period. Post-revisionist historical analysis has identified conflict in Stuart England between Parliament and Crown over perceived breaches of ancient customs enshrined in the

[47] Norbrook is influenced by Perez Zagorin, *The Court and Country* (London: Routledge, 1969).
[48] For the revisionists' approach, see Kevin Sharpe, *Criticism and Compliment* (Cambridge: CUP, 1987) ch.1. Post-revisionists are returning to Zagorin's model, although with a more nuanced approach to the ways in which surviving evidence bears witness to conflict, and without his teleological narrative; see references to Richard Cust's work below.
[49] 'There is a need…to view Jonson through a prism other than that of the court' (Kate Chedgzoy, Julie Sanders, and Susan Wiseman, eds. *Refashioning Ben Jonson* (Houndmills: Macmillan, 1998), 1) A classic New Historicist reading of Jonson is Jonathan Goldberg, *James I and the Politics of Literature* (Baltimore: John Hopkins UP, 1983) 176-186.
[50] For example, Martin Butler, '"Servant, but not Slave": Ben Jonson at the Jacobean Court', *Proceedings of the British Academy* 90 (1996): 65-93.

common law.[51] At key moments of pressure on such legal customs, Jonson's own personal returns to past literary associations reflect, and reflect on, the politics of custom. These issues often place Jonson in a position critical of monarchical power, showing him capable of complex public engagements with political issues. Thirdly, this paper shall contest the model of Jonson bifurcated into early and late selves. In isolation from the court, Jonson has been seen to experiment with neo-Spenserian rhetoric, creating pieces of Elizabethan nostalgia which implied political discontent with the Caroline regime. This position has been most famously articulated by Anne Barton, and has encouraged an important revaluation of the significance of the late works.[52] However such harking back, such personal returns to the past, are present in Jonson's commendatory poetry throughout his career. Jonson emerges as a consistently complex, politically engaged figure, not one bifurcated between politically distinct early and late selves.

HUGH HOLLAND'S *PANCHARIS* (1603) AND THE STUART ACCESSION

Jonson's earliest commendatory poems are to be found in contexts with which Jonson is not conventionally associated. They meditate on inspired rhetoric: in Jonson's first commendatory poem, to Thomas Palmer's manuscript book, *The Sprite of Trees and Herbs*, he falls 'giddy with amazement' into a 'deep trance', which is represented visually by asterisks.[53] Jonson's Catholicism led

[51] See the essays collected in Richard Cust and Ann Hughes, eds., *Conflict in Early Stuart England* (New York: Longman, 1989). On Stuart ideological divisions see J.P. Somerville, *Royalists and Patriots* (1986; Harlow: Pearson Education, 1999). For an overview of revisionists' notions of consensus see Kevin Sharpe, *Remapping Early Modern England* (Cambridge: CUP, 2000), ch.1.
[52] Anne Barton, *Ben Jonson: Dramatist* (Cambridge: CUP, 1984) ch.14.
[53] BL Add. MS. 18040.

him to contribute to the Jesuit controversialist Thomas Wright's *The Passion of the Mind*, along with Hugh Holland. But the verse before Holland's *Pancharis* provides a particularly useful instance both of Jonson's early associations, and the ways in which his poetry meditates upon such associations.[54] The Welsh poet Hugh Holland was educated at Westminster School, where he met Jonson, Camden and Robert Cotton.[55] He wrote mainly commendatory poems, and his only extended work is *Pancharis*, an historical poem on the subject of Owen Glendower's love for Henry V's widow, Katharine. On the title page, Holland claims the poem was 'Long since intended to her Maiden Majesty' (A2r), Elizabeth, but is now to be presented to James and his family. The volume, in other words, looks in two directions: back towards the Elizabethan period, and on into new patronage links among the Stuarts. The poem itself looks back to the Ovidian epyllia of the 1590s: it has a framing narrative of Venus and her son Cupid, characteristic of the poems of Marlowe, Shakespeare and Chapman.[56] The poem also calls to mind the historical narratives of the Tudor union of England: Katharine and Owen are Henry VII's grandparents. So the paratextual material has a particular patronage negotiation to make: it must turn an essentially Elizabethan poem into a work suitable for the Stuart royal family. Holland's epistle addressed to Robert Cotton, the antiquary, and appended to *Pancharis*, is a crucial part of this strategy. Holland claims Cotton had initially encouraged him to make a gift of the *Pancharis* manuscript: 'to have gone into *Scotland* and to have given it to the king' (D4v). And Holland finally promises two

[54] Hugh Holland, *Pancharis* (London, 1603).
[55] See Louise Imogen Guiney, *Recusant Poets* (London: Sheed & Ward, 1938), 361-71.
[56] For recent work on the 1590s epyllion see Georgia Brown, *Redefining Elizabethan Literature* (Cambridge: CUP, 2004), ch.3.

more parts to the work, the first dedicated to Prince Henry, the second to Anne. Holland recognises the heterogeneous nature of James' court, and rightly predicted that all three courts would become major centres for patronage.[57] The volume, therefore, presents a slightly old-fashioned 1590s poem, emerging from a Welsh author with links to an antiquarian milieu, and attempts to turn the work into an object of patronage for three different courts.

Jonson's poem extends this focus on multiple courts to explore the geographical complexity of his literary associations at the turn of the century. Jonson's commendatory poem is a chorographical 'Ode *allegoric*', in which the 'black swan' (the swarthy Hugh Holland) flies around the whole of the British Isles, beginning and ending with 'the breast of *Tamisis*' (8). Chorography was an historical mode in which narratives grow out of particular places in the landscape, and was made famous by Elizabethan antiquarians, especially William Camden in his chorographic description of the British Isles, *Britannia* (1586). *Pancharis*' paratexts link the work to antiquarian circles – it has a commendatory poem addressed to Camden, and a postscript to Robert Cotton – and Jonson's chorographic poem is appropriate to this milieu.[58] Jonson's early work would be influenced by antiquarians: he cites Camden's river poem '*Con. Tam. & Isis.*' in the notes to *The King's Entertainment*, as an example of contemporary application of the Roman origins of the British people.[59] And the altar inscription in *Hymenaei* may

[57] For example, Malcolm Smuts, 'Cultural Diversity and Cultural Change at the Court of James I', in Linda Levy Peck, ed., *The Mental World of the Jacobean Court* (Cambridge: CUP, 1991), 99-112 and Leeds Barroll, 'The Court of the First Stuart Queen', in Peck, ed., *Jacobean Court*, 191-208.
[58] On Cotton's literary associations see Kevin Sharpe, *Sir Robert Cotton, 1586-1631* (Oxford: OUP, 1979), 195-222.
[59] H&S 10:390.

have been suggested by Cotton's collection of Roman inscriptions.[60] But the adoption of antiquarian chorography is politically significant. Spenser had written chorographic poetry in the 1590s (*Colin Clouts Come Home Again*), and the genre is particularly associated with early-seventeenth century 'Spenserian' works such as Drayton's *Poly-Olbion*.[61] Local diversity and independence in Spenserian chorography is distinguished from Jonson's country-house poetry, in which the landscape is dominated by the single, seigneurial perspective of the landowner's house – a landowner who is the servant of the Crown.[62] Jonson's chorographic ode troubles such a binary: centralized, courtly pastoral is too simple to describe the multiplicity of Jonson's early literary associations.

Jonson asks the swan to begin its flight by crossing 'old Mone' (Welsh for Anglesey) into Wales, and 'to *Cluid* stoop low / The Vale, that bred thee pure, as her Hills Snow' (40). Llwyd is Holland's birth-place in Denbighshire, North Wales, and the swan's stop is deliberate. Jonson's North Wales connections are only beginning to be understood, but Christ Church MS 184 bears witness to Jonson's associations with John Salusbury of Llewenii, the most powerful landowner in Denbighshire.[63] Jonson had sent to Salusbury a series of poems, including 'An Ode to James, Earl of Desmond' published in 1640. Salusbury had encouraged Jonson to contribute to

---

[60] D. McKitterick, 'From Camden to Cambridge: Sir Robert Cotton's Roman Inscriptions and their Subsequent History', in C.J. Wright, ed., *Sir Robert Cotton as Collector* (London: British Library, 1997), 105-28.

[61] See Leah Marcus, 'Politics and Pastoral: writing the court on the countryside', in Kevin Sharpe and Peter Lake, eds., *Culture and politics in early Stuart England* (London: Macmillan, 1994). On *Poly-Olbion*, see Richard Helgerson, *Forms of Nationhood* (Chicago: Chicago UP, 1992) ch.3; Claire McEachern, *The Poetics of English nationhood, 1590-1612* (Cambridge: CUP, 1996), ch.3.

[62] Recently on the difference between Jonson's country-house poetry and chorography see Martin Elsky, 'Microhistory and Cultural Geography: Ben Jonson's "To Sir Robert Wroth" and the Absorption of Local Community in the Commonwealth', *Renaissance Quarterly* 53 (2000): 500-28.

[63] Mark Bland, '"As far from all Reuolt": Sir John Salusbury, Christ Church MS 184 and Ben Jonson's first ode', *English Manuscript Studies, 1100-1700* 8 (2000): 43-78.

Robert Chester's *Love's Martyr* (1601), along with Shakespeare and Chapman. Like *Pancharis*, *Love's Martyr* looks back to 1590s epyllia, while Shakespeare's 'Let the bird of loudest lay' revisits Sidney's eighth eclogue. But Jonson's 'Epode' is the first poem in English with this title, and both Jonson and Chapman may have been seeking new patronage connections, possibly from Salusbury, by contributing to the volume.[64] Chester also lived in Denbighshire, and was probably a member of Salusbury's household. The 'Ode' form may have reflected this Welsh context. Although Jonson later became the poet of satirical epigrams and epistles of praise, at this stage in his career he was probably planning a collection of Horatian Odes.[65] The form seems to have been particularly associated with his Welsh connections: Jonson contributed the 'Ode *enthusiastick*' to *Love's Martyr*, as well as sending manuscript odes to Salusbury. Furthermore, the unusual spelling of Jonson's name might be read in this context. Although critics have argued it is an attempt by Jonson to link his name's uniqueness with his own poetic uniqueness, recent research suggests the name is a contraction of 'ap Jones' (son of Jones), and common in the Welsh marches.[66] Jonson started to use this spelling in 1604, and it may be that the decision was a deliberate attempt to link himself to Welsh associations. So the swan is not simply revisiting the vale that 'breeds' Hugh Holland, but also an important early patronage connection for Jonson himself.

---

[64] William Shakespeare, *The Complete Sonnets and Poems*, ed. Colin Burrow (Oxford: OUP, 2002) 82-90.
[65] Bland, '"Reuolt"', 45. See Bodleian Rawlinson Manuscript Poetry 31.
[66] See David Riggs, *Ben Jonson* (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1989), 114. On the derivation of Jonson's name, see Mark Bland, 'Ben Jonson and the Legacies of the Past', *Huntington Library Quarterly* 67 (2004): 371-400, 399-400.

When the swan travels '[o]uer Ierna main' (42, the Irish sea) to arrive in Ireland, where 'the rout…late were out' (43-45) of the Irish Pale, the instability of the Irish landscape reflects troubled literary associations. In chorography, historical narrative is attached to the landscape in which it took place, and so Jonson invokes a specific piece of recent Irish history: the pacification of the Tyrone Rebellion in 1601 by Charles Mountjoy, the Lord Deputy of Ireland. Mountjoy 'more hath wonne / Vpon the *Kerne*, and wildest *Irishry*, / Then time hath donne' (52-4). British heterogeneity is registered linguistically by placing the technical term for an Irish footsoldier, a 'kern', amidst the largely classical nomenclature throughout the poem. Mountjoy is also an inspiration for poets: 'Who euer sipped at *Baphyre* river…And is not rap't / With entheate rage, to publish their bright tracts?' (57, 60-61). John Davies had praised Mountjoy in his *Microcosmus*, also published in 1603 and Josuah Sylvester wrote verses to be published as part of the *Divine Weeks and Workes* (1598). Jonson may have praised Mountjoy specifically as an inspiration to poets as a way of making covert reference to the fall of Essex, who had been Mountjoy's predecessor as Lord Deputy of Ireland. Jonson may have been manoeuvring for the patronage of Essex at this period, and *Poetaster* (1602) and *Sejanus* (1603) may reflect on his fall.[67] Essex was one of the major patrons of poetry in the 1590s, and his death created a vacuum in the networks of patronage which many hoped would be filled by the arrival of the new Stuart king.[68] Essex's shadowy presence behind these lines may be suggested by the earlier references to North Wales. Essex was, by the late sixteenth century, the most powerful noble landowner

[67] See Tom Cain, '"Satyres, That Girde and Fart at the Time": *Poetaster* and the Essex Rebellion', in Sanders, Chedgzoy, and Wiseman, eds., *Refashioning*, 48-70.
[68] Many of those who received Essex's patronage were favoured by Prince Henry: J.H.M. Salmon, 'Seneca and Tacitus in Jacobean England', in Peck, ed., *Jacobean Court*, 169-188.

in South Wales – the fact South Wales is never referred to in the poem might perhaps suggest that it has been erased from the map of patronage connections in Britain.[69] The juxtaposition of the story of Montjoy's heroism with the swan's arrival in Scotland (flying across the 'scatter'd Orcades') implies the source of new poetic patronage.

The swan's final stop, in England, is also significant and suggests literary connections that Jonson will pursue throughout his life. The swan is asked to travel over '*Tine*, / *Humber*, or *Owse*', until it arrives 'over Land to *Trent*', where Jonson orders it to 'coole thy Plumes' (73-76). The Trent runs through the North Midlands: Lincolnshire, Nottinghamshire, and into Derby. This is the landscape of a key early patronage relationship: the fifth earl of Rutland, Roger Manners, and his wife, Elizabeth. In his 'Epistle to Elizabeth, Countess of Rutland', Jonson wittily exploits patronage rivalries, by commending both Elizabeth Manners and Lucy, Countess of Bedford, another early patron.[70] The 'Ode *allegoric*' playfully exploits the same rivalry: the swan does not 'decline' to the river Ouse, which runs through Bedford.[71] Neither of these figures are clearly targets in the volume's search for patronage, but this perhaps suggests something about Jonson's purpose in the poem. The poem is not only a bid for patronage, but an attempt to draw together and reflect upon the ways in which Jonson's multiple literary associations encompass the British Isles. The swan's flight charts existing literary relationships, such as the North Wales links, and Jonson's links to the Midlands, as well as projecting future literary

[69] See Bland, '"Reuolt"', 53.
[70] Robert C. Evans, *Ben Jonson and the Poetics of Patronage* (London: Associated UP, 1989), 48-50.
[71] Jonson's gift-copy of *Cynthia's Revels* was presented to Bedford around this time, and links her with the county: '*she, that Bounty / appropriates still vnto that* County' (3-4).

associations with the Scottish king and nobility. It does this in a synthesis of poetic forms, the chorographical ode, which anticipates new directions in Stuart verse as well as turning back to the forms of the 1590s. It projects a vision of Britain which is itself as complex and multiple as the literary communities which inhabit it, and cannot be simplified into two competing associations.

The *Pancharis* volume, therefore, meditates on literary and historical continuities: Holland's poem is essentially a work of the 1590s 'long since intended' to Elizabeth, and Jonson's poem looks back to 1590s literary associations, as well as forward to the Stuart age. Such meditations were not innocent in 1603. At the point of James' accession, some feared that a king with no knowledge of English Parliamentary tradition, coming from Scotland with no equivalent of Fortescue's theorizing of mixed monarchy, might abandon the traditions of common law and mixed monarchy.[72] Levack has shown that the question of the Union of Britain provoked fears that civil law might be imposed on English common law.[73] This is an anxiety felt in Samuel Daniel's *Panegyrike* (1603) on James' accession. Daniel's advice-to-princes poem insists on the maintenance of continuities in English law and politics: 'We shall continue one and remaine all one / In Law, in Iustice, and in Magistrate'.[74] The poem's manuscript history suggests Holland's claim that *Pancharis* was intended 'long since' to Elizabeth may be a fiction, designed to link the poem to debates over literary and political continuities. Katherine Duncan-

[72] Jenny Wormald, 'James VI and I, *Basilikon Doron* and *The Trew Law of Free Monarchies*: The Scottish Context and the English Translation', Peck, ed., *Jacobean Court*, 36-54.
[73] On the British Question and constitutional change, see Brian P. Levack, 'Law, sovereignty and the union', in Roger A. Mason, ed., *Scots and Britons* (Cambridge, 1994), 213-237.
[74] Samuel Daniel, *A Panegyrike Congratvlatorie* (London, 1603), A8r. On Daniel's *Panegyrike* and the politics of literary 'custom' see Helgerson, *Nationhood* ch.1.

Jones has recently discovered an early manuscript version of the first thirty-two lines of *Pancharis*, entitled 'OWEN TUDYR' and dated on its title-page to 1601.[75] The manuscript looks like a gift-copy, but only represents a fragment of the poem. Duncan-Jones tentatively suggests that Holland might have been asking advice on whether the poem was worth finishing as a compliment to Elizabeth. In other words, in 1601 it was possible that the poem was still unfinished. Read in such a context, the poem appears deliberately passé, implying in its form that 1603 did not constitute a decisive break from the past. Holland's reference in his epistle to Robert Cotton's descent from the '*le Bruse*' family may be read as a covert reference to the Union question: Robert the Bruce was a fierce defender of Scottish separatism, perhaps implying that the countries need to preserve their own independent traditions (D5r). Jonson's poem responds to both questions, drawing out continuities between communities that imply 1603 is not a period of radical transformation, and depicting Britain's land as irreducibly diverse.[76] This extraordinary commendatory poem illustrates the ways in which social continuities between the groups and institutions which produce literature might suggest the preservation of larger, political continuities.

JOHN FLETCHER'S *THE FAITHFUL SHEPHERDESS* (1609) AND LEICESTERSHIRE POLITICS

[75] Katherine Duncan-Jones, 'A Feather from the Black Swan's Wing: Hugh Holland's *Owen Tudyr* (1601)', *English Manuscript Studies: 1100-1700* 11 (2002): 93-108.

[76] David Norbrook's account of the accession of James opposes Jonson's ability to ingratiate himself with the monarch with Daniel's insistence on the maintenance of his firm political principles (*Poetry*, 157-58).

Between 1603 and 1609, the books Jonson commends are mostly dedicated to Prince Henry: Sylvester's *Divine Weeks and Works* (1605), and in 1609 Clement Edmondes' commentaries on Caesar, and two song-books by Ferrabosco. But in 1609, Jonson also commended a volume which connects him with the geographical complexity of the associations mapped out in the preface to *Pancharis*: John Fletcher's *The Faithful Shepherdess*.[77] Whereas in *Pancharis*, Jonson presented literary communities as embedded within the British landscape, in *The Faithful Shepherdess* the relationship between literary communities is more mobile and unstable. Fletcher's play is another intermediary volume: it looks forward to the influence of Italian tragicomedy, and back to the Spenserian pastoral of the Elizabethan period.[78] The play is commended by the London theatrical community (Nathan Field, Francis Beaumont, Jonson and George Chapman) and is dedicated to three patrons: Sir Walter Aston, Sir William Skipwith and Robert Towneshend. The commendatory poems were clearly produced in close collaboration, and all share two features: they draw a distinction between the play for the theatre, and the play as a textual artefact; and they comment on the audience who condemned the play at its first performance.[79] More than any other poem analysed in this paper, Jonson's contribution is not a stand-alone work; its complexity is only revealed when located

[77] On the dating of the play see John Fletcher et al., *The Dramatic Works of the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon*, ed. Fredson Bowers, 11 vols. (Cambridge: CUP, 1966-1996), 3:485. References to poems not by Jonson are to this edition.

[78] On Italian influence see James J. Yoch, 'The Renaissance Dramatization of Temperance: The Italian Revival of Tragicomedy and *The Faithful Shepherdess*', in Nancy Klein Maguire, ed., *Renaissance Tragicomedy* (New York: AMS Press, 1987), 115-38. On the play's Spenserian language, see Philip J. Finkelpearl, 'John Fletcher as Spenserian Playwright: *The Faithful Shepherdess* and *The Island Princess*', *Studies in English Literature* 27 (1987): 285-302.

[79] Field fears 'the monster' who 'clap[s] his thousand hands' (3:490, ll.33). Beaumont condemns the 'multitudes…whose judgements goes / Headlong' (3:491, ll.27-28) according to theatrical fashion.

in the network of interactions between the book's poems, poets, and patrons. This may help to answer Herford and Simpsons' question as to why this 'fine tribute' was not reprinted in the *Epigrammes*: it simply would not have been the same poem when relocated to this context.[80]

The volume demonstrates the complex interactions between the London literary scene and regional centres of patronage. Fletcher's patron in this period was the fifth Earl of Huntingdon, the leading Leicestershire nobleman and patron of Spenserian poetry.[81] Although Gordon McMullan has finely analysed the volume's relationship to Leicestershire and the Midlands riots of 1607, new research into factional divisions within Leicestershire makes a reconsideration of the volume necessary.[82] Richard Cust has shown that early seventeenth-century Leicestershire was becoming politically divided. After the death of the third Earl of Huntingdon, the most powerful figure in local politics, the Grey family had become more assertive, leading to factional strife between their family and the Huntingdons. The Grey family by 1606 had constructed an alliance with two other important local centres of power: the Beaumonts of Coleorton, and Sir William Skipwith.[83] The Beaumonts of Coleorton were cousins of Francis Beaumont, and Finkelpearl observes that they would have been a useful conduit for information on both

[80] H&S VIII, 359-60.
[81] On Spenserian literature and Huntingdon see James Knowles, 'Marston, Skipwith and *The Entertainment at Ashby*', *English Manuscript Studies: 1100-1700* 3 (1992): 137-192.
[82] Gordon McMullan, *The Politics of Unease in the Plays of John Fletcher* (Amherst: Masachussets UP, 1994), 56-65.
[83] See Richard Cust, 'Purveyance and politics in Jacobean Leicestershire', in P. Fleming, A. Gross and J.R. Lander, eds., *Regionalism and revision* (London: Hambledon, 1999), 145-62.

Leicestershire and Parliamentary politics for Francis.[84] Cust argues that the factional dispute within Leicestershire was really a family rivalry, motivated by the preservation of honour, but politics was a way of articulating that conflict. Grey and his allies, especially Skipwith, took an independent line in Parliament over the administration of purveyance, opposing Huntingdon. The local conflict influences Parliament, and struggles in Parliament in turn affect the county. Similar interactions take place in the volume. Fletcher chooses not to dedicate the play to the Earl of Huntingdon, but instead seems to align himself with the Beaumont-Skipwith faction. In his dedication to Skipwith he claims 'I have all I sought for, / For no ich of greater name'. At the end of the poem he asks, 'Onely to your selfe, and such / whose true touch / Makes all good, let me seeme witty', a declaration of loyalty that might seem anxious in the context of divisions between his patrons. The volume takes figures from the London theatrical community, and draws out patronage alignments on the basis of local, Leicestershire disputes.

What is all this to Jonson? He is connected directly with the Skipwith family through their manuscript miscellany (BL Add. MS 25707), compiled from the early- to mid-seventeenth century and containing several of Jonson's poems.[85] And Jonson is also linked to Leicestershire through the patronage of the Manners family, who were major landowners in the North Midlands, a connection already suggested by the swan in Jonson's *Pancharis* poem descending to the Trent. Skipwith was a prominent member of a literary circle gathered under Sir Henry Goodyer, a circle

[84] Philip J. Finkelpearl, *Court and Country in the Plays of Beaumont and Fletcher* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1990), 14.
[85] See Peter Beal, *Index of English Literary Manuscripts*, 5 vols. (London: Mansell, 1980), 1.2:233-295.

with which Jonson had clear connections. He addressed two epigrams to Goodyer (LXXXV and LXXXVI), which meditate on literary circles in ways characteristic of Jonson's commendatory poems. In the first, the image of the hawk, a bird 'sacred to Apollo', which 'in circle tarrie' (4, 9), becomes an emblem for the poets gathering around Goodyer himself. In the second epigram, the social intimacy of literary endeavour is treated more directly: Jonson praises Goodyer for 'making thy friends bookes, and thy bookes friends' (4). Sir Walter Aston, another dedicatee of Fletcher's play and Michael Dratyon's patron, was an important member of this circle: the juxtaposition of Jonson, Skipwith and Aston might have evoked this complex literary scene stretching from London into the Midlands.[86] The final dedicatee of the book was also an early patron of Jonson's, Sir Robert Towneshend, who received an inscribed gift copy of *Sejanus*: 'The testimony of my Affection, and Observance to my noble Friend S^{r} Robert Townseehend w^{ch} I desire may remayne wth him and last beyond Marble'.[87] Gordon McMullan's analysis suggests that Jonson's importance to the volume's patronage ambitions might have been to link Towneshend, a London figure, with the country circles suggested by the other patrons.[88] But Jonson is connected in complex ways with all the patrons, the literary circle surrounding Goodyer, Aston and Skipwith, and with the factional rivalries in Leicestershire.

Jonson did not only have patronage connections with the counties. He is also close to Francis Beaumont, a member of the family allied to Skipwith and the Greys.

---

[86] See also Dennis Kay, 'Poems by Sir Walter Aston, and a Date for the Donne/Godyer Verse Epistle "*Alternis Vicibus*"', *Review of English Studies* 37 (1986): 198-210.
[87] H&S, 1:30-31.
[88] McMullan, *Fletcher*, 65.

Jonson's poem is printed immediately after Beaumont's, and they develop as a sequence. The last line of Beaumont's poem refers ironically to Fletcher's theatre audience as his 'shreudest judges', which Jonson picks up in his first line: 'The wise, and many-headed *Bench*' (3:491-2). For the coterie audience with access to manuscript culture, the close associations of these figures in print recalls Beaumont's verse letters to Jonson, widely circulated in seventeenth-century manuscripts. Beaumont's first verse-letter to Jonson, probably written in late July or August 1605, explicitly presents itself as a letter from 'the country', in fact his Leicestershire home, Gracedieu, to Jonson 'at London'.[89] The poem reflects on the pressure of political divisions within the countryside. In the country, Beaumont says, they have 'a potion sent vs downe to drinke', which erases all memory of division, 'Drownes all past iniuryes', acting as 'A medicine to obey our Magistrates' and makes them feel 'we all are equall'. His implication is that the country is not a pastoral retreat from courtly infighting: he situates himself in a factionalized province while pretending no such divisions exist. His commendatory poem to Fletcher's play offers another image of such factional dispute: the play has been judged by a 'thousand men', 'Scarce two of which can understand the lawes / Which they should judge by, nor the parties cause'. For a reader with knowledge of manuscript poetry, Fletcher's volume not only places into print an association between Beaumont and Jonson, but also does so in a context which echoes the circulated verse epistles. Jonson's contribution to Fletcher's volume acted as a similar kind of review of earlier literary associations to Jonson's poem in *Pancharis*,

[89] For the text of the poem, see Mark Bland, 'Francis Beaumont's Verse Letters to Ben Jonson and "The Mermaid Club"', *English Manuscript Studies 1100-1700* 12 (2005): 139-179, 170-172.

except here the complexity of the review can only be traced by reading the paratextual material as a whole.

Locating Jonson and the volume as a whole in between London and the counties, in mobile literary and patronage circles, returns Jonson's poem to its original print context. Each poem in the collection depicts differently the play's first audience. Fletcher's 'To the Reader' presents the audience as country bumpkins who 'missing whitsun ales, creame, wassells and morris-dances, began to be angry' (3:497). Jonson's poem, however, treats the audience as urban characters from a city comedy, or the morally defunct figures of his *Epigrammes*. They were upset not to find 'vices, which they look'd for', in contrast to Fletcher's depiction of an audience eager for country sports. Nearly half Jonson's poem describes the play's audience:

> (Compos'd of *Gamester*, *Captaine*, *Knight*, *Knight's man*,
> *Lady*, or *Pusil*, that weares maske, or fan,
> *Veluet*, or *Taffata* cap, rank'd in the darke
> With the shops *Foreman*, or some such *braue sparke*,
> That may judge for his *six-pence*) (3-7)

The precision of these references to the lowest price of admission to the public theatre, to ladies' fashions, and to the indoor theatres where *Faithful* was first performed ('rank'd in the darke') creates a double perspective within the poem. The reader is intimately knowledgeable about the theatre, but the fact that this

knowledge is stated rather than taken for granted, suggests that the reader is placed outside this group of gallants. We are an observer of this crowd, rather than an habitué who ceases to notice their mores. Jonson specifically uses the phrase 'many-headed' (1), from Horace's first *Epistle*, in which Horace differentiates himself from the mass of the Roman people.[90] The play's patrons, or readers with access to geographically complex manuscript culture, are invited to view the play from a perspective outside the London theatrical environment. The volume not only emerges from a combination of the London theatrical world and Leicestershire landowners, but Jonson's poem helps to recreate the patrons' perspective on the London theatre: observing fashionable theatrical performances without becoming entirely absorbed into that milieu. Jonson's poem, then, registers the geographical complexity of the book's movements. This is an important shift in emphasis from the *Pancharis* volume, in which literary circles were embedded in specific milieux, rather than mobile and overlapping. Jonson commends a pastoral with much in common with neo-Spenserian rhetoric, and in doing so demonstrates the manifold connections in literature and patronage between London and the counties: the volume records interactions between 'court' and 'country', rather than rivalry or antipathy.

SELDEN'S *TITLES OF HONOR* (1614) AND THE POLITICS OF LEGAL HISTORY

[90] Horace, *Satires ,Epistles and Ars Poetica*, ed. and trans., H. Rushton Fairclough (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP, 1978), *Epistles* 1.1.176.

Jonson commended one more work dedicated to Prince Henry before his death, *Coriats Crudities* (1611), before turning to books from the legal and Parliamentary community. The young antiquary John Selden, a friend of Cotton's and the author of a 1610 treatise on English legal history (*Jani Anglorum Facies Altera*), crosses over between legal communities and Jonson's scholarly, antiquarian associations. In *Pancharis*, Jonson's practice of drawing literary continuities between earlier and later periods was politicized by the transition into the Stuart period; 1614 was a similar period in which such continuities were politicized. In *Titles of Honor*, the community from which the volume emerges is geographically small, but this is perhaps due to the work's tighter focus on high politics – the debates in the 1610 and 1614 Parliaments.[91] The relationship between James and both these Parliaments was turbulent, and the issues at stake provoked reflection on the politics of custom. The key debate was over the royal power to collect 'impositions', taxes on imports and exports that were not granted by Parliament; this led to a much wider dispute over the power of the royal prerogative to override common law. If the monarch was allowed to collect taxes without consulting Parliament, several members argued, then his subjects' rights to their own property could no longer be protected by the common law. Although revisionists have played down the constitutional significance of the 1610 and 1614 Parliaments, post-revisionists have focused on the ways these Parliaments provoked wider debates in

[91] John Selden, *Titles of Honor* (London, 1614).

Stuart historiography over the politics of legal and historical custom.[92] The dispute among common lawyers was over the continuity of the common law: had the law been radically altered since Roman times? Whilst the most famous common lawyer of the early Stuart period, Edward Coke, argued that the common law had remained unchanged since pre-Norman times, the more mainstream opinion, articulated by Thomas Hedley in the 1610 Parliament, was that common law had evolved according to 'artificial reason', adapting to changing political needs and circumstances.[93] The law remained essentially the same, but this involved a measure of evolution. The notion of 'artificial reason' kept the law as the preserve of the legally educated: such 'artificial reason' could only be understood by common lawyers.[94]

Jonson may have encountered such debates through his legal connections. In 1613, he commended John Stephens' *Cinthias Revenge*. Stephens was a legal scholar, with particular interest in the history of the common law. His 'Satyre in defence of the common law' (1615) praised an unchanging law, which 'hast made / Way through the bloudy and victorious blade / Of *Danes* and *Normans*', but is now under threat from both scholars and church men.[95] But Jonson's most direct contact with the Addled Parliament was through Donne's friend, Christopher Brooke. He is often grouped with the Spenserians, contributing eclogues to Browne's *The Shepherds*

---

[92] Conrad Russell, *The Addled Parliament 1614* (Reading: University of Reading, 1992). For recent work see Stephen Clucas and Rosalind Davies, eds. *The Crisis of 1614 and The Addled Parliaments* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003).
[93] On legal debates see J.G.A. Pocock, *The Ancient Constitution and the Feudal Law* (1957; New York: CUP, 1987) 255-305; Somerville, *Royalists* 81-104.
[94] See Alan Cromartie, 'The Constitutionalist Revolution: The Transformation of Political Culture in Early Stuart England', *Past and Present* 163 (1999): 76-120.
[95] John Stephens, *Essayes and characters* (London, 1615), 29-50, 30.

Pipe, under the name of 'Cuddy'. Christopher Brooke sat as MP for York in both the 1610 and 1614 Parliaments, and in 1614 was one of the MPs to challenge the legality of impositions in a way which turned the Crown's monetary need into a constitutional issue: 'If the King may impose by his absolute power, then no man certain what he has, for it shall be subject to the King's pleasure'.[96] The ability to impose 'by his absolute power', in other words without the consent of Parliament, potentially creates a monarchical absolutism in which the subjects' rights to property are no longer guaranteed. Jonson was one of the writers to commend Brooke's poem, *The Ghost of Richard the Third*, entered in the Stationers' Register on 14th May 1614, in the midst of the Addled Parliament.[97] Brooke's poem embeds earlier literary forms – *The Mirror for Magistrates* – in current politics, by presenting Richard's usurpation as a process of legal manipulation.[98] Richard is a scholarly tyrant, and his study has allowed him to manipulate the law: 'I plaid with *Law*…To make a foot-stoole on't for me to rise' (E2r). Jonson's commendation of Brooke's poem highlights the law as a crucial issue in Brooke's work. His is the last in a sequence of commendatory poems, and begins by asking 'When these, and such, their voices have employed; / What place is for my *testimony* void?' (1-2); 'Or, to so many, and so *broad seals* had, / What can one *witness*, and a weak one, add' (2-3, emphasis added). Such legal rhetoric is also appropriate to the paratext's

[96] Maija Jansson, *Proceedings in Parliament, 1614* (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1988), 85.
[97] Christopher Brooke, *The Ghost of Richard the Third* (London, 1614). On the poem's relationship to the Addled Parliament see O'Callaghan, *The "shepheards nation"*, 63-85.
[98] In the *Mirror*, Richard simply overcomes laws with aggression, boasting 'For ryght through might I cruelly defaced' (*Mirror*.27), and Buckingham 'dyed without iudgement or order of lawes' (*Mirror.*196). References to Thomas Sackville, *The Mirror for Magistrates*, ed. Lily B. Campbell (Cambridge: CUP, 1938).

combination of legal and theatrical milieux, suggesting the ways in which the literary community was becoming aware of the political issues unfolding in Parliament: Chapman, Robert Daborne and Jonson commend the work alongside 'Fr. Dynne, Int. Temp.' and the legally educated poets, William Browne and George Wither.

Richard Brathwaite, as mentioned in the first part of this chapter, specifically links 'solid *Seldon*, and their *Cuddy* [Brooke] too', and Selden's *Titles of Honor* is closely connected with the themes of Brooke's poem.[99] Selden's *Titles of Honor* was entered in the Stationers' Register on 14th July 1614. Paul Christianson has argued that the book responded to the debates in the 1610 Parliament, historicizing Thomas Hedley's arguments.[100] Selden is quite specific that the Normans intervened to alter the law decisively: for example, 'Those kind of Militarie Fiefs or Fees as wee now have, were not till the Normans; with whom the custom of Wardships in Chivalrie…came into *England*' (301-302). Selden's work implies a constitutional, common-law framework in its reading of history: *Titles* even comes with an index so the reader can look up specific references to the common law.[101] Individual titles' histories are traced from the Roman period down through English history. Whilst the title's name frequently changes, the concept remains the same: continuity is preserved along with rational development.

---

[99] Richard Braithwaite, *A Strappado for the Diuell* (London, 1615), 23.
[100] Paul Christianson, *Discourse on History, Law and Governance in the Public Career of John Selden, 1610-1635* (Toronto: Toronto UP, 1996), 37-56.
[101] But Somerville argues the work would not have been connected with the common law: 'King James VI and I and John Selden: Two Voices on History and the Constitution', in Daniel Fischlin and Mark Fortier, eds., *Royal Subjects* (Detroit: Wayne State UP, 2002), 290-322.

Jonson's poem begins with a turn to his own past, as he expresses regret for the commendations he has given to some noblemen: 'I have too oft preferr'd / Men past their termes' (20-21). Such ill-deserved praise is placing the academic and literary sphere under threat. He describes the need to offer praise where it is not due as a 'penance', giving in to such pressures as a 'crime', and makes the author 'unto study, a…Pernitious enemie' (13-14). Jonson is connecting his characteristic practice of using commendatory poems to review, consolidate and develop social associations to Selden's own return to historical origins. Jonson begins his praise of Selden by suggesting that his work is a history of social relationships. He describes Selden having 'watched men, manners too, / Heard what times past have said, seen what ours do' (33-34). This perhaps echoes Selden's opening to his work, which begins by surveying the origins of 'Communities of life, and Ciuill Societie' (B1v). The texts of history that Selden has surveyed contain the records of social networks and the 'manners' that prevailed amongst them. Selden's reading of the documents from the past has placed him in physically close proximity to older societies: Jonson's metaphor throughout his praise for Selden is that he has 'heard' voices from the past, or 'seen' their practices. But this process of tracing such histories is not an innocent one. Political threats seem to be bearing in on Selden: his investigations have been an 'unweary'd paine', he has 'vext' fables, 'branded' impostures, his search has had a 'sharpnesse' (37, 39, 41, 59). The image of 'Impostures branded' is a particularly loaded one for Jonson, with his own thumb branded with a Tyburn 'T' after the murder of Gabriel Spencer. In a powerful analysis of Epigram CI, Robert Cummings has suggested that the 'libertie' of

historical writing (symbolized in the epigram by the works of Tacitus which would be read at dinner) is opposed to the world of political surveillance, represented by the exclusion of '*Pooly*, or *Parrot*' (36), two Elizabethan spies.[102] In this context, the praise of Selden having 'Innovations spide' (44) seems oxymoronic: Selden himself seems to be tainted with political compromises which have no place in the disinterested sphere of history. Tracing continuities and shifts in the history of social relationships has become increasingly politicized by 1614, both for Jonson and Selden.

The poem bears the pressure of the specific political context of the 1614 Parliament's debate over the extent to which the common law had developed and changed over time. Jonson praises Selden in terms which echo his own historical methodology, as laid out in the work's preface. Selden always wants to go back to the source, he will '*vent to you nothing quoted at second hand, but euer lou'd the Fountain*' (c4v). Jonson picks up the image of the '*Fountain*', when he praises Selden for having 'Sought out the Fountaines, Sources, Creekes, paths, ways, / And noted the beginnings and decayes!' (45-46). Jonson and Selden are certainly unanimous in praising this search for origins, but the nature of 'custom' which Jonson traces is unsettled. 'What blots and errours, have you watch'd and purg'd / Records, and authors of!' (42-43) suggests that Selden has traced a pristine tradition in the development of his titles; but, as we have already seen, this is a position far more similar to Edward Coke's, and one that cannot be applied easily to *Titles*. In the next sentence he seems much closer to praising Selden's own project, which has 'rectified

[102] Robert Cummings, 'Liberty and History in Jonson's Invitation to Supper', *Studies in English Literature* 40 (2000): 103-22.

/ Times, manners, customes!' (43-44). The word 'rectified' does not necessarily imply a return to origins, and so might allow for the process of rationally developing customs which Selden has traced. Jonson's final attempt to straddle the paradoxes of legal custom in 1614 seems incompatible with the praise of a return to 'the fountains, sources': 'Newness of Sense, Antiquitie of voyce!' (60) The poem, therefore, offers a multiple and conflicted reading of the work to which it is attached: it might be an attempt to chart the history of an unchanging common law, or a developing 'rectified' law, or finally a law which is essentially new, but bears traces of earlier rhetorical exposition ('Antiquitie of voyce'). Jonson's poem flirts with controversial political issues, without coming down definitively on one side or the other.[103] But such flirtations are risky, as the references to branding and spying suggest. The process of tracing continuities in the 'manners' of social groups, the practice of both Selden and Jonson, is becoming increasingly politically dangerous.

Jonson's poem, therefore, presents a divided attitude towards custom: Jonson is both reviewing his own past, and starting afresh, Selden is going back to the source, and presenting 'Newness of sense'. But the poem does look forward to new modes of literary association, as its final section turns to the work's dedication. Selden does not dedicate the *Titles* to a great lord, but 'To my most beloued Friend and Chamberfellow, M. Edward Heyward' (a2v). In this dedication, Selden presents an ideal sphere in which books are part of free intellectual exchange: 'Bookes should most fitly be consecrated to true louers of

[103] Martin Elsky, *Authorizing Words* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1989), 99-100 argues Jonson's commendatory poem to Clement Edmondes' Caesar commentaries resists all changes to customs. My argument suggest Jonson's attitude is more complex and difficult to pin down.

Goodnes and all good Learning'. Heyward has earned Selden's dedication, through friendship and learning: 'Our long societie of life…entitled You to it as from Mee'. In other words, the book represents not so much a new opportunity to create patronage relationships, but an emancipation from such relationships.[104] Jonson's poem praises Selden's decision: 'In offering this thy worke to no great Name' (69) he is demonstrating his status as a 'Monarch in letters' (65). Heyward can truly understand the work because he has 'wrought / In the same Mines of knowledge' (75-6), and because he has 'Humanitie enough to be a friend' (77). Both the previous works analysed have recorded complex patronage relationships stretching across the British Isles. This volume suggests a retreat from such geographical complexity: Selden is 'like a Compasse keeping one foot still / Upon your Center' (31-2), and it is his physical closeness to his 'learned chamber-fellow' that makes the dedication so appropriate. This closely knit group of writers, independent of any more powerful patrons, present a text which is both more politically threatened, and potentially threatening, than any with which Jonson had previously been involved. It is revealing that Jonson gathered together these two authors, Heyward and Selden, for a much more personally significant project, to commend his 1616 *Workes*.[105] Although individual works within the *Workes* volume are dedicated to individuals and institutions, the work itself is dedicated to no-one. This volume, too, represents an authorial emancipation from dependence on networks of patronage.

[104] On the practice of dedicating books to friends see Natalie Zemon Davis, 'Beyond the Market: Books as Gifts in Sixteenth-Century France', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 33 (1983): 69-88.
[105] Both *Titles* and the *Workes* were printed by William Stansby, who specialized in academic books (see James Bracken, 'Books from William Stansby's Printing House, and Jonson's Folio of 1616', *The Library* 18 (1988): 18-29, 24).

Surviving gift-copies of the book were not dedicated to the great and powerful, but to Jonson's friends.[106] In all this, it is analogous to Selden's *Titles*. And the only two authors who commend the *Workes* as a whole (rather than commend, say, *Sejanus*) are Selden and Heyward.[107] The group behind *Titles of Honor* reflects attempts to remove the book from the network of patronage. So the commendation of Selden's *Titles* seems finally to be Janus-faced. Jonson's poem meditates on the politics of historicism, whilst practicing its own return to origins to consolidate an antiquarian literary community, before looking forward to elaborate new possibilities for the book as a social artefact, as a witness to political pressures and the evasion of such pressures.

GEORGE CHAPMAN'S *GEORGICKS OF HESIOD* (1618): 'SUCH RETURNS MADE'

The publication of his 1616 *Workes* turned Jonson into the leading contemporary poet; he received a pension of £50 a year, effectively making him poet laureate. The *Workes* represented a summation of Jonson's literary associations and patronage links until 1616.[108] After 1616 he commends far fewer books until the late 1620s. But Jonson was not in a position of absolute strength; he remained vulnerable to court faction, and to the mutability of literary associations. The commendatory poem was still a useful way of gathering together such groupings, especially in difficult political and personal circumstances. The intellectual

[106] See Mark Bland, 'William Stansby', 29. One of the copies is dedicated to Heyward.
[107] H&S XI, 326-328.
[108] See Martin Butler, 'Sir Francis Stewart: Jonson's Overlooked Patron', *Ben Jonson Journal* 2 (1995): 101-127 and Butler, 'Jonson's Folio and the Politics of Patronage', *Criticism* 35 (1993): 377-90.

seriousness of his Christmas masque, *Pleasure Reconciled to Virtue* (1618), was disliked by James, and Jonson had to revise the work into the slighter, *For the Honor of Wales*. In the summer of 1618, Jonson's friend Sir Walter Ralegh was sentenced to death. Jonson had taken Ralegh's son on a European tour in 1613, and contributed a commendatory poem to his *History of the World*, despite the political risks involved in this volume.[109] The same summer, Jonson began his walking trip to Scotland, a risky manoeuvre in an already troubled year given that, as it absented Jonson from the court over the Christmas masquing season.[110] Jonson's political and literary connections, therefore, remained unstable even in the immediate aftermath of the publication of his *Workes*. His commendation of George Chapman's translation of Hesiod's *Works and Days* constitutes a key moment of reflection over many of his earlier literary associations.[111]

The translation is dedicated to a major courtier, Francis Bacon, but in the dedication (A2r-A3r) Chapman adopts a country posture. He praises Bacon for having 'banisht *Flattery*…euen from the *Court*', which has been purged so as to resemble 'my countrie, and more-then-vpland simplicite'. Chapman continues in this vein, asking Bacon to 'shine much the more cleere' on 'Vertue', 'which passeth aboue al clouds vnseen…and breaks out, in free beams, on some humblest Cotage.' Vice, therefore, has been associated in the dedicatory epistle with the court, and 'Vertue' is lodged in 'some humblest Cotage'. The first commendatory poem in the

[109] See Jennifer Brady, 'Jonson's "To King James": Plain Speaking in the *Epigrammes* and the *Conversations*', *Studies in Philology* 82 (1985): 380-98.
[110] James Knowles, 'Jonson In Scotland: Jonson's Mid-Jacobean Crisis', in Takashi Kozuka and J.R. Mulryne, eds., *Shakespeare, Marlowe, Jonson* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), 259-277. For a more optimistic reading of the trip, see Ian Donaldson, *Jonson's Walk to Scotland* (Edinburgh: Quadriga, 1993).
[111] George Chapman, *Georgicks of Hesiod* (London, 1618).

volume is by Michael Drayton (A4r), a figure often regarded as the chief among 'Spenserian' poets of the early-seventeenth century, and so involved in constructing a country opposition party. But this Spenserian binary, as we have already seen, proves difficult to sustain. Drayton and Jonson both commended Thomas Palmer's *Sprites of Trees and Herbs* in 1598, so their association developed over a long period.[112] Jonson and Drayton's commendations of Chapman were probably produced collaboratively, as they share very similar metaphors: both Jonson and Drayton present Chapman's 'labours' as having 'vnlock'd the treasury', and enlarged 'the dimensions of the English tongue'. The combination of Drayton and country rhetoric recalls the contexts of *Faithful Shepherdess*: Sir Walter Aston was Drayton's patron, as was Sir Henry Goodyer, to whom Skipwith was connected. Jonson's epigrams to Goodyer had now been published in the 1616 *Workes*: the connections between Drayton, Jonson and the literary circle of Goodyer, Skipwith and Aston were now presented across the range of Jonson's commendatory poems. Commending a volume along with Drayton, which specifically drew upon 'country' rhetoric does not seem like a new, Spenserian departure for Jonson, but rather the fulfilment of literary relationships which had been carefully constructed in print.

Jonson's poem provides the opportunity to review his relationships with Chapman, which ultimately lead back to *Pancharis* (1603). Jonson's praise for

[112] Michael Drayton, *The Works*, ed. J.Hebel, 5 Vols. (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1941), 1:497.

Chapman in mercantile rhetoric, for bringing 'treasure', 'store' and 'wealth' to our 'shore' picks up the language of Chapman's own praise of Jonson's *Sejanus*:[113]

> So brings the wealth-contracting Jeweller
>
> Pearles and deare Stones, from richest shores & streames,
>
> As thy accomplisht Travaile doth confer
>
> From skill-inriched soules, their wealthier Gems.[114]

Jonson is taking an opportunity to repay the compliment to Chapman, but doing so in a form which scrutinizes the issue of repayment itself. Chapman's process of translating Hesiod encourages a retrospective of Chapman's earlier translations: he has 'before wrought in rich *Homers* mine' (3). The process of translating, metaphorically a process of delving beneath the ground, is connected here to Jonson's own delving into Chapman's past (he has translated Homer 'before'). Chapman has 'such Returnes made' (10): but such 'Returnes' in the poem are both the national remunerations garnered by translation, and the process of returning to earlier moments in Chapman's poetic career. Jonson returns not only to Chapman's praise of *Sejanus*, but to even earlier literary associations. The verse form of triple-rhyming stanzas is very unusual for Jonson at this point, although there are a few later examples which appear in *Underwood*. In fact only one poem in print uses this verse form, 'And must I sing?', which first appeared in Robert Chester's *Love's*

[113] Richard Peterson, *Imitation and Praise in the Poems of Ben Jonson* (New Haven: Yale UP, 1981) 13-14. On Jonson's metaphors of imperial expansion see Barbara Fuchs, 'Pirating Spain: Jonson's commendatory poetry and the translation of empire', *Modern Philology* 99 (2002): 341-56.
[114] H&S, 11:309.1-4.

Martyr (1601). This collection had since been reprinted in 1611, and the poem itself formed part of *The Forest*. Triple-rhymed stanzas were something of a feature of *Love's Martyr*, as Shakespeare also adopted them in the 'Threnos' section of 'Let the bird of loudest lay'. And that collection was one of the first appearances in print of Jonson's work alongside Chapman's ('Peristeros: or the male Turtle'). The poem provides for Jonson a moment of retrospect, which gathers together his association with Chapman, and by implication his earliest Welsh associations with Chester and Salusbury. This return to Welsh associations perhaps seemed particularly significant in 1618, just before Jonson embarked on a series of new literary relationships in Scotland. Jonson's commendation of the volume draws together the history of his literary associations, both with Drayton's country circles and his earliest associations to Chapman.

The poem may revise the literary practices of such earlier contexts. Both Chapman and Drayton present the work as a prophecy. Chapman, in his dedication to Bacon, sees Hesiod as foreseeing the degeneration of the present: 'This Time, resembling the terrible Time whereof this *Poet* prophecied'. Drayton pursues this connection, saying: 'Th'olde Graecian prophets hither that hast brought, / Of their full words the true Interpreter'.[115] Annotations connected Hesiod to Old Testament prophets, for instance in the following note on the threats tyrants pose to their whole country: 'These threats vsed here (saith *Melanchton*) as in diuerse other places of this diuine *Poet*; He questionless gathered out of the doctrine of *Moses* and the *Prophets*' (11). There is evidence the book was read in this context from Henry

[115] On Drayton and inspired rhetoric, from a stylistic perspective, see Joan Grundy, *The Spenserian Poets*. (London: Edward Arnold, 1969); from political perspective, see Norbrook, *Poetry*, 178.

Reynolds' *Mythomystes*, in which he outlines a tradition of inspired rhetoric from ancient Greek poets such as Homer and Hesiod, which is then continued by Moses and Old Testament prophets, before largely being abandoned in the present; he suggests Chapman's translations are failed attempts to revive the tradition. The only modern writers he praises are Spenser, Drayton and Sylvester: Drayton's contribution to the volume may need to be seen in the context of his association with such inspired, prophetic rhetoric.[116]

But Jonson's poem includes no reference to prophecy, and no reference to inspired rhetoric. Although critics have suggested that Jonson's plain style is opposed to the rapt poetry of the Spenserians, especially Drayton, Jonson's early verses frequently adopt prophetic voices. The 'Ode *allegoric*' of the *Pancharis* volume initially attempts to describe 'Mysteries / Conceal'd from all but cleare Propheticke eyes' (112). And the 'Ode *enthusiastic*', printed in *Love's Martyr*, begins with an apostrophe to '*Splendor*! O more than mortal' (1). In the final line of the poem, Jonson suggests Chapman now owns the sole rights to Hesiod, 'who make thither else, rob, or inuade' (12). This echoes his earlier praise of Sylvester, whose Du Bartas translation has invaded France, which 'shall boast / No more, those maiden glories she hath lost'. Sylvester's translation of Du Bartas was a major influence on the Spenserians, and the development of Old Testament, prophetic rhetoric. But the echo only further suggests the ways prophetic rhetoric has been excluded from this poem. This is, perhaps, because such rhetoric by 1618 was being appropriated by poets with whom Jonson did not comfortably associate. In

[116] J.E. Spingarn, *Critical Essays of the Seventeenth Century*, 3 Vols. (Oxford: OUP, 1908), 1: 141-79, 165.

his 1623 masque *Pan's Anniversary*, the figure of the 'prophet' is connected, as Martin Butler has argued, with radical Puritanism.[117] From 1619, George Wither, often linked to other Spenserian poets, was increasingly coming to adopt the stance of a Hebraic prophet, which would culminate in the publication of his Psalm translations in 1623.[118] In that year's *Time Vindicated*, Jonson satirized Wither as 'Chronomastix', both for his presumption in writing satire, and for making pretensions to the 'profession of *Poetick* truth'.[119] In other words, new directions were developing in prophetic poetry which Jonson regarded as excessively politically radical. Jonson's commendation of Chapman's Hesiod is perhaps as significant in what it leaves out, as in what it includes: it returns to the literary culture of the early-seventeenth century, whilst abandoning the inspired, rapt poetic voices characteristic of that period. The poem also makes little of the country rhetoric which Chapman exploits, perhaps because of fears over the way in which country rhetoric and poetic prophecy were becoming allied. The land is a comparatively vague presence in this poem, but the reference to '*our* shore' (5, emphasis added) might reflect Jonson's wish to view Britain as a national whole, rather than a divided landscape. The volume is a complex witness to Jonson's poetic relationships at this moment. It gathers together lifelong associations with circles involving Chapman and Drayton, consolidating earlier patronage negotiations at a

[117] Martin Butler, 'Ben Jonson's *Pan's Anniversary* and the Politics of Early Stuart Pastoral', *ELR* 22 (1992): 369-404.
[118] George Wither, *The Hymnes and Songs of the Church* (London, 1623). See Jeffrey Shoulson, '"Proprietie in this Hebrew poesy": George Wither, Judaism, and the formation of English national identity', *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 98 (1999): 353-72.
[119] H&S, 7:661.184.

troublesome moment in Jonson's career. But it does suggest a scepticism about the future direction in which such circles might be moving.

JONSON'S CAROLINE COMMENDATORY POEMS

Jonson's commendation of Shakespeare's Folio in 1623 followed soon after by the accession of Charles and Jonson's resulting alienation from the court, has been seen to herald a new, late phase in Jonson's writing, characterized by nostalgic, 'harking back' to the Elizabethan period.[120] Jonson places Shakespeare among Elizabethan authors, yet he 'didst our *Lily* out-shine, / Or sporting *Kid*, or *Marlowes* mighty line' (29-30).[121] This poem's return to the Elizabethan period, it has been argued, is part of a wider adoption of neo-Elizabethan, Spenserian rhetoric in Jonson's late works, which implied political discontent with the Caroline regime from which he was largely excluded.[122] But such 'harking back' is not a new innovation for nostalgic, late Jonson, but a constant aspect of his work, which close attention to his commendatory verse uncovers. Nor is Jonson's nostalgia monolithically Elizabethan, and unfortunately much of the best work on 'Caroline nostalgia' has only focused on returns to the Elizabethan period.[123] And just as Jonson's reflection on the Elizabethan period in the 1603 *Pancharis* cannot quite be described as critical of James, Jonson's returns to the past in the Caroline period do

[120] Anne Barton, 'Harking Back to Elizabeth: Ben Jonson and Caroline Nostalgia', *English Literary History* 48 (1981): 706-731.
[121] On Jonson's Shakespeare poem: Lawrence Lipking, *The Life of the Poet* (Chicago: Chicago UP, 1981), 138-46; Ian Donaldson, *Jonson's Magic Houses* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1997), ch.2; Peterson, *Imitation*, ch.4.
[122] Norbrook, *Poetry*, 234.
[123] E.g. Thomas Berger, 'Looking for Shakespeare in Caroline England', *Viator* 27 (1996): 323-359.

not have one political valence. Finally, Jonson's nostalgia is not very 'nostalgic', as that term suggests a fuzziness which belies the precision of Jonson's returns to earlier associations. Julie Sanders' powerful recent survey of Jonson's patronage negotiations in the 1630s has begun to deconstruct the concept of Jonsonian 'lateness', but her insistence on the new associations and communities which Jonson was constructing obscures the continuities-within-difference that Jonson preserves with former groupings.[124] Whilst harking back to earlier communities remains Jonson's practice, in the late 1620s this process is placed under pressure by factionalized politics.[125]

The 1620s is often presented as a period of intensifying political division: pressure to intervene in the Thirty Years War, as well as growing hatred of Buckingham's position as favourite, polarized the literary environment.[126] By 1627, Buckingham was raising Parliamentary supply for war with France, leading an expedition against the Ile de Rhé. This was partly an attempt to divert Parliament from their attacks on Buckingham in 1626, which were increasingly being led by the Earl of Arundel. Arundel, a member of one of the most ancient English families, despised Buckingham for his comparatively low social origins. Arundel was the patron of both Selden and Cotton, and used their historical research to bolster his

---

[124] Julie Sanders, 'Jonson's Caroline Coteries', in Takashi Kozuka and J.R. Mulryne, eds., *Shakespeare, Marlowe, Jonson*, 279-294. There has already been much useful research into Jonson's connections to Newcastle, e.g. Hilton Kelliher, 'Donne, Jonson, Richard Andrews, and the Newcastle Manuscript', *English Manuscript Studies 1100-1700* 4 (1993): 134-73.

[125] The 'Tribe of Ben' was also important to Jonson at this period, however it is reflected primarily in manuscript culture. However, Jonson does address one commendatory poem to his 'Son', Joseph Rutter, *The Shepherds holy-day* (London, 1635).

[126] For Buckingham as a major centre of patronage, see Linda Levy Peck, 'Monopolizing Favour: Structures of Power in the Early Seventeenth-Century English Court', *The World of the Favourite*, eds. John H. Elliott and L.W.B. Brockliss (New Haven: Yale UP, 1999) 54-70.

power in Parliament. Arundel has also been connected to the revival of chivalric culture in the Caroline period. But as part of his attack on Buckingham, he was opposed to war with France in 1627.[127] And such conflicts were not restricted to Parliament: refusal to pay the Forced Loan was an acute problem for local administrators in early 1627, and it was also proving difficult to gather troops for the Ile de Rhé expedition.[128]

Jonson is extremely difficult to locate within these disputes. The poetry of the earlier 1620s might suggest an ambivalent pro-war stance, and he was certainly close to Buckingham in that period.[129] He turned to manuscript verse, and his public work (especially *The Staple of News*) has been read as an attempt to regulate increasingly aggressive political debates.[130] In the later 1620s he has been connected with Arundel, Buckingham, and the more consensual Newcastle.[131] He certainly became interested in debates over Caroline chivalry (important to both Arundel and Newcastle), which are reflected in Lovel in *The New Inn*.[132] A further aspect of this interest may have been his decision to commend three historical poems: Thomas May's translation of Lucan's *Pharsalia* (often seen as verse-history in the Renaissance), Drayton's 1627 folio collection, *The Battaile of Agincourt* (a

---

[127] Kevin Sharpe, 'The Earl of Arundel, his Circle, and the Opposition to the Duke of Buckingham, 1618-1628', in Kevin Sharpe, ed., *Faction and Parliament* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1978), 209-44.
[128] Richard Cust, *The Forced Loan and English Politics* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1987).
[129] On Buckingham's patronage see Martin Butler, '"We Are One Man's All": Jonson's *The Gipsies Metamorphosed*', *Yearbook of English Studies* 21 (1991): 253-73; John H. Astington, 'Buckingham's Patronage and *The Gypsies Metamorphosed*', *Theatre Survey* 43 (2002): 133-147. On the early 1620s poems and politics see Martin Butler, 'The Dates of Three Poems by Ben Jonson', *Huntington Library Quarterly* 55 (1992): 279-294.
[130] O'Callaghan, *The "shepheards nation"*, ch.5.
[131] Martin Butler, 'Late Jonson', in Gordon McMullan and Jonathan Hope, eds., *The Politics of Tragicomedy* (London: Routledge, 1992), 166-188, 168-172; Barton, 300-320.
[132] Nick Rowe, '"My Best Patron": William Cavendish and Jonson's Caroline Dramas', *The Seventeenth Century* 9 (1994): 197-21.

short epic on Henry V, along with pastorals, complaints, verse letters, satires and elegies), and John Beaumont's posthumous *Bosworth-Field* (1629).[133] Jonson's commendation of this latter volume is very characteristic, as it allows him to memorialize associations with the Beaumont family as a whole: 'Though I confess a Beaumont's book', where the indefinite article encompasses the work of Francis Beaumont, 'to be / The bound and frontier of our poetry'. The book, therefore, turns back to the earlier connections with the Beaumont family traced in *Faithful Shepherdess*, and the exchange of verse letters with Francis Beaumont. And Beaumont's poem also places pressure on political continuities between the Tudors and the Stuarts. In Beaumont's poem itself praise for Charles grows out of his praise for the military achievements of Henry VII. Adamson has shown Charles was turning away from elements of Tudor militaristic pageantry (such as Accession Day Tilts), for fear they may reflect uncomfortably on the present.[134] Beaumont's poem reaffirms continuities between the Tudors and the Stuarts, even as such ceremonial continuities were being abandoned. Jonson reinforces chivalric rhetoric, describing Beaumont's work as a 'fort of so impregnable access'. Jonson does not hark back to Elizabeth, but he does draw continuities with his own early literary associations which, in the context of Beaumont's poem, imply the need to maintain political continuities.

---

[133] On Lucan as historian see Gerald Maclean, *Time's Witness* (Wisconsin: Wisconsin UP, 1990), 26-44. John Beaumont, *The Shorter Poems of Sir John Beaumont*, ed. Roger D. Sell (Abo: Abo Akademi, 1974).

[134] J.S.A. Adamson, 'Chivalry and Political Culture in Caroline England', in Sharpe and Lake, eds., *Culture and Politics*, 161-197.

But Jonson's decision to commend Drayton's 1627 folio reflects in more complex ways the pressures placed on literary association by political faction.[135] Drayton's poem has received diametrically opposite political readings (pro- or anti-Buckingham's and Charles' war).[136] Jonson's position in the volume is dependent on such political readings: either Jonson was alienated from the Caroline establishment (anti-war), or Drayton was seeking a rapprochement with the court (pro-war), assisted by Jonson. Such readings are part of the wider notion of Jonson adopting the politics of Spenserian poetry as he was alienated from the Caroline monarchy.[137] The present analysis has already suggested that Jonson's relationship with Drayton is not a new innovation, but a long-standing association in print.[138] To attempt to categorise the volume's stance in relation to court policy simplifies its politics: rather than creating a new literary or political alignment, the *Battaile* volume, and Jonson's contribution to it, reflect on the difficulties of creating literary communities. Jonson begins his epistle to Drayton by hanging back from creating a literary association, disavowing any attempt to 'raise a riming *Club* / About the towne'. Jonson's transaction is with Drayton alone: 'this reck'ning I will pay'. This may reflect, as Timothy Raylor has argued, that 'Fraternities' and 'Orders' in the

---

[135] Michael Drayton, *The Battaile of Agincourt* (London, 1627).

[136] Richard McCoy argues the *Battaile* volume is an explicit attempt to construct an opposition to Buckingham, 'Old English honour in an evil time: aristocratic principle in the 1620s', *Stuart court*, ed. Smuts 133-155. Thomas Cogswell argues the volume is the beginning of Drayton's reconciliation with the Caroline state, 'The Path to Elizium "Lately Discovered": Drayton and the Early Stuart Court', *Huntington Library Quarterly* 54 (1991): 207-33. Arguing for a rapprochement between the poets in the late 1620s, Cogswell says, wrongly: 'In fact [*Bosworth-Field*] is the only [book] that both Jonson and Drayton ever recommended to the public', 225.

[137] Norbrook links Jonson's 'alienation from the court' to his adoption of 'Spenserian archaisms' and 'archaic dramatic and festive forms', *Poetry*, 234.

[138] For a recent account of the relationship (and tensions) between the two poets, see Andrew Hadfield, 'Michael Drayton's Brilliant Career', *Proceedings of the British Academy* 125 (2003): 119-147.

1620s had become increasingly politicized and ferociously anti-Catholic and anti-Spanish.[139] Jonson explicitly places Drayton's work in the context of 1620s factional divisions, although the reference is not directly to *The Battaile*, but to *The Barons Wars*:

> O, how in those, dost thou instruct these times,
> That Rebells' actions, are but valiant crimes!
> And caried, though with shoute, and noise, confesse
> A wild, and an authoriz'd wickedness. (43-46)

Although the context of *The Barons' Wars* suggests the 'Rebells' here are noblemen, the violence of the language ('shoute, and noise', 'wild', 'wickedness') vertiginously collapses distinctions between divided nobles in Parliament, and ordinary people refusing to sign up for war. Jonson registers the pressures of contemporary disputes, without clearly aligning himself with one faction.

Jonson begins by fulsomely praising the English invasion of France, hearing Drayton 'thy Drum to beate / A better cause, and strike the brauest heate' (55-56), and praising in particular the massing of troops ('Thy Catalogue of Ships' (61)). The poem could then be read as a piece of pro-Buckingham propaganda. However such references to the nobility and courage of Henry V and his men ('for his Country's sake / Braue are the Musters, that the Muse will make' (63-64), may need to be read in the context of Adamson's argument that Charles attempted to purge such

[139] Timothy Raylor, *Cavaliers, Clubs, and Literary Culture* (Newark: Delaware UP, 1994).

references to chivalry from his courtly ceremony: Drayton's poem, and Jonson's praise of it, may have sounded deliberately, and provocatively, antiquated.[140] Such a passé historical poem may have been intended to please Arundel, as the dedication suggests: 'To you those Noblest of Gentlemen…who in these declining times, haue yet in your braue bosomes the sparkes of that sprightly fire, of your couragious Ancestors' (A2r). Jonson's chivalric rhetoric ('And when he ships them where to vse their Armes, / How do his trumpets breath!' (65-66) could be read in the same context. He also doubts the rightness of Henry's cause: 'Our right in *France*! If ritely vnderstood' (58). This anticipates doubts in Drayton's poem, in which the war emerges not out of unequivocal desire to enforce England's rights in France, but out of a factional conflict between the clergy, the king, and Parliament. A Parliament is sitting in the early reign of Henry V, '[i]n which one Bill (mongst many) there was red, / Against the generall, and superfluous waste / Of temporall Lands' (B1v). However, a nobleman cooks up a plan, and 'out of the strength of wit, / He found a warre with *France*, must be the way / To dash this Bill, else threatning their decay' (B2r), persuading Henry to fight a war to distract attention from a troubled Parliament. This factional dispute would have had clear topical relevance in the 1620s, and might be seen as clear support for Arundel against a trumped-up war. Except the nobleman who trumps up the war is Arundel, a relative of the contemporary figure who was jealously proud of his family heritage. Such discontinuities are also reflected in the paratext, as Jonson's poem is set beside John Reynolds', an extremely radical anti-Spanish Protestant, who had been imprisoned

[140] Adamson, 'Chivalry'.

in 1624 for the publication of *Vox Coeli*. Jonson and Drayton resist taking sides with a particular faction, but also resist smoothing over differences to create consensus: discontinuous political perspectives are simply juxtaposed, suggesting any one alignment to be impossible.

Jonson suggests that their poems act as historical precedents: Drayton 'dost…instruct these times', and 'our English youth urge on'. But *The Battaile*'s precedents point in several directions: they praise war with France, whilst implying the war is a tactical manoeuvre in court politics; their invocation might be a means of flattering Arundel, except his family is satirized. Jonson's poem seems to register such disorders in custom and continuity. Whereas Jonson's earlier commendatory poems turned back to the past to construct communities over long periods, diachronic returns are frustrated in this poem. The material history of the book reflects such temporal disorder. The 1627 book is a folio in fours, printed by Augustine Mathewes. The whole book is signed continuously, from the prefatory 'A' gathering onwards, but Jonson's poem is inserted on conjugate leaves between sheets A2 and A3; the first inserted leaf is signed 'a', and the second is unsigned.[141] Jonson's epistle refers closely to the sequence in which the poems are printed: his poem unfolds for the reader as a microcosm of Drayton's book. This close account of the work was probably made possible by Mathewes allowing Jonson to read the work in proof, and submit his copy late, hence the insertion of his poem. This may reflect Jonson's desire to 'know to whom I write', but it may also suggest a certain reserve in his contribution to a difficult and complex volume. Either way, the reader

[141] Copy examined: Cambridge UL Syn.4.62.

of the volume is immediately presented with the record of temporal disruption in the dislocated page signatures: 'A2' is followed by 'a'.

Rather than revisiting and consolidating earlier associations, Jonson's review of Drayton's career reflects on discontinuities. Jonson begins his praise with 'I saw a Beauty from the Sea to rise' (15), but that beauty, as Donaldson has noticed, seems to be a book, a copy of Drayton's 1619 *Poems*.[142] 'The Orbe was cut forth into Regions seauen' (20), which reflects the seven groupings of poems on the title page of the 1619 volume. So Jonson starts not at the beginning of Drayton's career, or at the end, but in the middle. Except he then decides not to review the works in the order they appear in the 1619 *Poems*, but to reorder them chronologically (23-42): beginning with *Idea* (1593), he describes '*Legends* three' (actually four, but only three printed by 1597 which corrects the dating sequence), '*Heroick* Songs' (1597) and 'the wise *Athenian* Owle' (1604), but then has to double-back to '*Barons Warres*' (1603) to suggest a movement towards epic. Attempt to harmonize generic sequence (pastoral to epic) with chronology of composition deranges Jonson's normally meticulous classical references: '*Legends* three' are compared to 'old Theocritus / Or rural Virgil', even though they are serious historical works. Drayton of the *Heroicall Epistles* is happily likened to Ovid, but Jonson's likening of Drayton's *Owl* to ancient Orphic poetry is a rude temporal disjunction. Drayton's *Battaile* takes us back to the origins of poetry, Homer's epics, but via Drayton's imitation of Lucan ('Sayst thou so, *Lucan*?'), *The Barons' Wars*. This process of return has demonstrated temporal disruptions on every level: both the ability of the author to

[142] Ben Jonson, *Poems*, ed. Ian Donaldson (London: OUP, 1975) 313.

reorder his works, by juxtaposing the 1619 *Poems* with the actual order of publication, and by showing the refusal of Drayton's work to conform to the shape of any classical authority. This carefully disordered commendatory poem, slipped into a volume at the last minute will be unable to draw the kind of concrete continuities we have found in earlier volumes.

Such difficulties are characteristic of the mobile relationship between literary communities and political faction, but Jonson does manage less fraught returns to the past. His final commendatory poem is in a collection of verses called *Annalia Dubrensia* (1636), in praise of Robert Dover who had revived the 'Olympic Games' in the Cotswolds.[143] Jonson begins by comparing 'Cotswold and the Olympic exercise' (2): Jonson creates direct continuities between vastly divergent historical periods. He then goes on to hark back not to Elizabeth, but to James: Dover's games 'Renew the Glories of our blessed *Ieames*' and 'keepe alive his memorie; / With the *Glad Countrey*, and *Posteritie*' (3-6).[144] In the title, Jonson is very specific that the games take place 'at Cotswold', but here the preservation of a local custom is translated onto a national scale ('the…*Countrey*'). In *Annalia*, Jonson is accompanied by antiquarian historians, such as John Trussell, who similarly begins by placing the games in a large historical context (dating from Roman times), before suggesting that such historical continuities are under pressure ('The Hocktide pastimes, are /

[143] Mathew Walbancke, ed. *Annalia Dubrensia* (London, 1636). See Christopher Whitfield, *Robert Dover and the Cotswold Games* (London: Henry Sotheran, 1962).
[144] Leah Marcus, *The Politics of Mirth* (Chicago: Chicago UP, 1986), 132-33, sees these lines as a very specific criticism of Charles' maintenance of country sports, but they are characteristic of Jonson's commendatory verse.

Declin'd, if not deserted' (B2r)).[145] The volume is an important illustration of the ways in which Jonson's engagement with the politics of custom shifts according to context: whereas in *Titles*, legal custom and high politics were the primary focus, here the central issue is the way in which preservation of local customs translates into the preservation of political tradition ('the memorie' of James). As David Underdown has argued, in the pre-civil war period local gentry began increasingly to focus their complaints over regional administration and land-rights in terms analogous to debates over the ancient constitution.[146] Jonson's poem implies this interrelationship between centre and localities, saying the games operate both to 'advance…neighbourhood', before moving outwards geographically to do the 'Common-wealth the good' (7-8). And the volume itself enacts this geographical flexibility: Dover's Warwickshire friends and family members (John Dover, and his wife's family, Thomas, William and John Cole) are interspersed with his Inns of Court associates (e.g. Sir William Denny of Gray's Inn). Within this geographically dispersed network, three established poets (Jonson, the recently-deceased Drayton and Heywood) are placed alongside younger poets (Shackerley Marmion, Owen Feltham, and Thomas Randolph). These are particularly appropriate associations for Jonson, as they would mourn him in *Jonsonus Virbius* (1638). The last volume is elegiac, then: Jonson turns both towards past 'Glories', and his own posterity. But he is also located among a new, geographically complex, generation of antiquaries,

[145] The same year, Trussell printed an English history (Edward III-Henry VII), *A continuation of the collection of the history of England* (London, 1636).
[146] David Underdown, *A Freeborn people* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1996), 45-67.

poets and lawyers, to reflect on the dispersal of the politics of custom into the regions.

CONCLUSIONS

Michelle O'Callaghan is right to say that the model of competition between Spenserians and Jonson 'does need reconsidering given '*th*' Exchange *of* Letters', in the words of Jonson to Browne, between members of this Spenserian community and Jonson', but Jonson's commendatory poems also allow a much wider reconsideration of` the assumptions behind the model of 'competition' between literary groups.[147] Jonson was associated in print with Spenserian figures, with their poetic genres (chorography, inspired rhetoric), political criticism, and non-courtly circles of patronage: both ideological and factional divisions seem tenuous. But for all that literary groupings have emerged as mutable and overlapping, they are not anarchic: Jonson paid careful attention throughout his career to the process of harking back to earlier communities to continue shaping new associations.

The marginal position of commendatory verses – subsidiary to the main textual event, or to a volume's patronage ambitions – makes them unique witnesses to the importance of marginal centres of power to Jonson. Mark Bland has observed that the 'geography of [Jonson's] associations is but barely understood': commendatory verses extend 'Ben: Ionson' into geographically dispersed regions. In the wake of New Historicist insistence on centralized monarchical power, literary

[147] O'Callaghan, *The "shepheards nation"*, 235.

critics and cultural historians have turned to more dispersed models of power; a multiple monarchy unable to exert control over every centimetre of the archipelago has begun to replace focus on Stuart absolutism.[148] This paper has suggested that analysis of the three kingdoms does not go far enough to understand complex, regional, *loci* of power. Work on the cultural geography of Jonson's politics has been particularly effective in the Caroline period, as Jonson's drama turns to locally specific regional settings to explore the interrelationship between London and the counties. In the unfinished *The Sad Shepherd* Jonson returns to the Midlands Landscape, the 'Vale of Be'vir', or Belvoir, the Leicestershire country estate of the Earl of Rutland.[149] Falkland's elegy for Jonson in *Jonsonus Virbius* responds to the precision of this play's locale: 'Not long before his *Death*', Falkland says, 'our *woods* he meant / To *visit*, and descend from *Thames* to *Trent*' (the North Midlands landscape of *Sad Shepherd*).[150] But as we have seen, such geographically dispersed structures of power are not solely a response to specifically Caroline issues: Jonson had already descended 'from *Thames* to *Trent*' in his chorographic description of Holland's flight in *Pancharis*. As Falkland identifies, Jonson is a poet capable of shifting between the court and individual counties (rather than a homogenous

[148] E.g. for such a reading of the paratexts to a book Jonson commended, see Melanie Ord. 'Provincial Identification and Struggle over Representation in Thomas Coryat's *Crudities* (1611)', in Philip Schwyzer and Simon Mealor, eds., *Archipelagic Identities* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004).
[149] On *The Sad Shepherd* and local politics see, Julie Sanders, 'Jonson, *The Sad Shepherd* and the North Midlands', *Ben Jonson Journal* 6 (1999): 49-68. Recently on *A Tale of a Tub* and regional administration, see Catherine Rockwood, 'Topicality and Dissent in Jonson's *A Tale of a Tub*', *Ben Jonson Journal* 10 (2003): 77-100.
[150] Bryan Duppa, ed. *Jonsonus Virbius* (London, 1638), B4v. On *Jonsonus Virbius*' attempt to encompass geographic spaces, see Andrew N. Lynn, 'The Impact of Ben Jonson, 1637-1700', (Ph.D. thesis, University of Cambridge, 2001), ch.1.

'country'). The margins of books provide a unique perspective for Jonson to reflect on the relationship between the centre and margins of power.

The associations commendatory poems bear witness to are not only (and not always) matters of historical fact: associations such as the 'Sireniacal Gentlemen' and the 'Mermaid Tavern' are constructed on the space of the page.[151] Early Stuart writers deliberately drew attention to the collaborative settings in which their works were produced. Recent criticism has broadened 'collaboration' to cover 'any kind of cooperative endeavour behind a literary performance': commendatory poems both draw attention to this cooperative endeavour, and constitute collaborative performances.[152] Whereas Jonson is often seen as anti-collaborative (excising the second hand from *Sejanus*, for instance) the close involvement of Jonson's commendatory poems with the books they commend – teasing out politicized readings, as well as reflecting the political pressures from which the main text was produced – creates collaborative texts which are not fused together in the process of collaboration.[153] There is a danger when attempting to reread Jonson's politics as more 'oppositional' of returning to old-historicist assumptions: that the individual is the centre of their own discourse, and that literature reflects on (high)

---

[151] 'Sireniacal Gentlemen' is Thomas Coryate's phrase: see Michelle O'Callaghan, 'Tavern societies, the Inns of Court, and the culture of conviviality in early seventeenth-century London', in Adam Smyth, ed., *A pleasing sinne* (Woodbridge: Brewer, 2004), 37-51. On 'The Mermaid' see Bland, 'Verse Letters', 167-70.

[152] Heather Hirschfeld, 'Early Modern Collaboration and Theories of Authorship', *Proceedings of the Modern Language Association* 116 (2001): 609-22, 614. On commendatory poems as collaborations see James Bednarz, 'The Collaborator as Thief: Ralegh's (Re)Vision of *The Faerie Queene*', *English Literary History* 63 (1996): 279-307.

[153] Recently on anti-collaborative Jonson, see: Gregory Chaplin, '"Divided Amongst Themselves": Collaboration and Anxiety in Jonson's *Volpone*', *English Literary History* 69 (2002): 57-81.

politics whilst retaining intellectual independence.[154] The politics of Jonson's commendatory poems, on the other hand, are not only inextricable from the contexts – material, social – in which they emerge, but actually produced by dialogues which take place within such contexts. The anonymous author of *The Husband* (1614), another politically sensitive text commended by Jonson, provides a compact example of the seamless relationship between politics and the paratextual space of the book: 'you all haue made this work your own / By *Approbation*; which implyes *Defence*'.[155] Political pressures (factional, ideological) impinge directly; drawing attention to a work's production by a collaborative group of authors offers a means of resisting such pressures, whilst registering them acutely. A Renaissance book's paratextual space does not, therefore, herald the arrival of politically-independent literary public-sphere, where dispute takes place within an overall consensus.[156] On the contrary, it witnesses to the necessity of constructing collaborative literary associations within a political environment characterized by fragmentation and discontinuity. Commenting on Jonson's late dramas, Julie Sanders has observed that 'community concerned Jonson throughout his theatrical and poetic writing career and that future research will continue to find new means of reading and expressing this'.[157] Marginal and collaborative, commendatory poems demonstrate powerfully Jonson's engagement with the potentialities of textual communities throughout his career.

---

[154] Richard Burt, *Licensed by Authority* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1993) is very theoretically sophisticated in its historicist approach to Jonson.
[155] *The Husband* (London, 1614), A8v. The book was a sequel to Thomas Overbury's *The Wife*.
[156] Jürgen Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*, trans. Thomas Burger (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1989).
[157] Julie Sanders, '*The New Inn* and *The Magnetic Lady*: Jonson's Dramaturgy in the Caroline Context', in Brian Woolland, ed., *Jonsonians* (Burlington: Ashgate, 2003), 51-66.

Chapter 3: Drama in the Regions

We have moved from scholarship to poetry, and now we move to drama. In a thesis that stresses the unity of early-modern culture, I partly want to suggest we have not moved as far as it might seem. There were scholar dramatists as there were scholar poets -- not least Jonson himself, of course, whose poetry has provided the focus for the previous chapter. In this chapter, we will encounter the works of Thomas Middleton: a historian-dramatist, who also wrote some poetry. One antiquary even wrote a play for the public stage. He was William Smith, who wrote *The Hector of Germanie, or, The Palsgrave Prime Elector* for the marriage of Princess Elizabeth and Prince Friedrich.[1] His historical research was wide-ranging, covering the genealogies of European royal families, the history of Nuremberg, the history of the London mayoralty, and the ceremonies of the Order of the Garter (a popular antiquarian subject).[2] Antiquaries could also be avid play-readers. Sir Edward Dering compiled his own version of Shakespeare's *Henry IV* as well as collecting and analysing medieval charters.[3] And history remains the theme throughout this chapter: we move from the birth of the history play in our discussion of the Queen's

[1] William Smith, *The Hector of Germanie* (London, 1615). Although this play has previously been wrongly attributed to Wentworth Smith, David Kathman's *ODNB* article points to the 'overwhelming' circumstantial evidence for William's authorship, a judgement with which I entirely agree.
[2] On the London mayoralty see Bodl. Oxf., MS top. gen. e.29; on the Order of the Garter, a ceremony depicted in *The Hector of Germanie*, see Bodl. Oxf., MS Gough Berks. 12. I have not examined Smith's manuscripts outside Oxford, but they are well documented in David Kathman, 'William Smith (c.1550-1618)'. I am hoping to prepare a full study of Smith.
[3] T.N.S. Lennam, 'Sir Edward Dering's Collection of Playbooks, 1619-1624', *Shakespeare Quarterly* 16:2 (1965): 145-53; G. Blakemore Evans, 'The Dering MS. of Shakespeare's *Henry IV* and Sir Edward Dering', *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 54 (1955): 498-503; C.E. Wright, 'Sir Edward Dering: A Seventeenth-Century Antiquary and His "Saxon" Charters', in *The Early Cultures of North-West Europe* (Cambridge, 1950), 371-93.

Men, through the flourishing of the British history play to a late example of the genre, a play on the transition between British and Saxon history. So one answer to the question of 'why move to drama' is because to understand Renaissance culture we need to move across genres and practices that would not have seemed entirely distinct to early-modern individuals.

However, this is not the whole answer, and risks minimizing the ways in which drama can offer a different perspective on the issues of regionalism and antiquarianism this thesis is pursuing. We are moving here into two different forms of historiography. One is the chronicle, especially as it found its massive (and final) exempla in the work of Holinshed and his team.[4] Holinshed was the raw historical material for playwrights interested in British history between 1580 and 1640. Long after Holinshed represented anything like the latest in critical history (indeed, Holinshed never represented that) he was a resource in the playhouses. The other form we have not encountered much before is civic history, especially that written by John Stow. Chorographical writing on the London stage took many forms, and only one of these was the history play: in a certain sense, the localism of the history play finds its outlet in the early 1600s in city comedies, which stage minute particulars of the city of London.[5] The broader point here, perhaps, is that we are encountering in this chapter a very different market for history. For all that playwrights were almost always educated intellectuals, they are not writing works for the rarefied world of the international Republic of Letters. History plays sold: it

[4] Due to the enormity of the Shakespeare industry the chronicle history play has been the subject of much study. See recently, David Womersley, *Divinity and State* (Oxford: OUP, 2010).
[5] Jean E. Howard, *Theater of a City: the Places of London Comedy, 1598-1642* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007).

is clear that, especially in the 1590s, they were an enormously popular genre. This chapter tries to draw attention to the problematic circumstances of preparing plays for multiple audiences. The chapter tries to think regionally, by bearing in mind that theatre moved outside London, and travelled across the country. *King Lear* was a play not only for the London stage, but we know it was performed in Yorkshire in 1609 in Catholic households, and must have had a very different meaning there.[6] This chapter tries to bring together what can be reconstructed about touring routes and the circumstances of regional performances, together with readings of playtexts themselves. This means a study of drama in the regions can add a further dimension to our understanding of regionalism. A dramatic performance had a material instantiation and impact in a local area quite different from that of a scholarly book or a poem. Actors, playwrights and managers were members of civic institutions like guilds, which had a shaping impact on their work. Travelling players aroused strong feelings -- often of a religious nature. Drama helps us to tease out some of the tensions and difficulties which lie within the kind of carefully balanced social structures analysed in the previous chapters. It also helps to integrate the broader study of history and regionalism with which this thesis is engaged with social history; this is an interdisciplinary movement which is a rarely attempted. A play and the circumstances of playing can tell us something about the problematics of regionalism, and indeed something about the uses and application of scholarship, that direct study of scholarly works or even poems cannot tell us.

---

[6] See G.W. Boddy, 'Players of interludes in North Yorkshire in the early seventeenth century', *North Yorkshire County Record Office Publications Journal* 3 (1976): 95-130. For a recent reconsideration of this troupe of players see Paul Whitfield White, *Drama and Religion in English Provincial Society, 1485-1660* (Cambridge: CUP, 2008), 146-167.

(i) The Queen's Men and the Politics of Jurisdiction

Robert Wilson's play, *The Three Lords and Three Ladies of London* includes a brief elegy to Richard Tarlton, the most famous comic actor of his generation, who had died in 1588. Both Wilson and Tarlton were members of the Queen's Men, the acting company formed in 1583 by Francis Walsingham, probably with the support of the Earl of Leicester. The three lords of the play's title, Wealth, Will, and Wit meet Simplicity, a London chapman, who attempts to sell them his wares, one of which is 'Tarltons picture'. Will claims he never knew Tarlton, and so Simplicity elaborates on his origins:

> *Sim*. What was he: a prentice in his youth of this honorable city, God be with him: when he was yoong he was leaning to the trade that my wife vseth nowe, and I haue vsed, *vide lice shirt*, water-bearing: I wis he hath tost a Tankard in *Cornehil* er nowe[7]

Simplicity chooses to localize Tarlton's personal history within the companies and inns of London, and so presents his identity as constituted from and within multiple social groupings. Immediately followed by the reference to Tarlton having 'tost a Tankard', calling Tarlton a water-bearer was probably an ironic reference to his

[7] Robert Wilson, *The Three Lords and Three Ladies of London* (London, 1590), C1v

connection to the London alcohol industry. David Kathman has recently discovered that on 27 May 1584, Tarlton was translated from the Haberdashers Company to the Vintners at his own request.[8] The audience of this scene, therefore, are required to contextualize Tarlton within London guild culture, before any reference is made to him as an actor.[9] The play is filled with London nationalism (the Londoners defend England against the Armada, and defeat the citizens of Norwich), and so it is appropriate that Tarlton's posthumous honour derives from his freedom of 'this honorable city'. In the context of his apprenticeship, 'city' here probably refers specifically to the area (roughly within the city walls) under the jurisdiction of the London mayor, alderman and common council – the City of London. The elegy itself participates in the economy of the city of the London: as John Astington suggests, the stage-property picture of Tarlton lifted up by Simplicity is likely to have been a real ballad illustrated with a woodcut, and 'the ballads were probably for sale outside the playhouse after the performance'.[10] And Tarlton's place within the theatrical company is memorialized in the fact of the performance: in Wilson's earlier play, *The Three Ladies of London*, the role of Simplicity was probably performed by Tarlton himself. 'Tarlton' in this scene is criss-crossed by multiple local contexts and jurisdictions: guild, City, actors' company, fellow performers, and

---

[8] David Kathman, 'Grocers, Goldsmiths, and Drapers: Freemen and Apprentices in the Elizabethan Theatre', *SQ* (2004): 1-49. For recent work on guilds see Ian Anders Gadd and Patrick Wallis, eds., *Guilds, Society & Economy in London 1450-1800* (London: Centre for Metropolitan History, 2002).

[9] Which suggests the limitations of Tobias Düring's approach in the most recent consideration of elegies to actors, when he asserts that 'An actor's public standing or "degree" fully derives from the actor's performative capacities on stage, which commemorative poems must try to record', in 'Writing Performance: How to Elegize Elizabethan Actors', *Shakespeare Survey* 58 (2005): 60-71, 61

[10] John H. Astington, 'Rereading Illustrations of the English Stage', *Shakespeare Survey* 50 (1997): 151-170, 163. On the economics of Tarlton's posthumous reputation see further Alexandra Halasz, '"So beloved that men use his picture for their signs": Richard Tarlton and the Uses of Sixteenth-Century Celebrity', *Shakespeare Studies* 23 (1995): 19-38

his own performance history.[11] Robert Wilson was also a member of the Queen's Men, and this passage seems to be a personal tribute to his colleague within the company. Nevertheless, that tribute is presented in the context of larger economic and political institutions. Such institutions are the air breathed by contemporary playwrights, performers and audiences, but require careful archival recovery by the literary historian; this is only a small example of a mode of reading early-modern drama which attempts such a process of recovery. This section will show that the mobility of early-modern touring companies (of which the Queen's Men were the foremost) necessitated the development of play-texts which were able to move through the sort of institutional structures from which Tarlton's memory is constructed, and reflect on the potential conflicts between those structures.

Critical and Methodological Context

The history of critical approaches to the Queen's Men theatre has tended to link the establishment and repertory of this company to the development of English nationhood and the nation-state, but such approaches have obscured the sort of local, regional and institutional affinity we found in Simplicity's elegy to Tarlton. Richard Helgerson's path-breaking work on nationhood has connected the development of the English history-play from the Queen's Men in the 1580s, to Shakespeare's chronicle plays, with the emergence of discourses of English nationhood. Helgerson designated the touring theatre of the 1580s an 'actors'

[11] On the mosaic of political structures experienced by an early modern Londoner, see Steve Rappaport, *Worlds within worlds: structures of life in sixteenth-century London* (Cambridge: CUP, 1989) and Joseph P. Ward, *Metropolitan Communities: Trade Guilds, Identity, and Change in Early Modern London* (Stanford: Stanford UP, 1997)

theatre', relying on improvisatory clowning and physical dexterity by men like Tarlton. He argues this popular theatre is erased in the 1590s by the group of writers often known as 'university wits', and most especially by the history plays of Shakespeare, which identify the nation with its nobles and monarchy.[12] They turn an 'actors' theatre' into an 'authors' theatre.[13] He organize this argument around a binary between social inclusion (the Queen's Men theatre, and the Henslowe dramatists of the 1590s) and social exclusion (the Chamberlain's and King's Men's theatre of Shakespeare).[14] This argument remains influential – Scott McMillin and Sally-Beth Maclean pick up Helgerson's term, 'actors' theatre', to describe the 'medley style' of the Queen's Men.[15] However, they present the Queen's Men as clearly serving the interests of the court, in three principal ways: (i) established by Leicester and Walsingham, their drama promotes forward Protestant politics; (ii) they connect the court to the provinces, acting as a sort of private postal-service and possibly carrying out spying operations; (iii) by creating a clearly dominant, elite theatrical troupe, they help to drive other performers out of business, thus centralizing and delimiting the proliferation of theatrical practice. Their analysis focuses upon history plays. 'The most important kind of play performed by the Queen's Men,' they argue, 'was the English history play' (33), and 'their approach to

[12] Richard Helgerson, 'Staging Exclusion', *Forms of Nationhood* (Chicago: Chicago UP, 1992)
[13] 'From the Queen's Men of Tarlton and Wilson to the King's Men of Shakespeare and Burbage (to say nothing of Beaumont and Fletcher), there was a marked shift from inclusion to exclusion, from public to private, from "hodge-podge" to "art".' (*Forms of Nationhood* 203)
[14] Roslyn L. Knutson, *Playing Companies and Commerce in Shakespeare's Time* (Cambridge: CUP, 2001) argues that the contrast between Henslowe's 'hack writers' and the Chamberlain's/King's Men has been exaggerated.
[15] Scott McMillin and Sally-Beth Maclean, *The Queen's Men and their Plays* (Cambridge: CUP, 1998). Now see also the essays in Helen Ostovich, Holger Schott Syme and Andrew Griffin, eds., *Locating the Queen's Men, 1583-1603: Material Practices and Conditions of Playing* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009). Although these essays add interesting detail to the history of the Queen's Men, the framework of McMillin and Maclean's argument remains essentially unchallenged.

English history combines broad anti-Catholicism with a specifically Protestant style, "truth" and "plainness" intertwined' (36). History plays, in their argument, specifically act as devices for nation-building: the Queens' Men carry the liveries of leading courtiers and the monarch into the provinces, whilst performing fictions of national unification.[16]

Maclean and McMillin's analysis of the Queen's Men is a strange historiographical and critical hybrid. Although critically their work shows clear affinity with New Historicist interest in state-centralization, their research is also the product of the massive archival resources made available through the Records of Early English Drama (REED) project. REED is both produced out of, and continues to enable, the work of revisionist historians, who have challenged the very centralizing narratives of developing monarchical absolutism, to which Maclean and McMillin are indebted for their critical models.[17] Literary critics interested in nation-building have begun to integrate revisionist historians' research into their work, particularly through the turn towards analysis of the 'British problem' (the interactions between the four kingdoms of the Atlantic archipelago).[18] REED has begun itself to be influenced by this turn in revisionist scholarship, already moving beyond England

[16] Compare a similar recent argument made on county chorography: John M. Adrian, 'Tudor Centralization and Gentry Visions of Local Order in Lambarde's *Perambulation of Kent*', *English Literary Renaissance* (2006): 307-334.
[17] On the affinity between REED and revisionism see Robert Tittler, 'Early Modern British History, Here and There, Now and Again', *Albion* 31 (1999): 190-206, 200.
[18] Conrad Russell, *The Causes of the English Civil War* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990); John Morrill, *"Uneasy Lies the Head that Wears a Crown": Dynastic Crises in Tudor and Stewart Britain 1504-1746* (Reading: University of Reading, 2005); Glenn Burgess, ed., *The New British History: Founding a Modern State, 1603-1707* (London: Tauris Academic Studies, 1999).

into Wales, and soon into the Scottish marcher lands.[19] Critics such as Schwyzer, Maley and Kerrigan, influenced by the New British history, have analysed literature produced in, and reflecting upon, borderlands within the Atlantic archipelago between Anglo-Norman centres of power and the marginalized Celtic periphery.[20] The danger is that this work, by taking the 'nation' as its fundamental unit of analysis, can turn each of the individual nations (especially England) into unproblematic *tabula rasa*, acting as single homogeneous entities which can interact and conflict with other national entities. Ethnic and national borderlands, this section will suggest, are not the only early-modern British sites of energizing hybridity. The work of social and economics historians, particularly Keith Wrightson and his students, Michael Braddick and Philip Withington, has begun to turn away from interest in larger structures such as the 'state' or the 'nation', to analyse the development of smaller, localized institutions (the household, the parish, the incorporated borough, etc.).[21] Michael Braddick's recent work on 'state formation', for example, has turned away from earlier notions of state-building (implying centralized agency) to argue that increased monarchical power

---

[19] David N. Klausner, ed., *Wales* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press Incorporated, 2005); Elia Williamson and John McGavin, 'Crossing the Border: The Provincial Records of Southeast Scotland', in Audrey Douglas and Sally-Beth Maclean, eds., *REED in Review: Essays in Celebration of the First Twenty-Five Years* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2006), 5157-177.

[20] Willy Maley, *Nation, State and Empire in English Renaissance Literature: Shakespeare to Milton.* (Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003); Philip Schwyzer, *Literature, Nationalism, and Memory in Early Modern England and Wales* (Cambridge: CUP, 2004); John Kerrigan, *Archipelagic English: Literature, History and Politics, 1603-1707* (Oxford: OUP, 2008). A recent volume brings together historians and literary critics on the British question in the Jacobean period: Glenn Burgess, Rowland Wymer and Jason Lawrence, eds., *The Accession of James I: Historical and Cultural Consequences*. (Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006).

[21] Keith Wrightson, 'The Politics of the Parish in Early Modern England', in Paul Griffiths, Adam Fox and Steve Hindle, eds., *The Experience of Authority in Early Modern England* (Houndmills: Macmillan, 1996), 10-46; *Earthly Necessities: Economic Lives in Early Modern Britain* (New Haven and London: Yale UP, 2000).

necessarily created an increasingly *decentralized* polity, where local agents developed more effective means of wielding their own power to implement policy.[22] Literary criticism (with the exemplary exception of work on early-modern London) has yet to fully absorb some of the consequences of this scholarship.[23] We will explore ways in which we can connect together recent revisionist historical scholarship on the localized, processual, decentralized nature of early-modern Britain and to an analysis of the politics of the Queen's Men's theatre, without recourse to simple binaries of exlcusion/inclusion, or narratives of centralization and gathering monarchical absolutism.

Most critical work which has attempted to localize the performance of early-modern drama has focused on 'the place of the stage' in London. Critics following Stephen Mullaney's argument that the theatres were located outside the city walls in the Liberties, have insisted that the theatres' liberties (theatrical, social, moral) placed them in tension with the London civic government. The theatre is thus presented as an institution protected by the Privy Council and monarchy, at odds with local authorities in London.[24] In Peter Womack's words, Shakespeare's 'theatre was *nationally* central but *locally* marginal' – and the theatre's national centrality abets their performance of national centralization in the *Henry VI* history plays.[25]

---

[22] Michael J. Braddick, *State Formation in Early Modern England c.1550-1700* (Cambridge: CUP, 2000).

[23] Although see Cathy Shrank, 'Civility and the City in *Coriolanus*', *Shakespeare Quarterly* (2003): 406-423.

[24] See Stephen Mullaney, *The Place of the Stage: Licence, Play and Power in Early Modern England* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988). Matt Kozusko, 'Taking Liberties', *Early Theatre* 9 (2006): 37-60 clears up Mullaney's inaccuracies.

[25] Peter Womack, 'Imagining Communities: Theatres and the English Nation in the Sixteenth Century', in David Aers, ed., *Culture and History 1350-1600: Essays on English Communities, Identities and Writing* (New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1992), 91-145. For a more sophisticated locally situated

This approach has several problems: it tends to exaggerate the extent and nature of the opposition between civic and monarchical government, and to glamorize the city's margins. But more relevantly, it tends to suggest that the stage was fixed and centralized within London, which is untrue until the later Jacobean period.[26] The Queen's Men were, as Maclean and McMillin have shown, primarily a touring company: although they spent the winter performing in London (and sometimes the court, over the Christmas period), and the summer travelling in towns and noble households.[27] Travelling players, including the Queen's Men, needed to renegotiate the politics of competing jurisdictions at every site of performance. Each of these sites of performance needed to be persuaded firstly to permit the company to perform in their playing space, and secondly to pay the company for that performance: touring drama is at least partly an economic transaction, a commodity for sale.[28] Travelling players created networks of competing and conflicting local authority across England: the next part of this section will trace out some of the ways these jurisdictional conflicts arose and developed. We shall finally read two Queen's Men plays in the light of this analysis of jurisdictional complexity, to argue that their plays both reflect the politics of multiple jurisdictions in their refusal to

---

account of mobile performance spaces within London, see David Kathman, 'Citizens, Innholders, and Playhouse Builders, 1543-1622', *Research Opportunities in Medieval and Renaissance Drama* 44 (2005): 38-64 and Herbert Berry, 'The Bell Savage Inn and Playhouse in London' *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England* 19 (2006): 121-143.

[26] On the development of 'sedentarism' see Lawrence Manley, *Literature and Culture in Early Modern London* (Cambridge: CUP, 1995).

[27] On the extent to which tours were organized and planned, see Sally-Beth Maclean, 'Tour Routes: "Provincial Wanderings" or Traditional Circuits?', *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England* 6 (1993): 1-14. One of the most useful general surveys of attitudes to touring, and the problems it created, remains J.A.B. Somerset, '"How chances it they travel?" Provincial touring, playing places, and the King's Men', *Shakespeare Survey* 47 (1994): 45-60.

[28] On the economics of touring see William Ingram, 'The Costs of Touring', *Medieval and Renaissance Drama* 6 (1993): 57-62.

privilege one source of authority over another; and that the plays represent moments of conflicted jurisdictional authority, analogous to those created by touring theatre. In other words, the Queen's Men plays both reflect, and reflect on, the politics of multiple jurisdictions. Two plays are taken as exemplary of the Queen's Men's practice: a chronicle history (*Troublesome Raigne of King John*), and a historical romance (*Friar Bacon*) which draws on Holinshed's account of Edward III's reign.[29] Rather than an institution of state-building, the early history play emerges as a means of exploring contested and geographically dispersed sources of authority within early-modern Britain.

The REED volumes are the most useful archives in which to trace jurisdictional conflicts; it is necessary to briefly mention the methodological risks in using such an archive. The first methodological risk is that the REED volumes are legal records, and hence are likely to record voluminously jurisdictional conflict, and pass over in silence other kinds of ideological conflicts.[30] As the introduction to this DPhil project has attempted to show, however, there was an awareness among theorists and historians of the early-modern state (e.g. Smith and Coke) that the state was composed of multiple, conflicting sites of jurisdictional authority: other discourses and records provide comparable evidence to REED. Moreover, ideological conflicts (as examples below will attempt to show), such as Puritan

---

[29] Dermot Cavanagh, *Language and Politics in the Sixteenth-Century History Play* (Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003) points to the close generic affinities between history and romance plays in the period.

[30] In the 'Afterword' to *Poetry and Politics* (Oxford: OUP, 2002) David Norbrook says that the book was borne out of a 'firm belief that it was impossible to square revisionist interpretations with the immense imaginative and political openness of the period's poetic texts' (275). This thesis is broadly keen to show that revisionist historical approaches do not necessarily entail readings of texts which emphasize their political quiescence.

objections to playing, were often articulated in civic, regional and jurisdictional terms. And jurisdictional conflicts can pose questions over the sources and nature of power and authority in the kingdom.[31] The second objection to the use of REED volumes is the extent of lacunae in their records. Despite uncovering dates and places upon which plays were performed, REED has uncovered the names or contents of very few such plays (town hall records do not preserve these details). But the paper's argument that the politics of a Queen's Men play needed to be adaptable to multiple performance sites is designed to encourage a shift away from topical political reading towards analysis of the way a play is embedded within political structures and processes.[32] REED's lacunae do mean that a good deal of argument by analogy with the ways other theatre companies provoked jurisdictional disputes is necessary. While there are some reasons to assume the Queen's Men were exceptional (for instance, they were almost always paid more than any other theatre company for their visit), there is other good evidence to suggest they did create problems comparable to those of other companies. Like other companies, they were paid not to perform in a town or city; they were involved in an affray in Norwich in 1583 (precisely the sort of thing local authorities would wish to avoid); although the unique royal company, they were not unique in possessing a royal patent, and there is evidence (discussed below) that the authority

[31] Patrick Collinson argues that local institutions often operated as acephalous republics in, 'The Monarchical Republic of Elizabeth I', in John Guy, ed., *The Tudor Monarchy* (London: Arnold, 1997).
[32] A problem in the approach of Mary A. Blackstone, 'Performance and the Intertextual Negotiation of Community: The Example of Elizabethan Leicester', *Research Opportunities in Renaissance Drama* 43 (2004): 75-105. This is in many ways an excellent article, but its methodology is bifurcated between devolved revisionist local historicism and a Geertz-influenced, New Historicist analysis of the display of centralized power. For Geertz's work on the theatrical politics of monarchical progresses, see Clifford Geertz, 'Centers, Kings, and Charisma: Reflections on the Symbolics of Power', *Local Knowledge: Further Essays in Interpretive Anthropology* (London: Harper Collins, 1983), 121-146.

of such patents was contested.[33] There are good reasons to think that the Queen's Men provoked jurisdictional conflict, and that the REED volumes can be used to trace such conflict.

Travelling players and multiple jurisdictions

Companies of travelling players required a noble or royal patron, a place to perform to earn financial remuneration, and scripts, plays to perform. These four terms – patron, players, venue, and play text – exist in an infinitely complex relationship to one another, relationships which were not monolithic. The relationship between player and patron seems to have been far looser than has often been assumed, and also far less ideological.[34] Leicester's players respond to the 1572 'Act for the Punishment of Vagabonds and for the Relief of the Poor and Impotent', which demanded that players be patronised by 'any Baron of this Realm or…any other honourable Personage of greater Degree', by writing to their patron. They ask for reconfirmation of their status as Leicester's,

> household servants and daily waiters, not that we mean to crave any further stipend or benefit at your lordship's hands but our liveries as we have had, and also your honour's licence to certify that we are your household servants when we shall have occasion to travel amongst our friends as we do usually once a year, and as other noblemen's players do and have done in time past,

[33] See David Galloway, ed. *Norwich, 1540-1642* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1984), 180-3.
[34] The fullest account of theatrical patronage can be found in Paul Whitfield White and Suzanne R. Westfall, eds., *Shakespeare and Theatrical Patronage in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: CUP, 2002).

whereby we may enjoy our faculty in your lordship's name as we have done heretofore.[35]

The relationship here between players and patrons is highly devolved: they remind Leicester that 'we shall have occasion to travel amongst our friends as we do usually once a year', as though to suggest Leicester might well not be aware of their activities. Each of the players signs his name individually at the foot of the letter, suggesting there is no concept of a coherent, homogeneous 'company', but rather a series of connected individuals. The fact that the players wrote to Leicester at all suggests that the relationship between Leicester's players and the earl was not top down, but bottom up: an important distinction which is frequently elided in studies of early-modern patronage.[36] Leicester's response is to grant them a royal patent, effectively a letter, which is specifically designed to allow them to move across jurisdictions. It is addressed comprehensively: 'To all justices, mayors, sheriffs, bailiffs, head constables, under constables, and all other our officers and ministers, greeting'. And it attempts to grant Leicester's Men a universal right to perform within any jurisdiction: 'as well within our City of London and liberties of the same,

[35] Glynne Wickham, Herbert Berry and William Ingram, eds., *English Professional Theatre, 1530-1660*. (Cambridge: CUP, 2000)

[36] For an exemplary account of how Norton and Sackville might have been encouraged to adapt *Gorboduc* in the light of Leicester's appointment as the Inner Temple Lord of the Christmas Revels in 1561/2, see Mike Pincombe, 'Robert Dudley, *Gorboduc*, and "The masque of Beauty and Desire": A Reconsideration of the Evidence for Political Intervention', *Parergon* 20 (2003): 19-44. For strong versions of the opposite case (that patrons supported theatre troupes as propaganda tools) see Paul Whitfield White, 'Patronage, Protestantism and Stage Propaganda in Early Elizabethan England', *Yearbook of English Studies* 21 (1991): 39-52 and Paul Whitfield White, *Theatre and Reformation: Protestantism, Patronage, and Playing in Tudor England* (Cambridge: CUP, 1993). Suzanne R. Westfall, *Patrons and Performance: Early Tudor Household Revels* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990) argues that a theatre troupe was a sign of a patron's 'magnificence' as well as a means of constructing local affinities.

as also within the liberties and freedoms of any other cities, towns, boroughs, &c. whatsoever as without the same, throughout our realm of England'. So the key political issues which this document allows players to negotiate are not ideological (you must promote forward Protestantism) but jurisdictional (the right to perform within towns' 'liberties and freedoms'). The patent does not treat the players as a homogeneous company ('Leicester's Men'), but as a series of individuals, naming each of them: our 'loving subjects James Burbage, John Perkin, John Laneham, William Jonson, and Robert Wilson, servants of our trusty and well beloved cousin and counsellor the Earl of Leicester'. And again, this sounds rather less ideologically coherent than 'Leicester's Men'. Leicester was probably exceptional in the early-modern period for the closeness of his patronage of players, but the documentary evidence suggests that even in this extreme case, the relationship between patron and players was devolved, loose, pragmatic, and bottom-up.[37] Leicester probably supported and assisted the establishment of the Queen's Men (several of his players, such as Robert Wilson were part of the newly established company), but we cannot assume that this necessitated their propagation of internationalist Protestantism.[38] The loose patronage relationships between nobles and players may explain why we find such ideological latitude, rather than any clearly definable political agenda, in the plays of the Queen's Men.

---

[37] A valuable account of Leicester's literary patronage remains Eleanor Rosenberg, *Leicester: Patron of Letters* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1955). See also H. R. Woudhuysen, 'Leicester's Literary Patronage: A Study of the English Court, 1578-1582', (D.Phil. thesis, University of Oxford, 1981).

[38] For a rather crude attempt to make such an assumption in reading Peele's *Old Wives Tale*, see Frank Ardolino, 'The Protestant Context of George Peele's "Pleasant Conceited" *Old Wives Tale*', *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England* 18 (2005): 146-165.

Of course, the royal patent, or any other such noble patronage, did not succeed in preventing jurisdictional conflict when players arrived at sites of performance. The 1572 Vagabonds Act already recognizes that players might provoke jurisdictional conflict, specifying that 'Justices of the Peace for Counties shall not interfere with Justices for Cities'in administering the provisions set out in the Act. Likewise justices in cities or boroughs corporate were restrained from attempting to extend their powers of jurisdiction outwards into surrounding counties, as London boroughs might do into Middlesex or Surrey. Barbara Palmer's important recent essay on theatrical mobility has presented statistical evidence which suggests that towns were the most profitable performance venues for touring plays during the 1570s and 1580s, before noble and gentry households gradually supplanted their role from the 1590s onwards.[39] Given that the Queen's Men were at the height of their importance in the 1580s, it seems most appropriate to concentrate on the negotiations over performances in the town.[40] The towns which Maclean and McMillin have identified as the most common stopping points for the Queen's Men tend to possess charters of incorporation. An 'incorporated' town or borough possesses its own structures of self-government and regulation (the Mayor, the aldermen and the common council) before whom the players are required to perform. The common council is made up of 'citizens' who are freemen of the

[39] Barbara D. Palmer, 'Early Modern Mobility: Players, Payments, and Patrons', *Shakespeare Quarterly* 56 (2005): 259-305, 303.

[40] Studies which focus on household performance risk becoming rather speculative (e.g. Alison Findlay, *Playing Spaces in Early Women's Drama* (Cambridge: CUP, 2006)). But an exemplary such study (from the Caroline period onwards) is Lisa Hopkins, 'Play Houses: Drama at Bolsover and Welbeck', *Early Theatre* 2 (1999): 25-44. On the difficulty of recovering records of household performance, see Peter Davison, 'Commerce and Patronage: The Lord Chamberlain's Men's Tour of 1597', in Grace Ioppolo, ed., *Shakespeare Performed: Essays in Honor of R.A. Foakes* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2000), 56-71.

towns' guilds – like Tarlton – and they would have some involvement in the election of the aldermen and mayor.[41] When troupes arrived at an incorporated borough, it was conventional for the first performance to be paid for by the mayor and town, and to be played at the town hall. So theatre historians have observed that a relationship is here constructed between the town, the players and the players' patron: the town is able to construct an affinity with a specific patron by paying for performance by his troupe.[42] This seems to be true, and is reflected in the amount of remuneration different playing companies received. The Queen's Men tended to receive the most, with respect to their royal patron; Leicester's Men the second most, and so on. This pattern could vary according to local politics: for instance Leicester exchanged the manor of Beverley for properties in the West Midlands in 1566, but remained an influential figure in local borough politics. After their incorporation in 1573, the town set Dudley's arms in their guildhall: they clearly felt he had been instrumental in the granting of their charter. Just before this grant, in August 1572, Leicester's Men visited Beverley for a final performance at which they received their highest payment from the town.[43] Such affinities are subject to mobile local pressures.

---

[41] The classic statement of the argument for sixteenth-century urban decline is Charles Phythian-Adams, *Desolation of a City: Coventry and the Urban Crisis of the Later Middle Ages* (Cambridge: CUP 1979). For recent post-revisionist work see, Robert Tittler, *The Reformation and the Towns in England: Politics and Political Culture, c.1540-1640* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1998); *Townspeople and Nation: English Urban Experiences, 1540-1640* (Stanford: Stanford UP, 2001); Philip Withington, 'Two Renaissances: Urban Political Culture in Post-Reformation England Reconsidered', *The Historical Journal* 44 (2001): 239-267. On the growth of rhetorics and ideologies of citizenship within incorporated boroughs, see Phil Withington, *The Politics of Commonwealth: Citizens and Freemen in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: CUP, 2005).

[42] Elza Tiner, 'Patrons and Travelling Companies in Warwickshire', *Early Theatre* 4 (2001): 35-52.

[43] See Sally-Beth MacLean, 'Tracking Leicester's Men: the patronage of a performance troupe', in White and Westfall, eds., *Shakespeare and Theatrical Patronage*, 246-271, 254.

But the archive shows that there was much dispute over the significance and nature of the relationship created between town, player and patron, and we must not assume the creation of a mutually beneficial community was universal. A famous example of the construction of such a community is found in R.W.'s 1639 retrospective account of a theatrical performance witnessed in his youth in Gloucester:

> as I think…in other like corporations…if the Mayor like the Actors, or would shew respect to their Lord and Master, he appoints them to play their first play before himselfe and the Aldermen and common Counsell of the City; and that is called the Mayors play, where every one that will comes in without money, the Mayor giving the players a reward as hee thinks fit to shew respect unto them.[44]

R.W. bears witness to the complex interleaved power structures, upon which a touring performance is based. R.W. presents an ideal version of the process of constructing patronage networks through dramatic performance, in which the Mayor would not only 'shew respect to their Lord and Master' by sponsoring the play, but also 'shew respect' to the players themselves by rewarding their performance. The entire assembled corporation can watch and judge the play, not only the mayor, 'the Aldermen and Common Counsell of the City', but 'every one that will'. R.W. suggests that this relationship between players, patrons and the town

[44] R.W., *Mount Tabor* (London, 1639), 110-111.

was not isolated to Gloucester, but practised 'in other like corporations'. R.W.'s presentation of (in Patrick Collinson's expression) the 'ever seductive myth of community' – a deep horizontal association between nobles, townsmen, citizens and players – might encourage a nostalgic criticism to universalize this account of theatrical patronage.[45]

However, REED volumes show that players acted not only to construct such communities, but to prize open tensions within them. In Chester, David Mills has pointed to a letter from the Puritan Christopher Goodman (a private citizen) to the earl of Derby in 1575 that suggests that the town would like to save the £40 it generally spent on troupes with patrons, but was apprehensive about doing so. Goodman explains that some civic officials are

> partly diswaded by some addicted to coostme, and partly fearinge the displeasure of such noble personages (to whom the aforesaide Bearward*es*, Players, minstrells, and Tumblers doe appertaine and weare their lyveries) the Citie is very loth to send them awaye w*i*thout such intertainment as these vnprofitable and Idell persons desire, rather than deserve.[46]

Here, a rather different relationship between players, patrons and towns is adumbrated: Goodman perceives a tension between 'the Citie' and 'the displeasure

[45] Patrick Collinson, 'John Stow and nostalgic antiquarianism', *Imagining Early Modern London: Perceptions and Portrayals of the City from Stow to Strype, 1598-1720*, ed. J.F. Merritt (Cambridge: CUP, 2001) 27-51, 28.
[46] David Mills, 'Where Have All the Players Gone? A Chester Problem', *Early Theatre* 1 (1998): 129-137, 132-33.

of such noble personages', or in other words he sees citizens blackmailed by powerful members of the nobility. Rather than the ideal mutuality and community presented by R.W., Goodman argues that playing teases out disputes between the City and the nobility; playing becomes a flashpoint for jurisdictional conflict. Goodman is undoubtedly motivated by a Puritan hostility to drama, but it is significant that he presents his religious discontent in finely nuanced jurisdictional terms. The very plays which are able to persuade early-modern Christopher Goodmans that players are not avatars for a nobility eager to sponge off incorporated boroughs, must be ready to be performed in noble households.

A third example (albeit from a slightly later period) might suggest ways in which players could tease out conflicts between the authority of towns and the power of the court and monarchy. On March 20th 1624, the Lady Elizabeth's Men played at Dover. Their credentials were 'his Ma^{ts} lycence, & ye m^{r} of Revells his confirmation'.[47] After this stop, they made their way south to Lyme Regis, and then north to Norwich, where they arrived on Saturday, April 24th. One of the players, Francis Wambus, presented the Mayor's Court with 'A Bill signed with his Ma*ies*ties hand & vnder his highnes privie Signet authorisinge…Servant*es* to the Lady Elizabeth to play Interludes'.[48] This bill was dated March 20th 1621. Wambus was confronted with 'Letters directed from the Lord*es* of his ma*ies*ties most honorable privie Counsell Dated the 27th of May 1623': the letters state that 'mr maior & Iustices of peace are authorised & required not to suffer any Players to shewe or

[47] James M. Gibson, ed. *Kent: Diocese of Canterbury*, 3 vols. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2002), 2:516. John Tucker Murray, *English Dramatic Companies, 1558-1642* (London: Constable and Company Limited, 1910), 1:256-8 gives a good summary of this incident.
[48] Galloway, ed., *Norwich* 180-3.

exercise any playes w*i*thin this City or liberties hereof'. Wambus insisted that he and his players would perform anyway, and on April 26th they attempted to perform 'an excelent Comedy Called the Spanishe Contract' at 'the Signe of the white horse'. The mayor and JPs again attempt to prevent Wambus' performance, but he responds robustly: 'the Counsell*es* order beinge againe redd vnto him hee sayde he would play whatsoeu*er* had bene saide to the contrary & accused mr Maior to his face that he contemned the kyng*es* authority he said notwithstandinge that he would play'. Wambus was committed to prison 'vntill he should find suerties' for his 'good behavior'. The conflict here is extraordinarily multivalent, and all sources of political authority are overlapping and confused. Wambus and Elizabeth's players clearly possess a measure of royal authority: the same kind of royal license, perhaps, which was granted to Leicester's Men. But the mayor and the town authorities prefer to align themselves with the edict of the Privy Council, and presumably to some extent against the townsmen whom they represent: there is clearly a demand for plays in Norwich, as shown by the players' attempt to perform at the inn, in spite of the citizens' ban. Wambus is released from prison a month later (24th May 1624): the mayor and JPs recognize he is unlikely to find 'suerties for his good behavior' because he is 'a Stranger in this City'. Again, the players' ambiguous status, strangers to the city, is recognized.[49] But in September, he returns to Norwich again, with 'a Letter from S*i*r Henry Hobart [Herbert] Dated in Iune last'. Herbert seems to have lent his support to the players, which encouraged them to claim recompense from the citizens of Norwich for 'wronges done to the said wambus'. This final twist

[49] On 'strangers' in early-modern theatre, see John Michael Archer, *Citizen Shakespeare: Freemen and Aliens in the Language of the Plays* (Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005).

adds further jurisdictional complexity: the citizens reject the apparent efforts of Herbert to wade in on the side of players, thus potentially entering into a conflict with that powerful peer. So in this case, Lady Elizabeth's Men act as a catalyst for jurisdictional conflict between the monarch, Privy Council, citizens, town, players and finally Herbert, the Lord Chamberlain. Examples can be multiplied to show the range of ways in which travelling players must negotiate their place within multiple jurisdictions: these examples have simply tried to show the range of different ways the presence of travelling players can open up conflicts between power structures that are local (mayor, townsmen), regional (local nobility) and national (the monarch and Privy Council). The plays of the Queen's Men both register and reflect upon these multiple jurisdictional pressures.

The Troublesome Raigne of King John and Civic Politics

The second scene of *The Troublesome Raigne* must count as one of the most extraordinary moments of citizen agency in early-modern literature.[50] There are three monarchs (or potential monarchs) arraigned outside the town of Angiers: the King of France, Philip, the King of England, John, and his nephew, Arthur, the Duke of Brittany. Angiers, part of the Anjou territories in France, is an ambiguous borderland: it is at the boundaries of the lands over which England was sovereign in France. And the French king, manipulating Arthur, disputes with John over the national jurisdiction to which the town belongs. Except in this borderland, 'nation' is itself a disputed category. Philip opens the scene by proclaiming, 'Now gin we

[50] *The Troublesome Raigne of Iohn King of England* (London, 1591).

broach the title of thy claime / Yong *Arthur* in the *Albion* Territories'. The scene is not set in 'England' or 'Albion', which might falsely reify the borders and extent of the English nation, we are in '*Albion* Territories', suggestive of the kind of loose, rag-bag, miscegenated polity over which the kings will dispute. It is significant that Arthur is 'Duke of Brittaine' (Brittany), a title which gestures towards a decentralized British polity, where the channel is a link to mainland English territories rather than a boundary sundering England from the world (an England within living memory of some members of the first audience of *Troublesome*).[51] Arthur himself, rather paradoxically, seems to want to put a stop to such plurality and hybridity: he identifies John's concern to protect every atom of his territories as proof that 'questionles he is an Englishman'. But the French noble, Lewes, responds by saying that '*England* is *England*' (fair enough), 'And *Iohn* of *England* is as other *Iohns*', statements which don't quite hang together: one claiming a stable English self-identity, the other suggesting that there is no such stable entity as an 'English John'. Indeed, regional and territorial hybridity infects nearly every speech and character in the scene; perhaps Philip the Bastard is the clearest example here. He is the illegitimate son of *Cordelions*, Richard I, and is confronted with his father's killer, Lymoges, duke of Austria, who has sided with the French. Lymoges is wearing Richard's lion-skin, or as the Bastard calls it, the 'matchles moniment / Thy fathers triumph ore the Sauages'. The Bastard stakes the integrity of his identity on claiming back this stolen 'Trophie':

[51] See David Wallace, *Premodern Places* (Oxford: OUP, 2004), ch.1 for comparable work on shifting English perceptions of Calais.

Philip hath sworne, and if it be not done,

Let not the world repute me *Richards* Sonne.

The Bastard wins the lion-skin back in battle, and victoriously dons 'The first freehold that *Richard* left his son' – he retrospectively declares this spoil of conquest to be his rightful inheritance, like land passed down from father to son. And of course the bastard's hybridity is only a reflection of the conflicts over the rightful inheritance of the crown: Constance, Arthur's mother, calls her son 'heire to thy elder Brother, / Without ambiguous shadow of discent, / Is Soueraigne to the substance thou withholdst' (C2r). A region divided between jurisdictions, the town of Angiers, begins to tease apart contradictions in the way each of those jurisdictions define and legitimate themselves.

John and Philip make the extraordinary decision of allowing the 'citizens' (the term always used for the inhabitants) of Angiers to determine to which jurisdiction they belong, English or French. John boasts to Philip that their acquiescence will be instantaneous:

But wilt thou see me parley with the Towne,

And heare them offer me allegeance,

Fealtie and homage, as true liege men ought. (C3v)

Of course, the citizens turn out to be infinitely more politically subtle and complex than John has bargained for, and they insist on waiting to determine which king has

'lawful right' over their territory. The townsmen are introduced in a stage-direction:

They summon the Towne, the Citizens appeare vpon the walls. (C3v)

The townsmen are always referred to as 'Citizens', but the conjunction here of 'the Towne' and 'the Citizens appeare' suggests they may not be quite coterminous with one another. 'Citizen', in early-modern England, was a very specific title, referring to the men free of guilds in incorporated boroughs, who had active say in the running of their town (in electing aldermen, for example). So the 'citizens' who 'appeare vpon the walls' suggest these enfranchised representatives of the 130 boroughs which, at the end of the sixteenth-century, had received charters of incorporation. At the end of the scene, the citizen representative claims to speak 'for the common good' (D2r), but the citizens seem quite uncertain about how to define this 'common good'. Although citizens frequently appear in many early-modern plays whose action centres on London, the hybrid, borderland setting of Angiers specifically calls to mind the circumstances of regional performance: members of a regional political class enter the stage, uncertain of how to act or how to define their political actions.[52] Their mantra is 'till we have prooued one right, we acknowledge none

[52] On the rhetorics with which local officeholders defined their responsibilities, see Mark Goldie, 'The Unacknowledged Republic: Officeholding in Early Modern England', in Tim Harris, ed., *The Politics of the Excluded* (Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2001), 153-194; Jonathan Barry, 'Civility and Civic Culture in Early Modern England: the Meanings of Urban Freedom', in Peter Burke, Brian Harrison, and Paul Slack, eds., *Civil Histories: Essays Presented to Sir Keith Thomas* (Oxford: OUP, 2000), 181-96. A useful example of such attempts to define citizen responsibilities can be found in John Hooker, *A Pamphlet of the Offices, and duties of euerie particular sworne Officer, of the Citie of Excester* (London, 1584).

right', which they repeat to both John and Philip (C4r). This is their first response to John's statement of his sovereignty over the town:

> *Citizen*. And it please your Highnes we comptroll not your title, neither will we rashly admit your entrance: if you bee lawfull King, with all obedience we keepe it to your vse, if not King, our rashnes to be impeached for yeelding, without more considerate triall: we answere not as men lawles, but to the behoofe of him that prooues lawfull. (C4r)

Their preoccupation is with establishing the 'lawful King', and they are concerned that the dispute doesn't dissolve into violence. They seem to suggest that this concern with establishing a legal footing for sovereignty is bound up with a need to articulate their own civic identity: 'we answere not as men lawles, but to the behoofe of him that prooues lawfull'. They are not only legalistic, but pride themselves on their discursive approach to jurisdictional complexity. They 'require a parle of their Majesties' and 'Entreate your Maiestie to heare them speake'.[53] Their own speeches are repetitious (saying more or less the same to John and to Philip), and their final speech, in which they offer a solution to the jurisdictional dispute, is a long piece of deliberative rhetoric. As identities and jurisdictions are plural and complicated in this scene, so the citizens are characterized by a discursive openness and untidiness, as they attempt to define their own place within

[53] See the Swallowfield Articles (1-6) which establish rules governing rhetoric and debate in the parish. Steve Hindle, 'Hierarchy and community in the Elizabethan parish: the Swallowfield articles of 1596', *Historical Journal* 42 (1999): 835-51.

overlapping jurisdictions. Characteristically, they eventually solve the dispute not by opting for one side or the other, but by an elaborate mingling of jurisdictions brought about by marriages which reshape European politics from Spain to France.

The way in which this scene can be read politically is dependent on the site of the play's performance: despite their extraordinary political agency in redrawing European politics, the scene is not a simple case of citizen aggrandizement. The citizens are most clearly preoccupied with defining the boundaries of their civic space: they enter arraigned upon the walls, and will not 'rashly admit your entrance'.[54] Finally, the 'gates of Angiers shall giue way / And stand wide open to your [John's] harts content', only once their demands have been met. John fails to persuade them categorically that he is their lawful monarch, and asks them:

> *Iohn*. I shall not come in then?
>
> *Citizen*. No my Lord, till we know more. (C4r)

Even tiny phrases like 'admit your entrance' and 'come in' can, I think, in early-modern drama, act as signals to metadramatic complexity; the significance of this scene seems to change quite drastically as the site of performance changes. It is worth observing that these two phrases, 'admit your entrance' and 'come in' are stage directions, and stage directions which contradict one another. To 'Admit your

[54] On the reconstruction of civic spaces (in which this play was performed) see Robert Tittler, *Architecture and Power: The Town Hall and the English Urban Community c.1500-1640* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991). On town halls as performance sites, see Herbert Berry and James Stokes, 'Actors and Town Hall in the Sixteenth Century', *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England* 6 (1993): 37-55.

entrance' is to allow John to come onto the stage, frequently designated as 'out' or 'without', but when John asks to 'come in', he wishes to go off the stage: off-stage space is frequently designated as 'within' or simply 'in'. Henry Turner's recent book, *The English Renaissance Stage*, has powerfully argued that plays such as *King Lear* blur the crucial dividing line between onstage and offstage spaces.[55] Designating the stage 'without' and the tiring house 'within' is confusing from the perspective of the audience, who see things the other way round. Such confusion between audience and actor seems to me to be at the heart of the political significance of this scene in *Troublesome Raigne*. For the king, the space of the town, Angiers, is off-stage (he wants to 'come in'), and hence (in his view) outside the main arena of political activity; for the citizens, things are the other way round: they won't allow the king to make an entrance, to go off-stage from the play's perspective, but on stage from the citizens' point-of-view. And of course, as the play moves across multiple performance sites (from town-hall, to household, to court) the metatheatrical and political implications of this moment change radically. When performed in the town-hall, the nobles and monarchs stand alone, isolated on stage. The off-stage space is actually the space of the town-hall, the civic structure which the play attempts to define and explore. The audience, in other words, shares the citizen perspective: John cannot 'come in' to their arena of political activity. When the play is performed at court or in a noble household, the situation is reversed: the citizens

[55] Henry S. Turner, *The English Renaissance Stage: Geometry, Poetics and the Practical Spatial Arts 1580-1630* (Oxford: OUP, 2006), 172. See also P.W.K. Stone, *The Textual History of King Lear* (London: Scolar Press, 1980): 'It is well known that in Elizabethan theatrical parlance the stage was "out" or "without" and the tiring-house "in" or "within," though a spectator would most naturally take the opposite view' (111).

are arrayed against the audience, defining and protecting a potentially threatening space which has no material presence to the audience. The play requires the audience to define its own jurisdictional place in relation to the jurisdictional disputes and struggles of the nobles, kings and citizens onstage.[56] The audience is caught up in the mosaics of power represented in the play.

We can move from performance to play to material textual artefact, tracing citizenship politics in the play's publication history. Although the politics of citizenship in the play are explored in jurisdictions distant from the metropolitan centre, the material text of the play emphasizes the play's performances in the London civic centre. Paul Menzer, in discussion of the first *Hamlet* quarto's claim to have been performed 'in…the Citie of London', observes that this is a very rare claim on the title-pages of early-modern plays: only seven plays make specific reference to 'Citie of London' performances, and only five of those plays claim to have been performed 'in', rather than 'about', the 'honourable Citie of London'.[57] One of those plays is *The Troublesome Raigne*. If, as Peter Blayney argues, play quartos served to advertise performances, it is likely geographical and institutional details of performance were preserved accurately.[58] Work on the place of the London stage has repeatedly insisted on the antipathy of the London civic government to

[56] Compare Greg Walker's work on the political implications of performances in noble households, *The Politics of Performance in early Renaissance drama* (Cambridge: CUP, 1998) chs.1 & 2

[57] Paul Menzer, 'The Tragedians of the City? Q1 *Hamlet* and the Settlements of the 1590s,' *SQ* (2006): 162-182

[58] Peter Blayney, 'The Publication of Playbooks,' *A New History of Early English Drama*, eds. John D. Cox and David Scott Kastan (New York: Columbia UP, 1997) 357-382. For more recent work on dramatic advertising, see Tiffany Stern, '"On each Wall and Corner Poast": Playbills, Title-pages, and Advertising in Early Modern London,' *ELR* (2006): 57-89. This article also seeks to blur some of the boundaries between text and performance. Her book, *Documents of Performance in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: CUP, 2009) adds a huge amount to our understanding of dramatic performance in early-modern England.

theatrical performances, banishing theatres to the suburbs such as Southwark. But the Queen's Men were most likely exempt from any such ban, as they received specific permission to play at one particular inn on 28 November 1583, 'at the sygnes of the Bull in Bushoppesgate streete, and the sygne of the Bell in Gratioustreete and nowheare els'.[59] The claim that *Troublesome Raigne* was performed in London's civic centre is, therefore, likely to be historically accurate, but perhaps more importantly, it bears witness to the kinds of jurisdictional interrelationships that this paper has been tracing. The material form of a play that represents citizens' modes of communal organization bears witness to successful cooperation with those modes of civic government. In this context, London emerges not as an elite metropolitan centre, whose culture is clearly linked to that of the court, but rather as another example of a self-constituting civic centre, not different in kind from the regional towns and boroughs to which the Queen's Men would have brought *The Troublesome Raigne*.

But the Queen's Men's theatre tends not to simply privilege one jurisdiction over another, but prefers to depict a medley of competing jurisdictions: in *Troublesome Raigne* civic politics is by no means clearly pre-eminent. There are two other chief centres of authority in the play: courtly and noble power. Although McMillin and Maclean present the play as an exercise in exporting a courtly ideology of forward Protestantism to the regions through depictions of John's inspiring anti-Catholicism, this reading is troubled by both the extent to which John is a flawed monarch, and the greed and lechery which is at the heart of the Bastard's attempt to

[59] Quoted in E.K. Chambers, *The Elizabethan Stage*, 4 vols. (Oxford: OUP, 1923) 4:296

dissolve the monasteries. Any attempt to read the play as advertisement of the Leicestrian court faction's religious policy is only a partial account of the play's mosaics of power structures. The English nobility in the play is alienated from John's court by his religious policy (his virulent anti-Catholicism), as well as his attempt to murder Prince Arthur (the rightful king of England). This eventually sparks the nobles' rebellion: as the Bastard reports, 'The Nobles have elected Lewes King,' at Bury St Edmonds.[60] The local setting is significant: the nobles gather away from the main centre of courtly authority, near Kent from where they will receive French support. Not only are the nobles in conflict with the court, but they seem to neutralize the civic independence of England's towns: citizen attitudes become rhetorical *exempla* in Lewes' attempts to justify the rebellion. Lewes boasts to John that 'Your Citie Rochester with great applause / By some devine instinct layd armes aside', and even 'Troynovant your fayre Metropolis' yielded to his advances (C2v). The citizen initiatives of the play's opening can be heard only through the filter of political rhetoric. Clearly bounded and defined civic spaces have lost their integrity. So rather than an unequivocal reproduction of civic power to a civic audience, the play represents structures of localized authority contesting one another: a mobile English court, nobles plotting in the Suffolk countryside, and towns both resisting and engaging in larger political power struggles. Politics in the *Troublesome Raigne* are necessarily complicated by the need to perform the play in multiple locales, each with their own particularized political rhetorics and modes of self-presentation. Theatrical mobility demands texts attuned to the multiple jurisdictions in which

[60] *The Second Part of the Troublesome Raigne of King John* (London, 1591), B1v.

they will be performed. It also allows sources of power and authority in early-modern Britain to be staged and interrogated, in ways which mirror and re-enact the pressures placed upon such authorities by the jurisdictional ambiguities teased out by travelling players.

Robert Greene's *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*

Robert Greene is often grouped among the 'university wits' – Marlowe, Peele, Nashe and others – a socially exclusive group, whose elite status derived from membership of one of the universities. The phrase 'university wit' implies that their attendance at university has become a primary term for self-identification, that humanist learning has dissociated them from their origins (socially humble, geographically provincial). As Helgerson suggests, 'Though Greene and the others were no better born than Shakespeare, they had won the right to gentility along with a university degree – and that, they would have us believe, made all the difference'.[61] Critics have also tended to agree that Greene's self-presentation in print as an 'Elizabethan prodigal' is carefully constructed out of paradoxes.[62] But Greene's presentation of his own social status is similarly double: he is the metropolitan author of cony-catching pamphlets, but he also presents himself as a writer with strong roots in provincial England. The epistle to his first published work, *Mamillia*, is signed, 'From my Studie in Clarehall the vij. of Iulie' – in other words, Greene draws attention to the connection between social status and

[61] *Forms of Nationhood*, 200.
[62] Richard Helgerson, *The Elizabethan Prodigals* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1976), 79-104.

university education.[63] However, the work is dedicated to 'the right honourable his very good Lorde and Maister, Lord Darcie of the North'. Brenda Richardson has analysed the social circle adumbrated by the early dedications of Greene's prose works, showing that they describe a South Yorkshire circle of gentry, who otherwise show no connections to the London literary scene.[64] *Mamillia* may, therefore, be the fruit of a university education, but it is not an education that dislocated Greene from geographically regional centres of patronage. Two of Greene's other works suggest he may have been born in Norwich: he signs himself 'R. Greene, *Nordouicensis*' on one occasion (14:300) and '*Rob. Greene. Norfolciensis*' on another (1:258).[65] Richardson presents an intricate analysis of archival sources to show that a Greene family in Norwich did migrate to Yorkshire, and so a plausible biography can be constructed to explain Greene's connections to these parts of England. But given that Greene's self-presentation in print is so carefully constructed, perhaps more significant than the historicity of these regional connections is the fact that Greene chooses to present himself as a writer moving across geographically dispersed circles – born in Norwich, cultivating connections in Yorkshire, educated at both universities, metropolitan, courtly even, all at the same time.[66] Even when Greene dedicates his most ambitious prose work, the *Planetomachia* to Leicester, chosen

---

[63] Robert Greene, *The Life and Complete Works of Robert Greene*, ed. A.B. Grosart (London: Huth Library, 1881-6), II:143. Remaining references to the prose are given in brackets in the text.

[64] Brenda Richardson, 'Robert Greene's Yorkshire Connexions: A New Hypothesis', *Yearbook of English Studies* 10 (1980): 160-180. The Darcy family seat, for instance, was at Temple Hirst, near Snaith.

[65] For a useful discussion of Greene's biography, see Charles W. Crupi, *Robert Greene* (Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1986). Now on Robert Greene see Kirk Melnikoff and Edward Gieskes, ed., *Writing Robert Greene: New Essays on England's First Notorious Professional Writer* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008).

[66] Lori Newcomb concludes that, '[t]he authorial persona he built throughout his works, particularly in their titles and prefaces, may be his most lasting achievement.' (*ODNB*, 'Greene, Robert').

perhaps primarily because of his connections at court, Greene addresses him as 'Earl of Denbigh' – as though his status derived not from his court connections, but from his extensive landholdings in north Wales.[67]

Unlike Wilson, in this essay's opening example, Greene is not a member of the Queen's Men: he is a commercial writer, whose play script was purchased (or possibly commissioned) by the theatre company. Grace Ioppolo's important recent work has pointed to the close collaboration between writers and theatrical companies: playwrights were producing a work suited to a particular performing institution.[68] Greene does seem at times to have had a fairly cavalier attitude to the sale of his scripts: he probably sold *Orlando Furioso* to both the Queen's and Admiral's Men.[69] But *Friar Bacon* seems to have been particularly closely associated with the Queen's Men, or at least with some of their members, into the seventeenth-century: when Elizabeth Allde printed the 1630 edition of the play, she added a woodcut from the 1627 edition of Bacon's source, the chapbook, *The Famous History of Friar Bacon*. Bacon's clown in this woodcut, as Levin points out, closely resembles the many images of Richard Tarlton circulated in posthumous jest-books.[70] It is significant that the play of Greene's most associated with the Queen's Men was not one which presents forward Protestant politics, or any clear consolidation of the

[67] On Leicester's Denbigshire links see Simon Adams, *Leicester and the Court: Essays on Elizabethan Politics* (Manchester: Manchester UP, 2002), ch.14.
[68] Grace Ioppolo, *Dramatists and their Manuscripts in the Age of Shakespeare, Jonson, Middleton and Heywood: Authorship, authority and the playhouse* (London & New York: Routledge, 2006).
[69] As *The Defence of Conny Catching* (a pamphlet which may have been written by Greene himself) points out: 'Aske the Queens Players, if you sold them not *Orlando Furioso* for twenty Nobles, and when they were in the country, sold the same Play to the Lord Admirals men for as much more. Was not this plaine *Conny-catching* Maister R. G.?' (XI:75-76). Roslyn Knutson, *The Repertory of Shakespeare's Company, 1594-1613* (Fayetteville: University of Arkansas Press, 1991) agues that such permeability between repertoires was uncommon.
[70] Richard Levin, 'Tarlton in The Famous History of Friar Bacon and Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay', *MARDIE* 12 (1999): 84-98.

Tudor state: it instead explores the dangers and complexities of interactions between multiple sites of authority.[71]

Friar Bacon is set in three different locations – the court, Oxford, and Fressingfield, a village in Suffolk – and explores a minutely complex series of interrelationships and tensions between these *loci*.[72] *Troublesome Raigne* both literally negotiates multiple jurisdictions by presenting mobile, overlapping political structures on stage, and metatheatrically explores the sources and conflicts of jurisdictions' authorities (by drawing the audience into jurisdictional disputes equivalent to the players' own). *Friar Bacon* develops this metatheatricallity through Bacon's 'glasse prospectiue', which makes multiple locations visible simultaneously: when Edward looks into Bacon's mirror, he is able to watch events in Suffolk (which are also acted out on the stage). Bacon describes the viewer of his magic mirror in similar terms to a play's audience member: 'Sit still and mark the sequel to their loves' (724), he insists to Edward. Metatheatrical highlighting of the stage's ability to render multiple locations and spaces present simultaneously resonates differently in a mobile theatre than in the permanent playing spaces of London: travelling players themselves literally tease out interrelationships between regions and authorities. All the spaces presented or described in *Friar Bacon* are important stopping off points for the Queen's Men: the Queen's Men made a tour of East Anglia in most of the years they travelled; Oxford could be a lucrative stop,

[71] On the ways in which a play might be adapted to a particular company, see Lawrence Manley, 'From Strange's Men to Pembroke's Men: *2 Henry VI* and *The First part of the Contention*', *Shakespeare Quarterly* 54 (2003): 253-287.
[72] References to *Friar Bacon* are to Robert Greene, *The Plays and Poems of Robert Greene*, ed. J. Churton Collins, 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1905).

although the players sometimes ran into problems with the University authorities; and the Sussex coastal region ('from Douer to the marketplace of Rie' (237)), where Bacon plans to build his 'wall of brasse', was a frequently travelled route.[73] Networks articulated by characters in the play are simultaneously being constructed by the actors of the play. Whereas *Troublesome* focussed on the politics of a particular institution – the incorporated borough – Greene's play explores a far wider range of conflicts created by interactions between geographically dispersed institutions.

Greene carefully constructs networks of institutions, which are connected to one another both vertically between different institutionally levels, and horizontally across geographical spaces. At the apex of vertical hierarchy of institutions is Henry III's court; Henry is presented as a rural landowner, whose lands stretch to the Suffolk deer-park, where his 'keeper' (the father of Margaret, the play's love interest) tends 'my fallow deere'. The king possesses only the most devolved and loose power over his polity. The university of Oxford is a semi-independent region, which Bacon refers to as 'our Accademicke State', and is permitted to devise its own entertainments for Henry's royal visit.[74] Bacon's college, Brasenose, is a further independent region within the university: in exchange for using his magic to help him win Margaret, Prince Edward offers Friar Bacon, 'Liuing and lands to strength thy colledge state'. But such miniature independent states can only be allowed a certain level of freedom: Henry is shocked that poor scholars food is offered as a

[73] McMillin and Maclean, *Queen's Men* 55-67.
[74] As Cambridge and Oxford had done in 1564 and 1566 respectively. See Richard Edwards, *The works of Richard Edwards: Politics, Poetry and Performance in Sixteenth-Century England*, ed. Ros King (Manchester: Manchester UP, 2001).

banquet for the 'western kings', and Bacon is forced to summon a ridiculously splendid banquet. Some town and gown divisions are also apparent: Oxford's Constable presents the drunken courtiers 'before the doctors to aunswer your misdemeanour', but the doctors do not enforce any justice. Such divisions are uniquely jurisdictionally problematic for travelling players: two incorporated institutions (town and University) frequently disputed over whether to permit playing.[75] Neither are Oxford's colleges independent of the fleshy world of taverns and kitchens. Bacon promises to show the assembled scholars that Burden has been studying a 'booke he keepes at *Henly* for him selfe': the book turns out to be the 'Hostesse at *Henly*, mistresse of the *Bell*', who was magically transported from 'the kitchen mongst the maydes, / Spitting the meate against supper for my guesse' (298-299). Suffolk is, finally, no monolithic entity, but a complex of small institutions connected to the nation as a whole. Lambert, a Suffolk landowner, gives the most complete expression of the multiple institutional layers which make up England, when he suggests that Margaret is the paragon of all English women:

> *Lambert.* Peggie the louelie flower of all townes,
> Suffolks faire Hellen, and rich Englands star,
> Whose beautie tempered with her huswifrie,
> Makes England talke of merry Frisingfield. (1392-5)

[75] Siobhan Keenan, *Travelling Players in Shakespeare's England* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002). No doubt playing continued: *Hamlet* and *Volpone* both claimed to have been performed in the Universities, and University drama shows the influence of the professional stage (e.g. *Return from Parnassus*).

The speech circles from the town (Fremingham, the town near to Fressingfield in which Henry locates the play's events), to the county (Suffolk), and nation, before returning to the local institutions in which we watch Margaret participate: the household and the village. Edward first encounters Margaret in her role in the household: she 'swept like *Venus* through the house', and she 'did shine, / As *Pallace* mongst her Princely huswiferie' (74, 77-8). But she is most frequently contextualized within 'merry Frisingfield' itself – a source of local pride and identity for the village. Modes of local and national self-identification coexist in this play: Margaret is the pride of towns, counties, nations, households and villages, all at once. It should be pointed out that Greene went to great lengths in adapting his sources to introduce these complex, multilayered institutions: nothing so complex can be found in *The Famous History of Friar Bacon*. For instance, details of Bacon's fellowship at Brasenose were taken from Bale's *Illustrium maioris Britanniae scriptorum Summarium*, where we read that Bacon was 'Oxonii ad nasum aeneum'.[76]

The staging of such networks is, however, not simply an exercise in presenting a nostalgic or idealized vision of horizontal community: institutional complexity can produce rivalries and ruptures analogous to those produced by real touring theatre troupes. The clearest example of such rupture occurs near the end of the play, when Lambert and Serlsby's sons, two Oxford scholars, approach Bacon to ask if they can make use of his 'glass prospectiue'. The first scholar tells Bacon that 'we are Suffolke men and neighbouring friends', 'colledge mates', whose fathers'

[76] John Bale, *Illustrium maioris Britanniae scriptorum Summarium* (London, 1548) Ff2v. See P.Z. Round, 'Greene's Materials in *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*', *Modern Language Review* 21 (1926): 19-21 and Frank Ardolino, 'Greene's Use of the History of Oxford in *The Honourable History of Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*', *American Notes and Queries* 18 (2005): 20-25.

lands 'adioyne' ('in *Crackfield* mine doth dwell, / And his in *Laxfield*' (1764-1768)). Warren Boutcher, commenting on this scene, observes that the scholars' time at university has 'clearly strengthened their identification with their "country"'.[77] The audience and the two young scholars watch Lambert and Serlsbie, in the 'glass prospectiue', boast that they each have a son, 'That liues in *Oxford* in the *Brodgates* hall' (the old site of Pembroke College), who will 'reuenge his fathers bloud with bloud' (1794). The fathers' conflict has been presented earlier in the play as an essentially economic dispute. Lambert makes an offer to Margaret's father that he will 'make thy daughter ioynter' of his 'land and liuing', but Serlsby reminds Margaret's father that he is 'the lanslord…of thy holds, / By coppie all thy liuing lies in me'. He then promises to 'infeofe faire *Margaret* in all' (1369-1373). But when we watch the men in the 'glass prospectiue', their economic dispute turns violent: the fathers kill each other, and immediately after they are each revenged as the sons stab one another. An economic dispute in Suffolk leads to the death of two men in Oxford. Although the title-pages to Greene's prose works suggests a comfortable accommodation between his regional links and his humanist, University education, this scene implies that such networks might be divisive. This troubling scene is immediately read by Bacon as a sign he must 'end all thy magicke and thine art at once', and he remonstrates with himself that 'thy magicke doth effect this massacre' (1823, 1819). The rapid communications between regions facilitated by Bacon's magic serves to intensify conflicts which themselves develop out of intense

[77] Warren Boutcher, 'Pilgrimage to Parnassus: Local Intellectual Traditions, Humanist Education, and the Cultural Geography of Sixteenth Century England', in Yun lee Too and Niall Livingston, eds., *Pedagogy and Power: Rhetorics of Classical Learning* (Cambridge: CUP, 1996), 110-48.

identifications between multiple English 'countries'. So the scene is not only a kind of repudiation of the play's relatively harmonious image of institutional networks, it also implies some of the dangers involved in theatrical mobility. If Bacon's 'magic' is, as suggested earlier, not only an emblem for theatre's ability to transform one symbolic space into another, but also of the literal mobility of the Queen's Men's theatre, then Bacon's responsibility also implies that the process of building connections between different jurisdictional layers contains the potential for violent rupture.

Bacon's smashing of his 'glass prospectiue' shuts down one medium of communication between regions. But the failure of his second plan, to build a 'wall of brasse' around England preserves England's international permeability. Bacon's plan was originally designed to 'strengthen England by my skill', and give her the capability to resist the invasion of 'ten *Caesars*' (229-30). But 'England' is an unstable category – Bacon reveals his plan is merely to build a wall 'such as rings the *English* strond / From *Douer* to the marketplace of *Rie*' (236-7). 'England' is reduced here to a short stretch of the Sussex coastline. The synecdoche by which 'strond' ('coast') becomes 'England' is itself caught up in the play's larger questioning of the rhetoric by which England should define itself. As conflicts over national and regional jurisdictions in the hybrid borderland around Angiers in *Troublesome* provoked wider conflict over English identities, so in *Friar Bacon* England shivers into multiple communities (villages, towns, counties, institutions) which attempt both to build, and to resist, connections between one another. The play ends with an uneasy celebration of monarchical authority through Bacon's Galfridian

prophecy, in which England is presented as 'the Royall Garden of a King'. But the monarchs and nobles leave Margaret in her regional context: she remains, 'the louely star of *Fressingfield*', while also becoming 'Countesse to the *Lincolne* Earle' (2054-55).[78] Local particularism is finally juxtaposed with monarchical power, in a play which refuses to present any single account of England's identity or its structures of power.

McMillin and Maclean begin by asking why Walsingham (probably with Leicester's help) established the company, the Queen's Men. They conclude that '[a]mong the manoeuvres by which [Walsingham] sought to maintain the influence of advanced Protestantism should be numbered the formation of an acting company bearing the queen's name and performing plays of such English and Protestant moderation as could displease only those reformers opposed to playing itself.'[79] In some sense this is the wrong question to be asking. It is an inevitably top-down question (from Walsingham's perspective), in contrast to the bottom up approach (the REED volumes, and the plays of the Queen's Men themselves) that taken here. When a theatre troupe has been established, theatrical patronage does not seem to have entailed particularly close ideological supervision on the part of the patron: being a Queen's Man does not automatically entail being a *Queen*'s Man, an organ of her power and magnificence, as some have argued membership of the King's Men

[78] Wendy Wall argues the play's ending repudiates the local household economies which her reading had earlier traced. See *Staging Domesticity: Household Work and English Identity in Early Modern Drama* (Cambridge: CUP, 2002), 127-146
[79] McMillin and Maclean, *Queen's Men*, 32

did in the 1600s.[80] Although, of course, the Queen's Men plays were performed at court, the court is one of many competing power structures that shapes these plays. Any turn back to 'Walsingham's intentions' in establishing the company simplifies the competing and overlapping agencies (patrons, audiences, authors, companies, etc.) that this paper has attempted to trace. Nina Levine's recent work on *Sir Thomas More* has argued that there is a relationship between the mode of the play's production (a highly collaborative project) and the participatory, civic politics staged in the play.[81] I wish to end by suggesting that a similar homology between devolved and decentralized modes of theatrical production and the staging of political processes can be found in the Queen's Men, but that this homology is most closely reflected in relation to the plays' style. McMillin and Maclean have written well on the Queen's Men's 'medley style': the combinations of genres, multiple symbolic stage spaces (jostling of *locus* and *platea*), mixtures of improvisation and fidelity to the script. The authors see this style as an expression of the plays' Protestant politics (a native, plain style, with affinities to that of the mid-century Edwardian poets). In the light of this paper's approach, it might be better to say that 'medley' style is a necessary consequence of the medley of political, jurisdictional agencies out of which these plays were produced. As *Friar Bacon*, for example, moves between multiple regions of authority and power, it also juxtaposes multiple genres: academic drama (in the scenes of Bacon beating his student), pastoral (in some of the Suffolk scenes), history play, romance. This discursive openness and

[80] Alvin B. Kiernan, *Shakespeare, the King's Playwright: Theatre at the Stuart Court 1603-1613* (New Haven: Yale UP, 1995).
[81] Nina Levine, 'Citizens' Games: Differentiating Collaboration and *Sir Thomas More*', *Shakespeare Quarterly* 58 (2007): 31-64.

variety is a testament to the plays' ability to move within a huge range of institutional structures, (each with their own discursive practices and rhetorics of authority), and to analyse the conflicts between such structures.

(ii) Writing the Borders of Wales

A lot happens to the history play in between the Queen's Men's pioneering efforts in the 1580s and the next play we will consider in depth, R.A.'s *The Valiant Welshman*, written in 1610.[82] One of the most important things that happens, in the present context, is that the history play starts to deal more directly than had before been possible with issues of the unity and disunity of Britain.[83] Shakespeare's history plays most obviously move in this direction, away from the chronicles of medieval history towards the tragedies of the British past, especially, of course, in *King Lear*.[84] There was a great deal of Welsh history on the Jacobean stage.[85] Shakespeare's *Cymbeline*, featuring Innogen's journey to Milford Haven, is by far the most famous example, but around the same time were written William Rowley's, *A Shoomaker, A Gentlemen*, Fletcher's *Bonduca*, the anonymous *Tom a Lincoln*, and

[82] R.A., *The Valiant Welshman* (London, 1615). It has been suggested this R.A. is Robert Armin. Although I have no author to offer as a substitute, it seems very unlikely that the author of the *Valiant Welshman* was Armin. His primarily comic output is quite unlike the *Valiant*, and there is nothing in his biography to connect him to the Prince's Men.
[83] James Shapiro, 'The Scot's Tragedy and the Politics of Popular Drama', *English Literary Renaissance* 23 (1993): 428-449 on a play of the 1590s which seems to have created much controversy in its depiction of Scottish history and politics.
[84] These issues are put clearly in Lisa Hopkins, *Shakespeare on the Edge: Border-crossing in the Tragedies and the* Henriad (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005).
[85] For an overview of these plays see Tristan Marshall, *Theatre and Empire: Great Britain on the London Stages Under James I and VI* (Manchester: Manchester UP, 2000).

R.A.'s *The Valiant Welshman*. There are two broad reasons why this Welsh material is widespread in the early seventeenth century. The first is that the accession of James VI of Scotland to the English crown in 1603 opened up a large debate about the possibility of uniting the whole of the British isles into one kingdom—to become 'great Britain'. Union of the states would be different from union of the crowns, because it might require common legal, religious and administrative policies throughout the British isles.[86] Wales offered one model for such a union—a model which John Morrill has called 'incorporative union'.[87] From 1536-1543, Henry VIII's first and second acts of Union entirely replaced Wales' indigenous structures of governance with English institutions: so Wales was divided into shires, like England, and English common law and practices of land tenure were uniformly applied.[88] Perhaps the most explicit example of Wales being used as a model for union is found in John Thornborough's *The Ioifull and blessed reuniting of the two mighty & famous kindomes, England & Scotland*: 'For who so considereth that many Shires, with the principality of Wales, heretofore made one England, cannot but confesse, that likewise England, & Scotland, with al their territories, Ilands, Shires, and Countries make now one great Brittaine, and al the people of both the mighty nations, Brittaines'.[89] Thinking about Wales often entails thinking about Scotland, and its

[86] The literature on the Union is enormous, but see for instance Jenny Wormald, 'Oh Brave New World? The Union of Scotland and England in 1603', in T.C. Smout, ed., *Anglo-Scottish Relations from 1603-1900, Proceedings of the British Academy* 127 (2005): 13-35.
[87] John Morrill, 'Thinking About the New British History', in David Armitage, ed., *British Political Thought in History, Literature and Theory, 1500-1800* (Cambridge: CUP, 2006), 23-46.
[88] Peter R. Roberts, 'Wales and England after the Tudor "Union": Crown, Principality and Parliament, 1543-1624', in Claire Cross, David Loades, and J.J. Scarisbrick, eds*., Law and Government under the Tudors: Essays Presented to Sir Geoffrey Elton* (Cambridge: CUP, 1988), 111-38.
[89] John Thornborough, *The Ioifull and blessed reuniting of the two mighty & famous kindomes, England & Scotland* (London, 1604), A1v-A2r.

relationship to England, and thinking about that relationship will often lead writers to consider Wales.[90]

The second, related, reason for early seventeenth-century interest in Wales is that, according to Galfridian historiography, Wales was the final point of retreat, within Britain itself, for the original British inhabitants of the island once the Saxon invaders had defeated them. A major element of Galfridian history was Cadwalader's prophecy that a British descendant would reunite the entire kingdom of Britain: such prophecies were frequently applied to James, who traced his ancestry back to the British (i.e. Welsh) kings via the Tudor line.[91] So there was a great deal of historical, antiquarian interest in the Anglo-Saxon and pre-Saxon history of Britain in the early seventeenth century, and attitudes taken to each of these periods could carry political inflections. Just to give one example of this kind of work: the Welsh antiquary George Owen Harry's produced a history of Britain called *The genealogy of the high and mighty Monarch King James* (1604), which draws on the Noahic origins of peoples, Galfridian history and sixteenth century historiography to produce an account of James' 'lineal descent from *Noah*, *by diuers direct lines to* Brutus, *first Inhabiter* of this Ile of Brittayne; and from him to *Cadwalader*, the last King *of the British blood; and from thence, sundry wayes to his Maiesty:* wherein is playnly shewed his rightfull Title, by lawfull descent *from the said* Cadwalader*, as well to the Kingdome of Brittayne*, *as to* the Principalities of

[90] Kerrigan, *Archipelagic English*, 79-90.
[91] On this see Philip Schwyzer, *Literature, nationalism, and memory in early modern England and Wales* (Cambridge: CUP, 2004).

Northwales and Southwales'.[92] Such ancient history was given new currency by the Stuart accession.

The influence of the New British History on early modern literary studies – most importantly in John Kerrigan's new book, *Archipelagic English* (2008) – has encouraged a focus on the triangular interaction between the 'three kingdoms' that make up the Atlantic Archipelago (England, Scotland and Ireland), as well as on the cultural importance of Wales.[93] But such focus on 'kingdom' or even 'nation' as a fundamental unit of analysis, as well as being anachronistic, tends to occlude interest in local regions within those nations (north Wales, rather than Wales, say). Such accounts can sometimes become complicit with the process of erasure of local cultures by state-centralization which they aim to critique. Jurisdictional disputes over territories exert pressure on identities to encourage the development of particular kinds of local affiliation—with civic, county, ethnic or national bodies. The relationship between centre and locality is dialectical: one cannot conceive of the local without also being able to conceive of its opposite, the central or national; literary texts, too, are shaped by this dialectic. There has been far less study of the dramatization of the history of the pre-Norman Conquest period than that of later medieval history, work on which has been inspired by Shakespeare's chronicle

[92] George Owen Harry, *The Genealogy of the High and Mighty Monarch, James, by the grace of God, King of great Brittayne, &c. with his lineal descent from Noah, by diuers direct lines to Brutus, first Inhabiter of this Ile of Brittayne; and from him to Cadwalader, the last King of the British blood; and from thence, sundry wayes to his Maiesty: wherein is playnly shewed his rightfull Title, by lawfull descent from the said Cadwalader, as well to the Kingdome of Brittayne, as to the Principalities of Northwales and Southwales* (London, 1604).

[93] Also in this field see, e.g., Lisa Hopkins, 'Welshness in Shakespeare's English Histories', in *Shakespeare's History Plays: Performance, Translation and Adaptation in Britain and Abroad*, ed. Ton Hoenselaars (Cambridge: CUP, 2004), 60-74.

plays.[94] Gordon McMullan in an important essay has recently called attention to the lack of work in this area; but Teresa Grant and Barbara Ravelhofer's new collection of essays on non-Shakespearean history plays doesn't contain an essay on the subject.[95] We need to continue the recovery of the multiple and contradictory uses to which ancient British history could be put in verse, prose and drama; and to continue to think about the ways in which both geographical mobility, and entrenchment within particular regions, can shape the ways in which such histories are written and presented.

The Borders of Wales[96]

At the opening of *The Valiant Welshman* a Welsh Bardh is summoned 'from his Tomb' to offer a prologue to the play. He begins by laying out the drama's historical context. He describes the political system under which ancient Wales was governed, pointing out that before Wales' union, it was governed by two kings:

> Before fair *Wales* her happy Union had,
> Blest Union, that such happines did bring,
> Like to the azure roof of heaven full packt
> …

[94] On Shakespeare and Wales see most recently Willy Maley and Philip Schwyzer, *Shakespeare and Wales: From the Marches to the Assembly* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2010).
[95] Gordon McMullan, 'The Colonisation of Britain on the Jacobean Stage', in Gordon McMullan and David Matthews, eds., *Reading the Medieval in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: CUP, 2007), 119-142; Teresa H. Grant and Barbara Ravelhofer, *English Historical Drama, 1500-1660: Forms Outside the Canon* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008).
[96] For an attempt to supervise and control Wales' border with the sea see W.R. Robinson, 'Dr. Thomas Phaer's Report on the Harbours and Customs Administration of Wales under Edward VI', *Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies* (1972): 485-503.

So was it with the spacious bounds of *Wales*,

Whose firmanent contained two glorious Suns,

Two Kings, both mighty in their arch-command…

But which 'happy Union' of Wales is being referred to here? Is it 'the uniting of Wales into a single kingdom'? Or does the first line mean 'before Wales' happy Union with the rest of England and Britain'? The first interpretation leaves open the possibility that union with the rest of Britain is unhappy, or at least incomplete, whilst the second interpretation questions whether Wales itself is a single entity, a national whole in its own right. These questions about the unity of Wales itself, and the unity of Wales with England, both remain unfinished and incomplete in the early Jacobean period.[97] There were two political and administrative conflicts that affected the 'unity' of Wales in the early seventeenth century. Returning to the two possible ways of reading the line from *The Valiant Welshman* with which this section began, 'Before fair Wales her happy Union had', we might say that the first conflict was over the extent to which Wales had a happy Union with England; and the second conflict was over the extent to which Wales had a happy Union with herself. The conflict over the nature of Wales' union with England is referred to by modern historians as the 'Four Shires controversy'.[98] Wales, and the four shires which border it – Herefordshire, Worcestershire, Shropshire and Gloucestershire - were administered in the early seventeenth century by the Council of Wales. The Council

[97] See especially John Kerrigan, *Archipelagic English* (Oxford: OUP, 2008).
[98] The best account of this dispute is R.E. Ham, 'The Four Shire Controversy', *Welsh History Review* 8 (1977): 381-400, to which my account is indebted.

acted as a law court, dealing with local disputes in Wales and these four shires. It was governed by a Lord President, and provided a useful means by which central government policy—especially religious policy—could be enforced in the region.[99] Although the body was called ' the council of Wales', its main seat was at Ludlow in Shropshire, and it travelled around the four shires. Edward IV had created the council by royal prerogative, and Henry VIII's 1543 second Act of Union had granted the council jurisdiction in Wales and 'the marches of Wales'. 'Marches' was a disputed term: did it refer to the defunct marcher lordships in Wales itself, in which case the jurisdictional claim was redundant? Or did it refer to the 'marches' of Wales in England – the four border shires? In the early seventeenth century, its jurisdiction over the four shires was under dispute in the shires themselves. The Council had come to be seen as corrupt, as an unnecessary financial burden on the shires (because it tended to impose heavy fines on these more prosperous areas in order to raise money), and as a tool of central policy largely dissociated from the local needs of the gentry. Its members were judges whose primary loyalty was to the centre, and its president need not have had any particular local connections—this was true of Edward, Lord Zouche, for example, the president from 1604-1607. Dislike of the council's authority was building in the latter half of the sixteenth century: the former palatinate of Chester, for example, successfully won exemption in 1569, with the assistance of the Earl of Leicester; although the town of Gloucester was refused a similar exemption in the 1590s. But from 1604 onwards, a group of

[99] Milton's *Masque at Ludlow Castle* has frequently been read in the context of the investiture of the Lord President of the Council of Wales, Lord Bridgewater, and the problematic nature of Welsh border-politics. See especially, 'Purity and Danger on the West Bank of the Severn: The Cultural Geography of *A Masque Presented at Ludlow Castle, 1634*', *Representations* 60 (1997): 22-48.

'gentlemen opposers' began to organize themselves in Parliament far more systematically. This group was loosely led by Herbert Croft, an MP for Herefordshire. The Crofts were a local family of consequence, whose fortunes had declined rather in the late sixteenth century; but Herbert Croft was determined to renew their status. Part of the reason for leading this dispute against the council's jurisdiction was to establish a leading role among the local four shires gentry. Many did support him, but opposition within the Four Shires was by no means universal or uniform. From 1605 the four shires started to boycott the council's rulings, but in Ludlow they continued to observe them—Ludlow benefited a great deal economically from the fact that the council had its base there. James held out against the removal of the Council's jurisdiction from the four shires: he and others, including Francis Bacon, argued that Croft and his gentlemen opposers were attacking the royal prerogative. The conflict rumbled on until around 1614, when minor reforms to the council's authority helped to placate the four shires gentry.

Several issues are relevant to the present thesis' thinking about regionalism. The first and most obvious is simply that the borders of Wales remained incompletely defined in the early seventeenth century: were the 'marches of Wales' a part of Wales or a part of England? Bacon points out in his 'Arguments on the Jurisdiction of the Council of the Marches' that the word 'march' means 'limit', but that neither side could agree on where that limit should be drawn.[100] The four shires remained a contested borderland. But it was a borderland primarily contested by the *English* shires: Welsh gentry and MPs were generally supportive of

[100] James Spedding et al., eds., *The Works of Sir Francis Bacon*, 14 vols. (London: Longman, 1861-1879), V.587-611, esp.587.

the council. The 'four shires controversy' is an English problem, as much as it is British problem.[101] The second large point is what this dispute can tells us about the role of antiquaries in early modern politics. On 10th April 1606, when Croft's bill was presented to Parliament, 'These Committees appointed to search the original Bill, Mr. Lieutenant of the Tower, Sir Rob: Johnson, Sir Rob: Cotton, Sir John Heigham, Sir Edw: Hobby'.[102] Two of these MPs were members of the Society of Antiquaries: Robert Cotton is, of course, the most famous antiquary and member of parliament of this period; 'Mr Lieutenant of the Tower' was Robert Bowyer, the parliamentary diarist and distinguished keeper of the Tower records from 1604.[103] Edward Hoby, although not a member of the Society of Antiquaries itself, was on the fringes of this circle: he was the dedicatee of the *Hibernia* section of Camden's *Britannia* (1587).[104] So antiquarian research contributed directly to the problems of Union and regional government within the British Isles.[105] And the third, simple point to observe, is the extent to which both regional identities and central power are dependent upon one another in this exchange: Croft used the dispute with central government to bolster his position among local gentry (we don't know if that was his intention, but it certainly seems to have been the result, at least until 1614); but when the

[101] A point which tends to be neglected by Kerrigan, *Archipelagic English*, because he is keen to situate even specific regional disputes within a model of the interactions between the three kingdoms.
[102] 'House of Commons Journal Volume 1: 10 April 1606', *Journal of the House of Commons: volume 1: 1547-1629* (1802), 295-296. URL: http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=6616 [Date accessed: 07 October 2010].
[103] On Cotton's role in early-modern politics see Kevin Sharpe, *Sir Robert Cotton, 1586-1631 : history and politics in early modern England* (Oxford: OUP, 1979). For more on Robert Bowyer and the records see chapter 1.
[104] William Camden, *Britannia* (London, 1586), on the verso of the separate title-page for the 'Hibernia' section, dedication to 'Domino Edwardo Hobeio'.
[105] On the interest of the members of the Society of Antiquaries in Celtic history see Linda van Norden, 'Celtic Antiquarianism in the "Curious Discourses"', *Essays Critical and Historical, Dedicated to Lily B. Campbell* (Berkley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1950), 65-70.

'gentlemen opposers' begin ignoring the council's authority, there is very little either the Council or James could do about it: they were dependent on the goodwill of the gentry to enforce central policy. So the four shires controversy tells us something about not only a Welsh/English border dispute, but also about the uses of historiography and the problematics of regionalism in Britain.

But if Wales did not have an entirely happy Union with England, she also did not have an entirely happy Union with herself. After the second act of Union, contemporary historians were divided over whether or not Wales was any longer a principality: i.e. whether or not the king's son should still be 'prince of Wales'. This dispute has wider regional ramifications— the palatinate of Chester and the duchy of Cornwall would also have been part of this principality. Perhaps the most important sixteenth century historian of Wales was David Powel, who compiled the *Historie of Cambria* (1584), building on the researches of the major Welsh antiquary, Humphrey Llhuyd.[106] This book continued to be reprinted well into the eighteenth century. Powel, in the *Historie of Cambria*, gives a list of all the princes of Wales (12 of them) with short biographies of each, but argued that Wales had now ceased to be a separate principality, with a separate prince: 'In the 29. yeere of king Henrie the eight, prince Edward his sonne was borne…who bicause the principalitie of Wales was now by statute…incorporated to the crowne and kingdome of England, being vnder the same lawes and iurisdiction, was none otherwise Prince of Wales than

[106] Caradoc of Llancarvan, *Historie of Cambria, now Called Wales*, tr. Humphrey Llwyd, corr. and cont. by David Powel (London, 1584); rev. William Wynne (London, 1697). On the importance of Welsh historiography for sixteenth-century Welsh identities, see Philip Jenkins, 'Seventeenth-Century Wales: Definition and Identity', in Brendan Bradshaw and Peter Roberts, eds., *British Consciousness and Identity: The Making of Britain, 1533-1707* (Cambridge: CUP, 1998).

vnder the generall title of England: as the king his father was king of England, and vnder the name K. of Wales as a member of England'.[107]

However, James' accession rendered this issue more problematic. His son, Henry, was ambitious to define his own power and identity within the Jacobean court.[108] One member of the Society of Antiquaries—whose members we have already seen were involved in the four shires controversy – wrote a tract for the king (and Henry) on the subject. This was John Doddridge, the lawyer and antiquary who also wrote important treatises on the authority of Parliament, which were published in 1658. *The History of the Antient and moderne Estate of The Principality of Wales, Dutchy of Cornewall, and Earldome of Chester* was dedicated to James in manuscript (it wasn't published until 1630). He argued that giving the heir to the throne some noble title and office was a widespread practice in European history: 'hence it is that all Potentates of the world haue highly respected and aduanced in the eyes of their subjects, their heire apparent, and giuen and conferred vpon him very high and eminent titles of honor: Of the Romans he was called *Caesar* and *Princeps juventutis*, as the principall of all their hopes in their posterity. Of the French he is honored by the name of the *Dolphin* of that part of the Country, being his patrimony. And in like manner in this our Country of *England*, the Prince of *Wales*, Duke of *Cornwall*, and Earle of *Chester*'.[109] He goes on to argue for the administrative convenience of the office of the prince of Wales, and for its antiquity.

---

[107] Caradoc of Llancarvan, *Historie of Cambria*, 382.
[108] The standard account of Henry's court is still Roy C. Strong, *Henry, Prince of Wales and England's Lost Renaissance* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1986).
[109] John Doddridge, *The History of the Antient and moderne Estate of The Principality of Wales, Dutchy of Cornewall, and Earldome of Chester* (London, 1630), dedicatory epistle.

But if the wholeness and unity of Wales was emphasized in order to defend the idea it remained a separate principality, then its union with England came into question. And when its union with England was questioned – by arguing that a prince of Wales was necessary to bring administrative order to Wales – then it started to seem problematic to turn Wales into a separate principality, and encourage the development of separate, regionally autonomous power-bases within Britain. The issue was eventually fudged, and Henry was invested as Prince of Wales in 1610. Anthony Munday's city pageant celebrating Henry's investiture, *Londons Loue*, turns Powel's historical argument against itself: Munday draws directly on Powel's history of the princes of Wales (he must have had the book open in front of him), but uses them to celebrate the antiquity of the principality, rather than to show it had become defunct.[110] So it was not only the borders of Wales which were under dispute, but also the extent to which Wales, and the related territories of Cornwall and Chester, should be considered a separate whole within Britain. So this dispute over Wales and its territories was being driven by overlapping sources of authority: the king, prince Henry, English gentry, Welsh officials, courtiers, historians.

Drama and the Borders of Wales

As we have seen, the Four Shires Controversy was not a dispute confined only to a small group of gentry. And not only were antiquaries and scholars involved

[110] Anthony Munday, *Londons loue, to the Royal Prince Henrie meeting him on the riuer of Thames, at his returne from Richmonde, with a worthie fleete of her cittizens, on Thursday the last of May, 1610* (London, 1610).

in the debate, so too were playwrights. *The Valiant Welshman* is a play probably first performed in London by Prince Henry's Men—before James' accession this company was the Lord Admiral's Men.[111] The relationship between dramatic companies and patrons seems to have been closer in the early seventeenth century than in the late sixteenth century: the players are entered amongst other 'Offices to the Prince,' as receiving four and a half yards of red cloth apiece as liveries for the coronation procession on 15 March 1604.[112] Between 1606 (when the company seems to have received its patent) and 1610, new players were added to the company. By the time a list of 'Comedyanes and Playores', included in the establishment book drawn up when Henry formed his own Household as Prince of Wales, six new players had been added to the eight already listed in the patent.[113] This was therefore a growing company, and may to some extent have benefited from the increasing prominence of Prince Henry in the run up to his investiture as Prince of Wales.[114] It was a company with a London theatrical base, at the Fortune theatre. But we should not think that London audiences and playwrights were insulated from debates over regional administration. Let us take one example of such interaction. In his parliamentary diary, the antiquary and MP Robert Bowyer in 1606 recorded that the poet John Hoskyns (MP for Hereford) seconded Herbert

---

[111] See the account in G.E. Bentley, *The Jacobean and Caroline Stage: Dramatic Companies and Players*, 5 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1941), I.135

[112] John Tucker Murray, *English Dramatic Companies, 1558-1642*, 2 vols. (London: Constable and Company Limited, 1910), I.207.

[113] See Bentley, *Jacobean and Caroline Stage*, I.136.

[114] Henry's investiture was met not only with pageants in London, but in Wales too. The text of the celebrations in Ludlow was written by Daniel Powel, son of David Powel, the Welsh historian. See Daniel Powel, *The Love of Wales to their soueraigne Prince, Expressed in a true Relation of the solemnity held at Ludlow in the Countie of Salop, vpon the fourth of Nouember last past. Anno Domini. 1616* (London, 1616).

Croft's motion to reject the authority of the council of Wales over the four shires: 'After him Mr. HOSKYNS spake second to him: and among other things he affirmed that they which labored to free those 4 shires from that arbitratable or commissionary gouernment do not impeach the Kings prerogative, but quoth he they which will against Law imprison the Kings subiects and not deliver them uppon a Habeas Corpus they stand against the prerogative'.[115] Hoskyns could be an interesting conduit of information about parliamentary debates to his friends in the London literary world: he was close, for example, to Ben Jonson, whose own Welsh links were described in chapter 2. Bowyer was also a friend of John Selden. London was not insulated from the rest of Britain, and the pressures of Welsh borderland disputes had ramifications for drama in the London theatre.

But it is also important to note that the Prince of Wales' Men were a touring theatre company, and they visited the four shires three times during the Four Shires controversy.[116] The Prince's Men visited Shrewsbury in 1608-9. They also visited Hereford in 1609, and Bridgnorth, Shropshire in 1609-10. In terms of the wider Welsh palatinate, they got as far as Barnstaple in Devon in both 1612-13 and 1613-14.[117] Given the habitual nature of such touring routes, it is likely that the Prince's Men also visited other towns in the four shires, but either the records of their performances have been lost or performances remained unrecorded. As we have suggested, opposition to the council of Wales was by no means uniform in the Four

[115] David Harris Willson, *The Parliamentary Diary of Robert Bowyer, 1606-1607* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1931), 49.
[116] On London theatre in the Four Shires see Rick Bowers, 'Tamburlaine in Ludlow', *Notes and Queries* 243 (1998): 361-3.
[117] See John Tucker Murray, *English Dramatic Companies*, I.226.

Shires: either geographically or socially. Shropshire generally benefited much more from the council than the other three shires: opposition was concentrated in Herefordshire, perhaps because it had the least representation on the Council of Wales. So an array of geo-political pressures were exerted on the author of *The Valiant Welshman*: from a company patron, from the metropolitan theatrical scene, and from the need for a dramatic work of geographical mobility, particularly in areas sensitive to issues of Welsh union. These are pressures exerted in opposite directions: the patronage of the Prince of Wales might encourage glorification of the wider principality of Wales, but the need for a play to be performed in the four shires might encourage the development of a language to express English regional identity. One might have thought it would be simpler for the Prince of Wales' Men to stick to romances and less apparently political works, but in *The Valiant Welshman* they engage directly and explicitly with the geopolitical problematics we have been tracing.

In *The Welshman*, R.A. gives an account of the Welsh king Caradoc's war against the Roman Emperor Claudius' attempts to impose tribute on the British territories. The play begins in Shrewsbury, where Octavian, king of North Wales, is enlisting the support of an early British Earl of March, Cadallan, to help him reclaim his crown from the usurper Monmouth. Cadallan himself is killed in the battle, but his son, Caradoc, the valiant Welshman himself, kills Monmouth—and Octavian gives him his daughter Guiniver in marriage, and 'after our decease, our Kingly right.' After order has been re-established, an ambassador arrives from 'Gederus, King of Brittain' to ask for Octavian and Wales' support in the struggle against the

Roman Emperor Claudius and his demands for tribute (in this concern with Roman tribute the play is comparable to *Cymbeline*). Whilst Caradoc is away from Wales, a coup is mounted against Octavian, led by Codigune, and supported by the Duke of Cornwall and the Earl of Gloster (of course resonantly *Lear*-like titles). They murder Octavian, and take prisoner Caradoc's wife, Guiniver, and his sister Voada (Boadicea). They also trick Gederus, king of Brittaine, into refusing to trust Caradoc, but he fights the Romans and plays a key role in conquering them nevertheless. Caradoc returns to Wales to fight Codigune and to reclaim 'my wife,/ My sister, and the Kingdom of Southwales' (E2v). Caradoc gives the defeated Codigune the government of the 'Kingdom of North-*Wales* for term of life' (E3r). Of course Gloster, Cornwall and Codigune continue to attempt to unseat Caradoc. Codigune offers his support to the Romans on their return to Britain, led by Ostorius. As the Welsh Bardh who acts as a chorus throughout the play reports, Caradoc's sister, Voada, was betrayed by Cornwal, and handed over to a lecherous Roman, Marcus Gallicus, who attempts to rape her. Caradoc flees northwards, finding the support of the Duke of York, Venusius, before his wife, Cartismanda, betrays Caradoc to the Romans. Caradoc is taken to Rome, but the Emperor Claudius decides 'honourably to return you home, / With everlasting peace and unity' (I4v).

R.A.'s play comes with a prologue, which promises a romp of Welsh patriotism: 'Amongst so many valiant Princes of our English Nation, whose liues haue already euen cloyed the Stage, I searched the Chronicles of elder ages, wherein I found amongst diuers renowned persons, one Brittish Prince…' (A3r). But it is clear even from the plot-summary, that *The Valiant Welshman* does not use British

history in any simplistically triumphalist manner. 'Wales' is a divided network of regions which prove difficult to unify: Caradoc inherits the (entirely fictional) ancient Earldom of March from his father, and the kingdom of Northwales from Octavian, but he turns the rebellious Codigune into a regent of that kingdom. Only Guiniver, Caradoc's wife, is declared be the 'Queen of *Cambria*', and of course her name (not in any of the play's sources) only reminds us of Guinevere's betrayal of the British king Arthur, leading to the collapse of a united British polity. The region of 'Britain', over which Gederus is king, is slippery and ill-defined. For modern historians, 'Britain' could be a name for Wales, or for the imperium of the British Isles conceived as a whole. But Gederus' appears to be the king of a discrete, bounded territory: when Caradoc arrives to offer his support against the Romans, Gederus implies that they have crossed over a territorial boundary from Wales into Britain: 'Once more, brave Peers of *Wales*, welcome to Brittain'. But the north of 'Britain' also seems to be a discrete kingdom, 'At Yorke the noble Prince *Venusius* dwels'. So the play depicts an interacting network of regions possessing independent authority and governance, rather than a series of unified nation states. The wider principality of Wales is divided against itself in internecine struggle: its main threats come from the Duke of Cornwall and the Earl of Gloucester, which was one of the four shires governed by the council of Wales. The overlap here between the contemporary problem of defining Welsh territories, and the play's treatment of British history, is striking. This is not simply a case of R.A. offering an allegory of contemporary jurisdictional disputes through his depiction of ancient British history. Instead, the play sets up a structure, a network of interacting regions, which

is driven by pressures comparable to those in the Jacobean period, pressures to define the relationship between local and central authorities. This lack of any one political commitment is symptomatic of the multiple pressures of patronage (company patron, audience-in-London, audience-in-the-regions). The play is about jurisdictional conflict. But it does not take side within that conflict.

The play's geopolitics are complicated by its use of sources. In the preface to the play, R.A. claims to have combed the historical record to find,

> one Brittish Prince, who of his enemies, receiued the title of *Valiant Brittaine,* his name was *Caradoc*, he was King of *Siluria, Ordouica* and *March*, which Countries are now called, *South-Wales*, *North-Wales*, and the *Marches*; and therefore being borne in Wales, and King of Wales, I called him the *valiant Welshman*; he liued about the yere of our Lord, 70. *Cornelius Tacitus* in his 12 booke sayth, that hee held warres 9. years against all the Romane puissance (A3r)

Such specific reference to a source is very unusual in Renaissance drama: it is possible that Jonson's *Sejanus* is the only comparable instance of it. The prose preface doesn't quite act as an adequate summary of the play: we neither see the patriotic staging of British history we were promised, nor do we ever see Caradoc become king of Southwales. R.A. has also modified Tacitus' geography. There is no mention in Tacitus' *Annals* Book 12 of the 'Marches': the only Welsh tribes are the *Siluri* and the *Ordouices*. It is likely that R.A. used Richard Greneway's translation of

Tacitus' *Annales* as his source. Greneway used Camden to identify each of the British tribes in the margins of his translation: the ancient *Siluri* tribe are from 'Southwales, as Herefordshire, Radnorshire, Brecknockshire, Monmouthshire, and Glamorganshire'. The only 'march' county Greneway mentions is Hereford, and this he presents as a part of Southwales.[118] R.A. has therefore deliberately introduced both a fictional Earl of March into the play (Cadallan, Caradoc's father), and a fictional marcher lordship into his preface. The prose preface's explicit acknowledgement of historical sources without acknowledging the way those sources have been modified invites the audience to reflect on the gap between history and dramatic representation. It foregrounds the process of appropriation and reappropriation of ancient history to contemporary geopolitical concerns.

But, as John Kerrigan has recently observed, R.A also drew on Holinshed's chronicles for one of the play's subplots: the story of Voada, Caradoc's sister, and her attempted rape by Marcus Gallicus.[119] Voada is Boadicea, who, according to the Roman historian Dion Cassius was queen of the Iceni, the tribes inhabiting East Anglia.[120] To find the story that Voada was Caradoc's sister, as well as the name of Caradoc's father, Cadallan, R.A. turned not to the account of English or Welsh history in Holinshed, but to Holinshed's *Historie of Scotland*.[121] The history of Voada or Boadicea had originally been brought north of the border by Hector Boece, which had provoked rebukes from historians elsewhere in Britain—Humphrey Lhuyd, for

[118] Richard Greneway, trans. *The Annales of Cornelius Tacitus. The description of Germanie* (London, 1598), 164.
[119] Kerrigan, *Archipelagic English*, 129.
[120] E. Cary, ed. and trans., *Dio's Roman History*, 8 vols. (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP, 1914-1927), VIII.lxii.1–12.
[121] Raphael Holinshed, et al., *The Historie of Scotland, conteyning the beginning, increase, proceedings, continuance, Actes and Gouernmente of the Scottish nation* (London, 1577), 32.

example, criticizes him.[122] Although members of the original audience might not have been able to pinpoint Holinshed's *Historie of Scotland* as the specific source for this story, the dispute over where Boadicea would have been well known to anyone interested in contemporary historiographical controversies. Voada moves first from England to Scotland, and now R.A. continues this process of appropriating great figures of British history to particular regions by transferring her to Wales. Even Caradoc himself, in Holinshed's *Historie of Scotland*, is the king of Scotland, so he has been reappropriated and returned to Wales.

Why turn to Scottish history at this point? The answer John Kerrigan offers is that thinking about Welsh history encourages thinking about wider problems of British union: after that Jacobean succession that meant thinking about Scotland. But in the context of the present thesis's thought about the relationship between historiography and literature, we might add that the play frequently makes self-conscious references to the fragile processes of historical transmission, and the ways in which those processes can be subject to misreading or deliberate cooption. The play is fascinated by the process of inheritance, legitimate or illegitimate. Caradoc inherits both his father's title, and Octavian's, Codigune, the villain of the play, is described as a 'bastard', and the Welsh bard describes Cornwall and Gloster as 'twins of some *Incubus,* son and heir to hells Imperial Crown' (C4v). Parallel to this process of the inheritance of power and land, is the process of transmission of

[122] 'He [i.e. Hector Boece] writeth that *Voadicia*, the most renowmed queene of *Iceni*, whose valient deedes agaynst the *Romans*: *Tacitus*, and also *Dion* haue made knowne to the world: *Veusius* Earle of *Brigantes*, *Cartimandua* the Queene, were all *Scots*. And finally, there is no one thinge, wherein the *Romans*, or *Britaynes*, behaued them selues couragiously, or wysely in Britayne: which this monstre doth not ascribe vnto his fayned *Scots*, and whiche at that time were vnknowen to the worlde' (Humphrey Lhuyd, *The Breuiary of Britayne*, trans. Thomas Twyne (London, 1573), Fviir.

historical knowledge. Octavian invokes the history of Britain to drum up support for resistance to the Romans: 'The *Brittains* are a Nation free and bold…

> *Claudius* forgets that when the *Brittish* Ile
> Scarce knew the meaning of a strangers march,
> Great *Julius Caesar*, fortunate in arms,
> Suffered three base repulses from the Cliffs
> Of chalky Dover: (C3v)

R.A. probably did take this passage from Book 12 of the *Annales*: 'He called upon the names of his auncestors, which chased *Caesar* the Dictator out of the Ile; by whose valour they were deliuered from hatchets, and tributes' (165). But in Tacitus the speech is attributed to Caradoc: so the point at which Octavian invokes the authority of the pat is also a moment in which past texts are being misread. Caradoc imagines their deeds of battle being recorded by future epic poets: 'And Kingly *Homers*…May tell their memorable acts in verse' (C3v). And Caradoc is aware of the importance of the circulation of a popular reputation as means to maintain memories of the past: 'Oh *Cornwall*, *Cornwall*, this thy treacherous act…Shall to succeeding ages tell thy shame'. Caesar ends the play by projecting Caradoc's reputation into future history: 'And this shall *Cesar* speake vnto thy Fame, / The valiant Welshman merits honours name.' (I4v). Of course it is not just Caradoc who is aware of, and can control, this process: historical memory can be manipulated in the play by those who wish to betray Britain too. At the moment of Codigune's betrayal, he asks the Romans to

look back to their own history: 'Then, Romans, derogate not from the worth, / That time in ancient Chronicles records / Of your eternal honours got in war' (F2r). Codigune goes on to say that the conquest of Britain will 'erect / A statue to your dying memory': of course leaving ambiguous whether or not the statue will be erected 'to perpetuate the memory of the fact he died in battle' or designed to stave off the current process by which the Romans are forgetting their own past ('since you have begun to forget Roman history, you need a statue to remind you of connections with the deeds of your Roman ancestors'). This network of references amounts to an extraordinary meditation on historical appropriation, an activity which the play is of course engaged with itself. So the play thinks reflexively about the problems of using ancient historical sources to reflect on contemporary political concerns: it is not just a work about the problems of the interaction between sites of overlapping regional authority, but also a work about the uses to which the historiography of ancient Britain can be put.

Perhaps both these strands of the play come together in its comments on the languages spoken in Britain. Languages in the play are invested with a sense of history and community affiliation. Caradoc expresses amazement that Ostorius can speak English, saying, 'Art thou a Roman, and canst speak that language, / The mother tongue of Fugitives and slaves?'. The English language in this play is an embodiment not of the heroic past of the nation, but of a history of subjugation, violence and exploitation. And there is also a reference to the Welsh language in the play, but it comes from Morgan, the Earl of Anglesey, a stock comic Welsh character. He is thrilled to find a clown who speaks Welsh:

Clown. Let your Cousin, let him come, you shall have diggon of Chymrade, I warrant you.

Morgan. Hark you, hark you Cousin, he speakes Brittish, by shesu. I not strike him now, if he call me three knaves more. God plesse us, if he doe not speak a good Brittish, as any in Troy walles. (G2r)

Morgan parodies Jacobean treatments of Galfridian history, which traced national origins to the heroic Trojan Brutus, whose descendants eventually became the Welsh. Language is a repository of national history, but again that history is not the heroic nationalism the play's preface promises: language's origins are trivialized and attenuated. What we are witnessing in this play, therefore, is a parody of the kind of antiquarian-philological approaches outlined in chapter 1, and adopted by Spenser in chapter 2. A dramatic text like the *Valiant Welshman*, written for complex contextual circumstances, offers the historian a very different purchase on the philological tradition to the one that say, a study of William Camden does. To complete our sense of how the interacting nexus of language, history, politics and philology functioned in the culture of early-modern Britain, we need to take into account a range of texts, not only the works of elite cultures. A play like the *Valiant Welshman*, about issues that antiquaries were studying, mediates those issues in a very different way. Whereas we might expect a tract written for parliament to take a side on this complex issue, or an antiquarian history to have worked out its positions according to the scholarly methodologies we traced in the first chapter, a play is

able simultaneously to inhabit those arguments and methodologies, and to stand outside them. This is one of the reasons it is helpful to combine the study of intellectual history with the study of literature: not simply to find literature reproducing the evidence of intellectual history, but to find a literary work capable of engaging with the same issues with which a scholarly work might engage, but in a very different manner, with different resources, and to different ends. Such a work is *The Valiant Welshman*.

(iii) Thomas Middleton Stages Local History

We now move to consider a characteristically London writer, Thomas Middleton. Middleton wrote one example of the history play, *Hengist King of Kent*, but this was long after the history play was at its popular height in the 1590s. What we shall see in this section is that Middleton's historical thinking was profoundly locally inflected: both with particular places and with particular circles of people. Middleton's historical interests were flourishing around 1619 and 1620, and this was the time he not only wrote *Hengist*, but was also appointed to the office of the City Chronologer of London. Middleton's historical thinking was also formally varied, ranging across both chronicle and chorography -- indeed, both forms interpenetrate, as we shall see, in his writing of civic pageants. Regionalism was not only something associated with far-away provinces. London itself was a region, with its own history and its own historical institutions, of which Middleton was very much the centre. So Middleton therefore forms the culmination of our survey of

historical drama because he brings the complexities of regionalism we have been exploring -- first in the case of touring theatre generally, and then in the case of the Welsh borderlands -- back to the metropolitan centre itself.

Hengist King of Kent[123]

Middleton's *Hengist* is narrated by Ranulf Higden, the fourteenth-century Benedictine monk and chronicler. He would himself have seemed rather anachronistic by 1620, both as a medieval chronicler who had been superseded by new Renaissance historiographical accounts and because he is speaking as a chorus and master of the play's many dumb shows, genres which were more associated with the plays of the 1590s than the 1610s.[124] One of the effects of this is to historicize the process of historical transmission itself: by creating an anachronistic narrator who seems himself to be the product of several different pasts (cultural, historiographical, theatrical) the viewer or reader of the play is invited to reflect on the historical specificity of the account of the past the narrator is offering. The story of Vortigern's reign and the arrival of Hengist in Britain is a crucial moment of transition in the history of Britain. The Romans have departed from Britain for the last time, and the country is beset with ethnic conflict: the Picts and Scots are

[123] Julia Briggs' essays are essential reading on *Hengist*: 'Middleton's Forgotten Tragedy *Hengist, King of Kent*', *Review of English Studies* 41 (1990): 479-495; 'New Times and Old Stories: Middleton's *Hengist*', in Donald Scragg and Carole Weinberg, eds., *Literary Appropriations of the Anglo-Saxons*, (Cambridge: CUP, 2000). I have tried only to add a little bit more historiographical context to the play, and to set it within the broader context of Middleton's historical writing.

[124] See B.R. Pearn, 'Dumb-Show in Elizabethan Drama', *Review of English Studies* 11 (1935): 385-405; Douglas Bruster and Robert Weimann, *Prologues to Shakespeare's Theatre: Performance and Liminality in Early Modern Drama* (London: Routledge, 2004). All references to the play are to Gary Taylor, John Lavagnino, et al., eds., *Thomas Middleton: The Collected Works* (Oxford: OUP, 2007).

invading from the north, while the ancient British inhabitants attempt to defend their hegemony in the southern parts of the island. At this point, Vortigern decides there is no option but to summon the Saxons from Germany to help to wage war against their northern enemies. And this is the moment that allows the Saxons to begin to extirpate the ancient British inhabitants from England, and drive them into the far western parts of the island: into Wales and Cornwall. So this is a key moment of violent rupture in which the control of Britain begins to pass from the British (i.e. the Welsh, Cornish and Breton inhabitants) towards the Saxons, the Angles and Jutes who come with them into Britain.[125] In the medieval and Renaissance British historiographical tradition, this story is frequently placed at the start of new books of British history. William of Malmesbury's *Gesta Regum Anglorum* begins with the story of Hengist and the Saxons' arrival in Britain: it is his moment of national origins of the 'English' people.[126] In Ranulph Higden's *Polychronicon*, Book 4 ends with the Roman's departure from Britain, and Book 5 introduces the story of Vortiger and the arrival of the Saxons.[127] But this is by no means a nostalgic story about the search for unified, ethnically, religiously or politically pure national origins.[128] It is an origin myth which depicts an ethnically and politically divided ancient Britain: the whole British territories are being fought over by Picts, Scots,

---

[125] For the significance of this story in the eighteenth century see Juliet Feibel, 'Vortigern, Rowena, and the Ancient Britons: Historical art and the Anglicization of National Origin', *Eighteenth-Century Life* 24: 1 (2001): 1-21.
[126] For the important Renaissance *editio princeps* of this text see Sir Henry Savile, ed., *Rerum Anglicarum Scriptores Post Bedam* (London, 1596), Aiij^{r}. The story of Vortiger begins on Aiij^{v}.
[127] See Wynkyn de Worde's second edition of this text, Ranulph Higden, *Polycronycon* (London, 1495), 'Book Quintus' (new page signatures for each book).
[128] For the association of national history and nostalgia, an association about which I remain sceptical, see Philip Schwyzer, *Literature, Nationalism, and Memory in Early Modern England and Wales* (CUP, 2004).

Britains, Jutes, Angles and Saxons. The story also questions the extent to which ancient Britain was ever an ideally organised religious society, which sixteenth- and seventeenth-century reformers often presented it as.[129] That the story offers a historical account of national origins which emphasizes crisis, rupture, violence and betrayal may have been one of the reasons Middleton was attracted to presenting this period on stage.

To understand the kind of history-writing upon which Middleton drew in *Hengist*, and the ways in which he made use of his source material, it is useful to have a full sense of the ways in which the story of King Vortiger and Hengist's arrival in Britain developed, from the earliest British histories down to the sixteenth century. Gildas described the summoning of 'that most fierce and detestable people the *Saxons*' by King Guthrigern to help the British in their wars against the Scots and Picts, and gives an account of how the Saxons proceeded to slaughter the British and conquer the entire island.[130] However, in Gildas there is no specific mention of Hengist, and so nothing of the attendant story of the seduction of Vortigern by Hengist's daughter. Bede develops the story (or records the developing tradition). Bede offers far more ethnic definition to the new arrivals in Britain: he distinguishes between Saxons, Angles and Jutes, and situates them in particular parts of Britain. He also names the brothers 'Hengist and Horsa', who 'some say' were the leaders of

---

[129] For a brilliant survey of these arguments see Anthony Milton, *Catholic and Reformed: The Roman and Protestant Churches in English Protestant Thought, 1600-1640* (Cambridge: CUP, 1995), ch.6. For an example of them in practice in the Renaissance see George Abbot, *A Treatise of the Perpetuall Visibilitie and Succession of the True Church in all Ages* (London, 1624).

[130] Quotations are from the early-modern translation: Gildas, *The Epistle of Gildas, The most Ancient British Author* (London, 1638), D1r. The introduction to this book is an important document for assessing the implication of history-writing with the politics of union: the author claims he translated the work around 1603 to draw attention to the dangers of division between England and Scotland.

the Saxons.[131] Bede also gives an account of the emissary of Germanus and Lupus to attempt to suppress the growth of the Pelagian heresy.[132] The Nennian compilation then introduces a further dimension to the story: when Hengist arrives in Britain, he invites Vortiger to a boozy dinner, at which the lascivious Vortiger falls in love with Hengist's daughter.[133] This infatuation leads Vortiger to bestow the territory of Kent on Hengist (despite the fact the territory already has its own king). In fact, the Nennian compilations stress Hengist's lasciviousness further by telling the story of his marriage to his own daughter. This creates a link between the stories of Hengist, Vortiger and St Germanus: in the Nennian account, Germanus confronts Vortiger over this incest. Also in the Nennian accounts we get for the first time far greater detail about the building of Vortiger's palace in Wales, where he hides once he has been deposed by the people in favour of his son Vortimer. Finally, the Nennian account introduces the story that Hengist invites Vortiger and the British to a peaceful celebration, before giving the word to his men ('Nimed eure Saxes') to seize their weapons and kill them all. The *Historia Brittonum* is largely the account that William of Malmesbury uses to begin his *Gesta Regum Anglorum*, although he does insert some more detail about the role of the Germans in propagating races around Europe: 'The Vandals, for instance, who formerly over-ran Africa; the Goths, who made themselves masters of Spain; the Lombards, who, even at the present time, are settled in Italy; and the Normans, who have given their own name to that part of

[131] Bede, *Historical Works*, ed. and trans. J.E. King (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP, 1930), I:xv.
[132] Bede, I:xvii.
[133] See Nennius, *The Historia Brittonum*, ed. David N. Dumville (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 1985), 3 vols.

Gaul which they subdued'.[134] But William of Malmesbury also strips back some of the less believable treatment of the prophecy that Vortiger receives that the Saxons will control Britain for three hundred years. It is, of course, Geoffrey of Monmouth who hugely elaborates this aspect of the story, and introduces Merlin into the account.[135] More immediately relevant to Middleton, Geoffrey greatly expands the treatment of the story of Hengist's daughter, giving her a name, Renwein, and expanding on the consequences of Vortiger's love for her. Geoffrey also puts the reign of Vortiger in a broader context by introducing the story of the monkish Constans and Vortiger's manipulation of him as a puppet king. At this point, the story has gathered more or less all its key features.

In the sixteenth century, it might be useful to distinguish here between broadly two different kinds of treatment of the Hengist and Horsa story: one could be called the 'chronicle' tradition, the other the 'antiquarian' tradition. The chronicle tradition broadly reproduces most of the accumulated features of the story just described, minus some of the extremer elements such as the prophecies delivered to Vortiger.[136] However, the antiquarian tradition introduces a newly synthetic and analytical approach to the source material. It is never critical of the Hengist and Horsa story itself, although some of the extraneous Nennian accretions are removed: Camden does not mention Hengist's daughter.[137] Camden and Speed, in particular, place the story of the Saxons' arrival in a far broader intellectual context,

---

[134] William of Malmesbury, *Chronicles of the Kings of England*, ed., J.A. Giles (London, 1847), 8.
[135] Geoffrey's sources are themselves offer a vast field for scholarship. The starting point remains J.S.P. Tatlock, *The Legendary History of Britain: Geoffrey of Monmouth's* Historia Regum Britanniae *and its Early Vernacular Versions* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: California UP, 1950).
[136] See, e.g., Robert Fabyan, *The Chronicle of Fabian* (London, 1559), ch.lxxx.
[137] William Camden, *Britain, or A Chorographicall Description* (London, 1609), 127-139.

drawing in particular on European scholarship to investigate the origins of the Saxons. They use etymological commentaries on the origin of the word 'Saxon' to develop different theories about the origin of the people themselves. Speed's round-up of European scholarship is largely derived from Camden, and so includes figures such as Joseph Scaliger and Goropius Becanus, but he also adds a number of more recent commentators, including Richard Verstegan. For these antiquarian writers, the language is itself historically sedimented, and distinguishing between these levels of sediment allows the historian to derive historical data.[138] Lambarde treats the story in the context of a chorographic history of Kent, so he is particularly keen to locate key particular places in the story, such as Thong Castle. This has an influence on John Stow too. Stow participates in the antiquarian tradition, making use of the chorographic mode in which to organise his *Survey* of London, for instance. But he also contributes to the chronicle tradition: his manuscript notebook for his chronicle history survives in the Bodleian, and shows him excerpting and comparing the many different chronicles of England's past.[139]

In some respects, Middleton's treatment has far greater affinity with the chronicle tradition. He synthesises elements of the English and Scottish sections of Holinshed.[140] This is partly why I am unpersuaded by Grace Ioppolo's suggestion

---

[138] For a recent account of the overlap between literature and etymology in the Renaissance see Angus Vine, 'Etymology, Names and the Search for Origins: Deriving the Past in Early Modern England', 21 (2006): 1-21.

[139] Ian Gadd and Alexandra Gillespie, *John Stow (1525-1605) and the Making of the English Past: Studies in Early Modern Culture and the History of the Book* (London: British Library, 2004).

[140] R.C. Bald, ed., *Hengist, King of Kent, or The Mayor of Queenborough* (New York and London, 1938), xxxviii, also points out, interestingly, that Middleton may have drawn some details (e.g. Constantius' great religiosity) from Robert Fabyan's *Chronicle*. He also points out that this chronicle contains a side-note: 'Thonge Castell standyth within 4 Miles of Feuersham by Thamys syde, nat ferre from Quynburghe', a note which is found only in the 1516 edition of Fabyan.

that Middleton drew the spelling of Hengist's daughter's name 'Roxena' from Lambarde's *Perambulation of Kent*: it seems more likely that he drew this spelling from the Scottish sections of the 1577 Holinshed.[141] But central to the English antiquarian tradition is a new analysis and perception of local history. The chorographic histories draw on local records to present the history of individual communities and associations - the county, town, city, guild, family, and so on. Middleton is steeped in this tradition by 1620. He is familiar with Stow and the history of London. And many of his plays respond indirectly to new perceptions of local identity and affiliation in the early seventeenth century, particularly his City Comedies. Even the titles (*The Widdow of Watling-streete*, or *A Chaste Maid in Cheapside*) situate the plays in local London contexts familiar to their original audiences. After considering Middleton's civic entertainments I wish to suggest that local and national histories and modes of historical writing overlap in *Hengist* in the conjunction of national chronicle history with the comic 'mayor of Queenborough' scenes.

The story of Hengist and Vortiger will have raised certain issues for Middleton and seventeenth-century readers of history. One is religious. The reformed church in Britain had argued that the ancient British church, before the introduction of Roman Christianity via Augustine in the sixth century, had been closely related in terms of doctrine and hierarchical governance to the contemporary reformed church in England. The reformed church in England was

[141] See Taylor *Thomas Middleton* (Oxford: OUP, 2007), 1449.

not a novelty, but a deliberate return to a church of originary apostolic purity.[142] So any play which stages early British society needs to think carefully about its depiction of that ancient church. The second issue the material raises is one of ethnicity. How far have the ancient tensions in the British Isles been resolved in the Jacobean present? How far are the contemporary British peoples descended from one particular grouping (Saxon, British, Scot etc.) and how far have they become amalgamated and indistinguishable over the centuries in between?[143] Thirdly, there is an issue of governance and political authority. How far was ancient Britain a monarchical state? How far was it governed from the centre, or how devolved were structures of power? These religious, ethnic and political questions are at the heart of understanding Middleton's treatment of the story of Hengist, King of Kent.

Religion, first of all. Middleton's *Hengist* depicts in an ancient Britain in which religion is traduced in every aspect. This can be seen most clearly in his adaptation of Germanus and Lupus from the chronicle sources. Rather than Bede's saintly Germanus, a miracle-worker and apostolic converter of the ancient Britains to true Christianity, or the Nennian Germanus' who is willing to speak truth to power to Vortiger, Middleton's Germanus, along with his colleague Lupus, is a tool of Vortiger's tyranny. Vortiger exploit Germanus and Lupus to force Constantius into the role of the puppet king at the oustet of the play: 'Holy Germanus / And reverend Lupus, with all expedition / Set the crown on him'. Whereas Bede's Germanus and

[142] On this issue see e.g. John E. Booty, *John Jewel as Apologist of the Church of England* (London, 1963), 126-149; Jean-Louis Quantin, *The Church of England and Christian Antiquity* (Oxford: OUP, 2009).
[143] A good starting point for the scholarship in this area is David J. Baker and Willy Maley, eds., *British Identities and English Renaissance Literature* (Cambridge, 2002).

Lupus respond to the threat of the Saxon war with prayers and cries of 'Alleluia', Middleton's Germanus is an advocate of naked power politics: religious retirement is useless 'when a time so violent calls upon you'; Germanus ignores Constantius' plea that he might 'Stand...Clear from all temporal charge by my profession' (I.i.88-89). This depiction of the ancient British church seeps out into other aspects of the play. In the manner of a sixteenth-century reformer, Hengist notes that national spending has been eaten up on the opulence of the church rather than helping the poor:

> There's the fruits
> Of their religious shows too, to lie rotting
> Under a million spent in gold and marble
> When thousands left behind dies without shelter,
> Having nor house nor food. (II.iv.134-38)

This is also to jumble the chronology of British history: the chronicles usually depict the Saxons as the great beautifiers and builders of churches after their conversion by St Augustine, whereas the ancient British places of worship were simple and unadorned. Sir Henry Spelman would include an illustration of such an ancient church in his 1639 edition of the councils of the British church, which was little more than a simple thatched hut.[144] And this depiction in *Hengist* of a factionalized, religiously atrophying state seeps out from the historical characters in the play to

[144] Henry Spelman, *Concilia, Decreta, Leges, Constitutiones in Re Ecclesiarum Orbis Britannici* (London, 1639), 11: 'Formam primae istius Ecclesiae totius orbis vetustissimae...hic intuere'.

the non-historical plot: the comedy of Oliver the puritan, and his conflict with Simon the Mayor of Queenborough. When the text was printed in 1661, the publisher's preface drew attention to parallels between Oliver in the play and 'the Rebel Oliver' Cromwell (A2r).[145] In other words, this plot underlines parallels between the division of the ancient British Church, the contemporary Jacobean Church, and even the Church forty years after the play was first written. The historical and non-historical aspects of this play are not mutually antipathetical but comment on and reinforce one another (and we will see a bit more of this when we come to consider the relation of the play to Middleton's civic pageants). So when looking back into the past to ancient British Christianity, Middleton does not depict an ideal church to which contemporary Britain might return. Rather this church is degraded and factionalized in ways which are comparable to the contemporary Jacobean church. Looking into the past in this play is far from a cause for religious nostalgia.[146]

One of the Jacobean stage-plays on a Welsh theme makes a particularly instructive comparison with Middleton: that of a play by Middleton's frequent collaborator, William Rowley's *A Shoomaker, a Gentleman* (London, 1638). Although this play was printed in 1638, it was probably written and performed around 1608, at a similar time to other plays set in Wales such as Shakespeare's *Cymbeline* and the *Valiant Welshman* (1615). Diocletian is making war against the ancient British Christians. In the opening scene, one of the princes of Wales plans to take the British queen to refuge 'safe into North Wales', but finds that already even there 'the

[145] See Thomas Middleton, *The Mayor of Quinborough* (London, 1661).
[146] On such nostalgia for the primitive church see Bruno Neveu, 'L'érudition ecclésiastique du XVIIe siècle et la nostalgie de l'antiquité chrétienne', in Keith Robbins, ed., *Religion and humanism* (Blackwell: Oxford, 1981), 195-223.

Barbarous Romans have supplanted peace' (B2v). The Welsh sequences of the play concentrate on the martyrdom of St Albon and the attempts of the virgin saint Winifred to resist rape by the Romans.[147] The Church ends with the prince Offa (in a radical telescoping of historical time) building a 'beauteous Monastery...In honour of our first English martyrs fame' (L1v-L2r). So the play centres around the attempt to protect the purity of primitive Welsh Christianity from the encroaching Roman invasion.

Ancient Wales and the ancient British are quite different in *Hengist*. The final scene of *Hengist* takes place in Wales (which is not noted in the Oxford edition).[148] Vortiger planned at the end of IV.iv to go to take shelter from the Saxon warriors in his Welsh castle: 'But we must part, / My queen and I, to Cambria' (128-9). All the historical, chronicle sources, from the Nennian compilations onwards, show that Vortiger's castle was built in Wales. Aurelius Ambrosius and Uther Pendragon return from their exile (in that other repository of Celtic Christianity, Armorica or Brittany) to burn down Vortiger's castle. This is quite a different treatment of ancient Wales to that we find in other contemporary plays. For one thing, the lascivious Vortiger is himself hardly an ideal representative of ancient British Christianity. He hides in Wales purely for reasons of realpolitik, rather than to preserve apostolic religious purity. But Ambrosius and Uter hardly fare much better either. Brutal violence against Vortiger is tricked out by Aurelius with the workings of divine justice: 'Let wildfire ruin' the castle, Aurelius orders, 'That his destruction

[147] For a discussion of this play in its Welsh context see John Kerrigan, *Archipelagic English* (OUP, 2008), ch.3.
[148] Simon threatens Hengist that he will 'follow you to Wales with a dog and a bell' (V.1.393).

may appear to him / I'th figure of heaven's wrath at the last day' (V.ii.2-4). Within the providential scheme of the 'ruin of Britain', which ultimately derives from Gildas but is strongly present in the sixteenth-century chronicle treatments of this period, this rhetoric might seem justifiable. In the universal religious decline of *Hengist*, this seems like another piece of power politics. The kind of apocalyptic visions of religious history which we find, for instance, in John Foxe's division of Christian history into five periods, is dependent on a historical periodization which privileges the primitive purity of Christianity.[149] Since *Hengist* deconstructs that very originary purity, the appeal to Christian apocalypticism is here rendered hollow as a consequence. There is no nostalgic repository of British Christianity in *Hengist*: simply pagan Saxons fighting against a corrupt British elite. This departure from earlier treatments of ancient Wales on the Jacobean stage gives the play a distinctively Middletonian satirical bite.

The second set of issues which Middleton's play raises I have called issues of 'ethnicity'. This is a useful catch-all word, but is also clearly troublesomely anachronistic.[150] In broader terms, it might be useful to think here of Middleton's play as a work concerned with national origins and nation building. The first thing to note here is that Middleton has removed a dimension of the story of the Saxon's arrival in Britain which is present in all the chronicle accounts, from Gildas onwards. There is no mention of war being made on the British by the Scots and the Picts.

---

[149] On Foxe's division of history see Anthony Martin, 'The End of History: Thomas Norton's "v Periodes" and the Pattern of English Protestant Historiography', in Christopher Highley and J.N. King, eds., *John Foxe and his World* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2002), 37-53.

[150] Again, the literature on this topic is vast. Some useful primary sources are gathered in Ania Loomba and Jonathan Burton, *Race in Early Modern England: A Documentary Companion* (Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007)

Hengist arrives to crush a rebellion by the British, not to defeat warring northern neighbours. Clearly one reason for this might be that Middleton was afraid of creating controversy with a Scottish king on the throne. But, of course, Middleton was not afraid of such controversy when it came to other works of the 1620s, especially another work on more recent history, of course, *A Game at Chess*. And there were other plays which depicted wars with the Scots and Picts, such Lodowick Carlell's two-part play, *Arviragus and Philicia* (1639).[151]

Perhaps another way of thinking about this problem is in terms of Kerrigan's notion of 'Archipelagic' writing: that seventeenth-century writing tends to depict the problematic interactivity of the multiple monarchies which make up Britain. Although this is clearly a seminal and powerful thesis, it is not one which applies universally to all writers. Middleton is an exception. He eschews an opportunity to think about the multiple monarchy of Britain in archipelagic terms - an opportunity which would clearly be afforded by the treatment of this period in chronicle history. Indeed, Middleton probably used Holinshed's *History of Scotland* to elaborate details of his plot. But instead of depicting interactions between the three kingdoms, or many nations, of Britain, Middleton's plays seems preoccupied with the conflict between Saxon (English) and British (Welsh) identities and histories. The particular inflection which Middleton gives to these issues perhaps helps us to distinguish Middleton's position in relation to other dramatists and theatrical history in the period. Middleton, on the other hand, is writing for a very different theatrical climate from the one we traced around *The Valiant Welshman*. The King's Men who

[151] Although clearly also the controversy over the *Isle of Dogs* set a precedent for dramatists getting in trouble over Scottish satire.

performed *Hengist*, and seem to have kept it prominently in their repertoire until the closure of the theatres, were a far more London-based company by 1620 than the theatre companies had been even ten years before.[152] And Middleton is a writer whose historical concerns are particularly closely centred on London and the south-east of England, as we will see in more detail below. In *Hengist*, these contextual pressures seem to have shaped a play which is particularly concerned with questions of national origin in England, and indeed with locating the origins in the south-east specifically, rather than with broader Britain-wide concerns.

So *Hengist* is a play in which the origins of the Saxons and English are put under particular scrutiny. Hengist himself most clearly indicates this notion in his paean to the first land which the Saxons claim in England: the area encircled by strips of leather, on which Thong castle is built. Hengist says:

> It is the first foundations of our fortunes
> On Britain's earth and ought to be embraced
> With a respect ne'er linked to adoration (II.iv.126-8)

This notion of a religious bond with the English earth ('adoration' comes from 'adorare', 'to pray towards') is crucial to understanding the kind of moment of historical transition we witness in the play. The Saxons are always presented in chronicle accounts as wanderers who love the coastal regions: Camden, for instance,

[152] Keenan, *Travelling Players in Shakespeare's England*, ch.9 gives a good overview of the decline in provincial playing and the reasons for it.

sees the Saxons as pirates who pillage and invade one coast after another.[153] Middleton acknowledges their status as wanderers in Raynulph's speech in act I: 'When Germany was overgrown / With sons of peace too thickly sown, / Several guides were chosen then / By destined lots to lead out men' (I.2.1-4). The Saxons have departed from Germany, but not on a piratical mission to pillage different lands, but instead to settle in one excellent land in particular. In Middleton's play, the Saxons are undergoing a transition from nomadic sailing-life to settled habitation of a particular venerated landscape.[154] Hengist goes on to say that 'About the fruitful banks of uberous Kent, / A fat and olive soil, there we came in' (II.iv.140-41). So Hengist's purchase on the land gradually moves outwards from the immediate area of Thong Castle to the broader landscape of Kent itself.

It is not just land in which the Saxons are investing themselves, but also language. It is significant that *Hengist* is the only play on the remarkably polyglot Renaissance stage to feature words in the Anglo-Saxon language. They come at a key moment of ethnic violence and betrayal. Hengist has summoned Vortiger and his British nobles to a seemingly friendly parley on Salisbury Plain. But he orders his men to keep their knives concealed and wait his word: '*Nemp your sexes'* (IV.ii.35) which roughly means 'seize your knives'. The Saxons slaughter the unarmed British nobles. This is a moment of historical betrayal which is repeated many times in the historical chronicle: it is a crucial moment of rupture and violence in the historical origins of the modern English people. The narrator of the play, Raynulph Higden, makes it clear the meeting takes place 'Upon the plain near Salisbury' (IV.iii.10).

[153] Camden, *Britain, A Chorographicall Description* (London, 1609), 127-128.
[154] This process is also described by Camden in *Britain*, 128.

This would have cast the historically alert viewer or reader's mind forward to the building of Stonehenge on this site to commemorate the Saxon betrayal and murder: one of the commonest aetiological explanations surrounding Stonehenge in the early-modern period.[155] Stonehenge is a site which resonates not only with betrayal, but with the extirpation of history and historical memory itself. This is evident in the little-known manuscript play written by the historian John Speed's son, also called John Speed, a physician at St John's College.[156] This academic play, performed at St John's in the 1630s, takes place on Salisbury plain amidst the monoliths of Stonehenge, the meaning of which stones mystify and fascinate the play's characters.[157] So this scene in Middleton takes place at a location which is resonant not only with memories of historical betrayal, but also with forgetting and the extirpation of such memories.

But perhaps particularly important in the context of Middleton's play is the use of the word '*sexes*' for 'knives'. The scholarly antiquarian tradition of history, as mentioned above, is preoccupied with the search for historical origins through etymology. One of the chief theories for the etymology of the word 'Saxon' was that it derived from '*seaxes*', the knives that were treasured by the warlike Saxon people. John Speed gives the clearest expression of this theory in the period:

---

[155] For an early-modern overview of theories about the origin of Stonehenge, see Inigo Jones and John Webb, *The Most Notable Antiquity of Great Britain, vulgarly called Stone-Heng on Salisbury Plain* (London, 1655).

[156] There is a brief account of this John Speed (1628-1711) embedded in the account of his father's life (1595-1640) in *ODNB*. It does not mention his surviving academic play.

[157] See BM Add. MS.14047, fols.44v-59v. The play was called *The Converted Robber*. See the discussion of authorship in G.E. Bentley, *The Jacobean and Caroline Stage: Volume V: Plays and Playwrights* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956), 1181-1184.

the name *Saxon* tooke the appellation from the *Fashion* of the *Weapon* that vsuallie they wore; which was a *Crooked Bowing Sword*, somewhat like vnto a *Sithe*, with the edge on the contrarie side, called by the *Netherlanders*, a *Saisen*, and by themselues *Seaxen*, and the shorter of like fashion for hand-weapons, *Seaxes*; such as were those that were hid vnder their Garments in the *Massacre* of the *British Nobilitie* vpon *Salisbury Plaine*, when *Hengist* gaue the watch-word, *Nem cour Seaxes*, that is, *Take your Swords*[158]

So the call of '*Nemp your sexes*' in Middleton's play announces not only a crucial moment of betrayal. It is a moment of betrayal which is woven etymologically into the very history of the name of the Saxons themselves. The Saxon language itself is instinct with this moment of violent historical rupture. It is an appropriate coincidence that at around the same time, Alexander Gil, Milton's schoolmaster, was writing a famous and much-celebrated Latin grammar of English in which he argued that the Saxons made war not only on the persons and possessions of the British, but on their language too: 'they so vented their fury on the British language itself, that nearly all the names of cities, towns, villages, rivers, forests, valleys, and mountains were changed to Saxon names'.[159] What is at stake in Middleton's play, therefore, is not only hegemony over the British landscape, but the possibility that the supplanting of the British language itself might be a means towards that domination. Middleton stages a look back into the shivered national origins of the English domination of land and language.

---

[158] John Speed, *History of Great Britaine* (London, 1611), 285. He is citing Richard Verstegan's *A Restitution of Decayed Intelligence in Antiquities* (Antwerp, 1605).

[159] Alexander Gil, *Logonomia Anglica (1619),* ed. Bror Danielsson and Arvid Gabrielson (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1972), II: 82; for the Latin, see facsimile in *Logonomia Anglica*, ed. Danielsson and Gabrielson, I:B1v: 'ita in ipsam Britonum linguam saeuitum est, vt omnia ferme nomina ciuitatum, oppidorum, villarum, fluminum, traiectuum, syluarum, vallium, & montium Saxonicis vocabulis mutarentur'.

What evidence is there for the ways contemporary audiences (either on the stage or page) read Middleton's play? There is some evidence that audiences might have been alive to what seems to modern audience's the play's strange oscillations between comedy and tragedy.[160] But did anyone seem to be aware of the historical content and sources? At least one reader was, and that was Gerard Langbaine in his *An Account of the English Dramatic Poets* (1691).[161] He calls the play, '*Mayor of Quinborough*' (after the published play title), and outlines the play's historical sources: 'In this Play are several Dumb Shews, explained by *Rainulph* monk of *Chester*, and the Author has chiefly followed his *Polychronicon*: See besides *Stow, Speed, Du Chesne, &c*. in the Reign of *Vortiger*' (372-3). *Polychronicon*, Stow and Speed are self-explanatory as choices of sources. It is interesting, however, that he mentions André Duchesne, whose *Histoire d'Angleterre, d'Ecosse, et d'Irelande* (Paris, 1614) was one of the most popular Continental European works on British history.[162] So although we know little about how Langbaine read *Hengist*, we can be sure that he was alive to the kind of multiplicity of historical sources available to Middleton, ranging from the chronicle tradition (*Polychronicon*) to scholarly antiquarian texts (Speed) and European scholarly works (Du Chesne). The range of historiographical contexts in which this essay has situated *Hengist* were available to early readers of the play. It is also worth tentatively noting that for Langbaine,

---

[160] Lucy Munro, 'A Neglected Allusion to *Pericles* and *Hengist, King of Kent* in Performance', *Notes and Queries* 51 (2004): 307-310.
[161] See pages 372-373.
[162] Duchesne was also something of an Anglophile, corresponding via Peiresc with William Camden in order to obtain manuscripts for his forthcoming edition of Norman historical texts, *Historiae Normanorum Scriptores Antiqui* (Paris, 1619). He thanks Cotton and Camden effusively in the preface to his edition (aiij^{v}) for providing manuscripts for *Emmae Anglorum Reginae...Encomium* and *Gesta Guillelmi II. Ducis Normannorum*.

calling the play the '*Mayor of Quinborough*', i.e. drawing attention to the comedy of Kentish civic life, did not render the historical sources of the play irrelevant. Appreciation of the dynamic interaction between the civic comedy and the historical scenes of the play are important to a full appreciation of Middleton's historical imagination - but this will become clearer after an analysis of Middleton's work as a civic historian.

Middleton's career as a civic historian

Around the same time as Middleton was writing *Hengist* (1619-21?), he was also at the apex of his career as a writer of civic histories and entertainments. Local London history writing, most obviously John Stow's *Survey of London*, was enormously popular in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries.[163] This kind of writing traced in detail the history of individual city guilds and corporations, the names and histories of individual mayors of London, and the structures and individuals who governed the city of London. In a developing metropolis, historians such as Ian Archer have suggested the value of historical writing to defining an emerging sense of civic identity and the cohesive values of local guilds and institutions.[164] Such histories were by no means restricted to London: we can see similar undertakings in other big towns in England.[165] But focus on institutions of civic governance does distinguish histories such as Stow's from both the narrative

[163] There is now a huge bibliography on Stow, especially on his *Survey*. The best starting point is the volume of essays dedicated to the range of his works: Ian Anders Gadd and Alexander Gillespie, eds., *John Stow (1525-1605) and the making of the English Past* (London: British Library, 2004).
[164] See Archer's essay in the volume cited above as well as his 'Discourses of History in Early Modern London', *Huntington Library Quarterly* 68 (2005): 205-226.
[165] E.g. Richard Butcher, *The Survey and Antiquitie of the Towne of Stamford in the County of Lincoln* (London, 1646).

chronicle tradition of historiography, and from the local county chorography, which were primarily genealogical in their focus as well as usually offering accounts of the resources available in the local landscape.[166] It is also important to distinguish the work of Stow, in some respects, from the work of Camden in his *Britannia*. Although both use the chorographic mode to structure their research, Camden's book participates in the scholarly culture of the European Republic of Letters in a way that Stow's book does not. Stow's work is aimed much more precisely at its local, London audience, rather than the trans-national audience of Camden's work. It is this historiographical environment in which we need to situate Middleton's work for the city of London.

On 6th September 1620, Middleton was appointed to the Office of the City Chronologer of London. What was the nature of this office? This question has proved notoriously difficult for historians to answer. Here it is possible to offer only a few comments on both the office in general and Middleton's assumption of it in particular. The names of most of the city chronologists appointed in the seventeenth century survive in the *Repertories* of the City of London, which were edited in the nineteenth century. One thing that stands out immediately is that many of these 'chronologists' were also major poets or dramatists in the period: Middleton, Jonson, and Francis Quarles were all appointed. When Jonson died, the king, the Earl of Pembroke and the Earl of Dorset all wrote in support of Thomas May to become the next city chronologer.[167] He was not selected for the post, and one Edward Hewes

[166] On the county histories see Jan Broadway, *"No Historie So Meete": Gentry Culture and the Development of Local History in Elizabethan and Early Stuart England* (Manchester, 2006).
[167] See David Norbrook, 'Thomas May', *ODNB* (2004).

succeeded him. But even so, the fact that he was nominated by such distinguished figures suggest that he would have been a suitable candidate for the post. So the post in the 1620s and 1630s seems to have primarily designed to reward a poet-dramatist and historian, which both Middleton and Jonson were well suited to. Middleton of course was a frequent writer of civic entertainments, but Jonson too had his moments in that genre: as Gabriel Heaton and James Knowles have shown, the lord mayor's inauguration records show that £12 was paid to Jonson for 'his device and speech for the children' and he wrote an entertainment for the Merchant Taylors' Company in July 1607.[168] The city fathers' threat to withdraw Jonson's stipend if he did not produce any historical chronicles soon, however, may show that in some respects he was the wrong appointment: his literary and patronage circles were not primarily, or even largely, civic.[169] Whereas two of Middleton's manuscripts he produced in this role survived into the eighteenth century, which suggests he might have been a better fit for a role aimed at a poet-historian with commitments to London and its civic institutions.

In Middleton's case specifically, there is a good probability that we can pinpoint the involvement of a very specific figure: Sir William Cokayne, who was mayor of London between 1619-20. [170] He was mayor at the point that Middleton

---

[168] Gabriel Heaton and James Knowles, '"Entertainment Perfect": Ben Jonson and Corporate Hospitality', *Review of English Studies* 54 (2003): 587-600.

[169] A good overview of Jonson's circles in the Caroline period is Julie Sanders, 'Jonson's Caroline Coteries' in Takashi Kozuka and J.R. Mulryne, eds., *Shakespeare, Marlowe, Jonson: New Directions in* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), 279-294.

[170] For a modern account of William Cokayne's life see his entry in *ODNB.* For an account of William Cokayne and his family, see G.E. Cokayne, *Some Account of the Lord Mayors and Sheriffs of the City of London During the First Quarter of the Seventeenth Century, 1601-1625* (London, 1897), 83-90. For his funeral sermon, preached by John Donne: Evelyn M. Simpson and George Potter, eds., *The Sermons of John Donne*, 10 vols., (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1954),

was invested as chronologer: indeed, Middleton wrote the entertainment for the day of the 'extirpation of his praetorship', his last day in mayoral office, on 28th October 1620.[171] This entertainment was written only shortly after Middleton's investiture as chronologer. Middleton wrote several pageants and entertainments for Sir William Cokayne: *The Triumphs of Love and Antiquity*, commissioned by the Company of the Skinners, celebrated Cokayne's investment as mayor; and the *Honourable Entertainments* for various occasions, such as the marriage of Cokayne's daughter. So that there was a close association between Middleton and Cokayne - indeed that Middleton was Cokayne's official writer of entertainments - is clearly and authoritatively documented. What is also significant is that Middleton's pageants for Cokayne include large amounts of historical material. Before turning to those pageants themselves, it is worth pointing out that within the *Honourable Entertainments*, the transition between Cokayne's mayoralty and that of his successor, Sir Francis Jones', is striking. The pageants for Sir Francis are largely on pastoral themes: the seventh entertainment, for instance, features long speeches by 'Severity', 'Levity', 'Flora' and 'Hyacinth'. They are really quite different in theme and subject matter to those for Cokayne. This close patronage relationship between Middleton and Cokayne might modify our reading of *Hengist* slightly. Grace Ioppolo has suggested that the poor petitioners' references in Act I of the play to 'a great enormity [i.e. crisis] in wool' (I.iii.98) might be a reference to the failure of the 'Cokayne Project'. This was Cokayne's attempt to ensure that all wool was dyed and

VII:257-78. For his funeral monument and inscription see William Dugdale, *The History of St Paul's Cathedral* (London, 1658), 68-9.

[171] Middleton, 1438.

processed domestically before being exported, through the establishment of The New Company of Merchant Adventurers (1615) who owned exclusive rights to export dyed wool and cloths. It was a complete disaster as the Dutch, in particular, refused to pay for the processed materials.[172] Middleton's relationship with Cokayne is therefore significantly complicated by these scenes. They strengthen the case that the play was written after October 1620 (i.e. after the end of Cokayne's Mayoralty). Civic patrons were likely fluid: once Cokayne had retired as mayor Middleton moved on to cultivating the next holder of the office. Indeed, because Cokayne was such a deeply unpopular figure he was willing to turn upon him in the presence of that other great patron of the London stage: the amassed audiences at the public theatres. Middleton was willing, in the context of a public stage play, to satirize the very patron he had eulogized in the more intimate civic setting.

What is the relationship between the historiography of Middleton's pageant and entertainment writing from that of *Hengist*? First of all, Middleton's pageant history has greater capacity for formal variation than the chronicle history play. In the *Honourable Entertainments* in particular, Middleton draws on the chorographic tradition of land-writing, particularly in *The Third Entertainment*. Here, a 'water-nymph' rises out of the water conduit to greet the magistrates upon their arrival at the water conduits by the Banqueting House. She then offers an account of the 'renewing' of this 'ancient custom' and laments that she has for a long time been 'so forgot' (3.1, 3.8, 3.42). Such rhetorical prosopopoeia through a water-nymph associated with a particular place and its history is characteristic of chorographic

[172] See Astrid Friis, *Alderman Cockayne's Project and the Cloth Trade: The Commercial Policy of England in its Main Aspects, 1603-1625*, trans. A. Fausbøl (Copenhagen, 1927)

poetry of the English Renaissance: Drayton's *Poly-Olbion* (1612) is a clear example, as is Spenser's *The Ruines of Time* (pub.1591). This genre has its forebears in antiquarian chorography itself and the poetry of practicing antiquaries, especially Leland's *Cygnea Cantio*.[173] But for all that greater formal possibilities are available to Middleton here, it must be admitted that politically this is an understandably quiescent genre. Hence there is no room for the vision of rupture and discontinuity offered in *Hengist*. The *Honourable Entertainments* are preoccupied with the renewing of ancient customs: *The Second Entertainment*, for instance, describes the reestablishment of archery festivals by Henry VIII and Edward VI. In older times, such festivals had been considered worthy of protection by the monarch:

> Old time made much on't, and it thought no praise
> Too dear for't, nor no honour in those days.
> Not only kings ordained laws to defend it
> But shined the first examples to commend it. (2.3-6)

So when old customs had been abandoned - such as archery festivals or the visit to the water conduits by the city fathers - then Middleton celebrates the reconnection of ancient custom and present practice.

Such continuities are strongly locally inflected, especially in *The Triumphs of Loue and Antiquity*. The figure of 'Antiquity' appears and announces that 'I record, that after-times may see / What former were, and how they ought to be' (254-55).

[173] First published as John Leland, *κύκνειον ᾄσμα: Cygnea Cantio* (London, 1545)

'Antiquity' appears and announces that 'I record, that after-times may see / What former were, and how they ought to be' (254-55). 'Antiquity' seems specifically to be a historian of the Skinners Company and their relationship with nobility and royalty since their establishment: he lists the kings, queens, prince, dukes and earls who were 'of this fraternity made free' (263).[174] He is keen in particular to establish the symbiotic relationship between local civic guild and national polity. The Fates, according to Antiquity, 'Have to this noble brotherhood knit such states' (266). After this speech, the printed pageant offers a long account of the interactions between monarchs and the Skinners Company, since the foundation of the latter in the reign of Edward III.[175] However, such local inflection of national politics is to some extent comparable to the relationship between the two plots of *Hengist, King of Kent*. Although having no historical warrant as such, it should be no surprise to a reader of Middleton's civic pageants to see a plot about disputes in corporate town administration and an account of national history being grafted together. *Hengist* presents an analysis of conflicts between different levels of government in Britain. When Hengist demands more than the Earldom of Kent, but instead the 'kingdom on't...without control, / The full possession' (IV.iv.91-2), Vortiger is reluctant because 'Never was King of Kent yet / But who was general King' (IV.iv.94-5).[176] This points to both the devolved nature

---

[174] For more on the history of the Skinners' Company see J.F. Wadmore, 'Some Account of the History and Antiquities of The Worshipful Company of Skinners, London', *Transactions of the London and Middlesex Archaeological Society* 5 (1876-80): 92-182.

[175] For more on the London guilds see Steven Rappaport, *Worlds Within Worlds: Structures of Life in Sixteenth-Century London* (Cambridge, 1989).

[176] Grace Ioppolo wants to place this kind of conflict in levels of governance within the context specifically of problems in the Island of Jersey. I am not convinced, both because there is no evidence Middleton knew or cared about Jersey, and because this sort of conflict between governmental hierarchies was a far more widespread problem in governing an early-modern state without any developed bureaucratic administration. On the latter issue see Michael Braddick, *State Formation in Early Modern England, c.1550-1700* (Cambridge: CUP, 2000). For Ioppolo's argument see Grace Ioppolo, 'Sexual Treason, Treasonous Sexuality, and the Eventful Politics of James I in Middleton's *Hengist, King of Kent*', *Ben Jonson Journal* 3 (1996): 87-107.

kingship in the early British kingdoms (that more than one king would be imaginable) and also the tense hierarchies between those kings (because the king of Kent is traditionally the King of the whole of Britain). And it is in this context that we should read the civic disputes within the town of Queenborough: local political squabbles mirror, and are interrelated with, violence and betrayal in national history.

In the town of Queenborough, Simon the Tanner is in conflict with the Puritan Oliver, a fustian-weaver. The conflict is presented to Hengist by the other townspeople as a rupture within the 'corporation' (III.3.55, 70), which alludes to the early-modern incorporated civic structures of governance. In such incorporated towns and boroughs, guild members could vote to elect aldermen and the mayoralty.[177] Each of the guild members is anxieties about the civic institution are expressed in metaphors associated with their trade. The Barber is a 'corrector of enormities in hair' (III.3.46), the tailor intends to 'rip the linings' (68) of the town quarrel to show them to Hengist, the glover is anxious that 'our town wants a hand' (88), and so forth. Hengist is asked to solve this dispute, which he finds puzzling. To Hengist, the nobility should remain outside such civic disputes, which ideally could be resolved internally. He asks, 'But why to me is this election offered? / The choosing of a mayor goes by most voices' (III.3.143-44). Hengist actually abandons the people to their disputes. When Simon later offers a 'gilded scabbard' to the royal party (IV.1.14) Vortiger rejects his offer with a contempt for all the ordinary citizens of Kent ('I hate 'em as I do the rotten roots of you' (16)). This drives the

[177] See Phil Withington, *The Politics of the Commonwealth: Citizens and Freemen in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: CUP, 2005)

townspeople into the arms of Hengist: 'Then bless the good Earl of Kent' (21), Simon concludes. We are in recognisably the same world here as the one described by Middleton's historical pageants, a world in which guilds constitute political order both horizontally in relation to one another, and vertically by their relationship to the king and local nobility. But whereas the pageants represent these relations in idealized terms, the play teases out conflicts and discontinuities. Guilds are set against one another here, particularly on religious grounds: Oliver is a Puritan rebel. In that sense, the comic plot underlines the religious conflicts in the historical plot. But the comic characters also are themselves caught up within the larger political divisions in the kingdom. They offer fealty to Vortiger and his family, but are forced instead to factionalize and to side with Hengist. Middleton's historical imagination in both *Hengist* and his pageants is deeply invested in the local: regional landscapes, politics, and civic contexts. Chronicle history is situated in specific local, chorographic, contexts. But whereas in the pageants, such historical modes and the political visions they imply are seamless with one another, in *Hengist* they are set into dynamic conflict.

What is clear from the above survey is that the multiple ways in which Middleton engaged with history were closely shaped by the context within which he was writing. The same historical forms do not obtain for a pageant as they do for a play. However, some things remain constant, and if they do not quite amount to a vision of history they are still worth enumerating individually. Firstly, Middleton's historical vision is intensely locally inflected, particularly focussing on London and the south-east of England. It is no surprise he should have been attracted to writing

a play about the ways strangers and alien settlers embed themselves in that landscape to become the modern English. Secondly, and allied to this first point, is the idea that national and local history are intertwined. Rather than seeing a tussle between comedy and tragedy, or the local and the national in *Hengist*, I want to have pointed towards ways in which competing genres and institutions are mutually sustaining and interpenetrating. This is why it is necessary to see Middleton's historical vision developing within a particular civic context: his civic histories, as we have seen, are preoccupied with the sustaining relationship between local institutions and national sovereign government. Finally, it is worth pointing to what makes Middleton's use of history unique. We have already suggested earlier that rather than presenting an idealized ancient Britain, or at least some partially idealized figures within that Britain, Middleton finds the ancient British and the ancient Saxons tyrannous, idolatrous and lascivious. There is no secure return to national origins. Once Middleton has stripped away anything that we might call patriotic -- or looking back from the vantage point of the eighteenth-century, nationalistic -- what is left in his historical vision are the competing and fragmented histories of local regions. Middleton has therefore brought the history play back to something the genre's original performers, the Queen's Men, would have understood very well.

Chapter 4: Milton and the Confessionalization of Antiquarianism

In this final chapter, we are returning fully to the world of Latin erudition described in chapter 1. But we are doing so at a very different moment in English history. As we near the end of our period, it is necessary to ask what was the impact of the gathering crisis of the civil war on erudition and its relationship to regionalism. So far we have situated the religious politics of antiquarianism in relation to the recovery of the ancient British church. These were arguments being turned against Catholics, including English Catholic exiles like Thomas Stapleton.[1] But what happened when religious history was turned inwards? When British religious history was itself the subject of sectarian polemic? Poetry, drama and antiquarianism, so this thesis has argued, are difficult to cast into oppositional groupings within Britain itself, and this more nuanced picture of British politics is one of the benefits of a regionalist way of thinking. Regionalism encourages sensitivity to the multiply overlapping institutions and affiliations in which early-modern culture was being produced. It is no surprise that the modern academic interest in county history was closely related to the rise of revisionist interpretations of the civil war: close study of local communities showed that the supposed ideological dogmatism imputed to the English by earlier civil war historiography did not get an empirical purchase on what was happening on the ground.[2] But more recently, there has been a tendency to return an appreciation of England's religious divisions to an understanding of the origins of the civil war: Socinianism, for instance, has been seen to have

[1] On this subject see Christopher Highley, *Catholics Writing the Nation in Early Modern Britain and Ireland* (Oxford: OUP, 2008).
[2] See the introduction to the thesis for more on this subject.

political ramifications from the 1630s onwards.[3] So while this chapter seems to depart from a concern with regionalism as such, this is inevitable in order to understand what happened to the religious politics of philology, scholarship and literature in the late 1630s and into the 1640s. Scholarship, literature and religion could no longer maintain the kinds of delicate balances between each other that the previous chapters have traced.

Inevitably, we can only gesture towards the civil war in the space of the present study, but John Milton, for many reasons, provides an obvious focus for this discussion. Milton was a major poet, but also a brilliant *érudit* and controversialist: he is a successor to the kind of humanists and poet-scholars described in chapter 2. From the 1630s onwards, Milton engaged in a serious programme of reading religious history; and yet, there is very little work on Milton's historical thought, beyond studies of his interest in millenarianism.[4] His shifts in political and religious allegiance are also notoriously difficult to gauge. This chapter responds implicitly to the revisionist work of Corns and Campbell, who argue that Milton was essentially a Laudian high-Churchman until he was 'radicalized' in his period at Horton in the 1630s.[5] While not wishing to accept entirely the paradigm of 'radicalization', this chapter will situate Milton within a fast-moving series of political events and within his fast-moving explorations in religious erudition. These two went in hand-in-hand for Milton in the 1630s, and mutually reinforced one another. This chapter, therefore, seeks through a

---

[3] Sarah Mortimer, *Reason and Religion in the English Revolution: the Challenge of Socinianism* (Cambridge: CUP, 2010).
[4] David Loewenstein, *Milton and the Drama of History: Historical Vision, Iconoclasm and the Literary Imagination* (Cambridge: CUP, 1990).
[5] Gordon Campbell and Thomas N. Corns, *John Milton: Life, Work, and Thought* (Oxford: OUP, 2008).

reading of Milton's early writings some answer to the question of what happened when Protestant erudition was turned against other Protestants.

These questions have specific ramifications for Miltonists. In particular, I want to frame a detailed treatment of Milton's early historical reading and writing with two speculative questions: Why does Milton say he wants to write an epic about King Arthur? And why does he abandon this project? This essay will try to offer some context in which these questions might begin to be answered. I want to show that young Milton, the Milton up until around 1642, was preoccupied with history and antiquarianism. This is demonstrated from a survey of Milton's reading in these fields, particularly focussing on his *Commonplace Book*. Then I want to try to give a fresh account of the role of historical methodologies in the debates on episcopacy in the early 1640s. Milton began to distinguish his role in this controversy from that of the Smectymnuans, and he did so because of the ways his modes of historical thought were developing throughout the controversy.

Milton and the Arthurian Epic

In his two longest and most substantial Latin poems, *Epitaphium Damonis* and *Mansus*, Milton outlines his plan to write an epic poem on King Arthur, his defence of the British, and his conquest of the Saxons. In *Mansus*, Milton's neo-Latin poem in imitation of Tasso, written in 1638 for the Italian neo-Latinist Giovanni Battista Manso, he plans to 'indigenas revocabo in carmina reges' (line 80, 'to recall my native kings in songs').[6] Particularly he would tell of King

[6] References to the Latin poems are to Stella P. Revard, ed., *John Milton: Complete Shorter Poems* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2009).

Arthur, and Milton imagines himself in this poem '[f]rangam Saxonicas Britonum sub Marte phalanges' (line 84, 'smashing the Saxon phalanxes under a British Mars').[7] In *Epitaphium Damonis* (1639), Milton's pastoral elegy for his friend Carlo Diodati (of whom, more below), describes the projected Arthurian epic in more detail (lines 162-168). It would feature the crossing of the Trojan Brutus into Britain and describe the rules of the ancient British kings (drawn from Geoffrey of Monmouth), the assimilation of the 'Armoricos' (inhabitants of Brittany) to the Trojan-British rule, and finally the birth of Arthur. Both of these long poems were published as the concluding poems in the book of Latin poems, the *Poemata*, which Milton brought out in 1645. These *Poemata* provide a counterpoint to the first book of vernacular poems, published with them in 1645. The Latin poems revisit matters from the first book: *Epitaphium Damonis*, for instance, forms a pair with *Lycidas*, the pastoral elegy which concludes the vernacular poems.

In both these poems, historical modes of description are prevalent, particularly the tradition of neo-Latin chorographic poetry: poetry which describes history as it is embedded in the landscape. This tradition, in England, reaches back to the first Englishman to be described as an 'antiquary', John Leland, whose *Cygnea Cantio* describes English history in the context of a swan's river journey.[8] *Epitaphium Damonis*' debt to chorographic writing can be seen in

---

[7] On Milton's neo-Latin poetry generally see Stella P. Revard, *The Tangles of Neaera's Hair: the making of the 1645 Poems* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1997) and specifically on the impact of his trip to Italy on his Latin writing see Estelle Haan, *From Academia to Amicitia: Milton's Latin Writings and the Italian Academies* (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1998).

[8] See 'antiquary, *a.* and *n.*, sense B.2.', *The Oxford English Dictionary*. 2nd ed. 1989. *OED Online*. Oxford University Press. 13 Sept. 2010. sense B.2, which cites Richard Grafton's description of Leland as 'the excellent antiquary' in 1563. For the poem itself see John Leland, *Cygnea Cantio*

the transition between the description of Milton's projected British epic in lines 162-168 to the contextualization of his own life and writings within the many rivers and waters of Britain in lines 175-178. He imagines his reputation echoing across the rivers which constitute important boundary points in ancient Britain: the 'Orcades', the most northerly point of Britain as described in Tacitus' *Agricola*; the 'Abra', or Humber, a key battle-line between the British and invaders from northern Europe; the 'Tamara', a point beyond which the British retreated after Saxon invasions; and, most of all, the 'Thamesis', the centre of the Roman military occupation of Britain.[9] In *Mansus*, Milton describes an ancient British land, where druids are imagined reciting poems about 'Corinëida Loxo', the daughter of Corineus, king of Cornwall in Geoffrey of Monmouth (42-48). Druids are themselves here seen as poet-historians, the preservers of oral history.[10] So these are both poems which not only describe a British epic, but also themselves borrow modes from historical writing and substantive matter from ancient British history. They themselves constitute mini-epics on British-historical subject matter.

But in early-modern historiography, confessional issues are always to the fore: what kind of primitive church existed in Britain? How far is that church a model for present practice? The best way into understanding the relevance of this question to Milton's Latin poetry is through Giovanni Battista Manso's short epigram for Milton, which was reprinted as part of the 'Testimonia' to Milton, at the opening of the *Poemata* (1645):

(London, 1645). Recently on John Leland see the definitive edition of his *De Viris Illustribus*: James Carley, ed., *De uiris illustribus = On famous men* (Toronto, 2010).

[9] The *locus classicus* here is Tacitus' description of Britain in his *Agricola* I.x.

[10] For a recent survey of classical references to the druids see Ronald Hutton, *Blood and Mistletoe: the History of the Druids in Britain* (New Haven: Yale UP, 2009).

Ut mens, forma, decor, facies, mos, si pietas sic,

Non Anglus, verum hercle Angelus ipse fores.

Lawrence Revard's recent translation reads: 'If your piety were such as your mind, figure, grace, appearance, manners, then not an Angle but, by Hercules, an angel you would be'.[11] This little epigram can be read in a complex dialogue with Milton's *Mansus*. Manso's pun (Anglus into Angelus) is drawn from an episode in Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum*. Bede describes Pope Gregory I seeing boys at a slave-market, and on discovering that they were English, he quipped that were they Christians they would be 'Non Angli, sed angeli' (Not Angles, but angels'). This was the moment, according to Bede, which inspired Gregory to send Augustine's mission to convert the English, and Augustine later became the first Archbishop of Canterbury.[12] So Manso's epigram figures Milton as one of the beautiful heathen slaves Gregory sees: capable of being converted from his Protestantism to Catholicism and so becoming an 'Angelus', but currently merely an 'Anglus'. This is a very witty and erudite joke, but it does have a serious purpose because it adumbrates the confessional conflicts which are at stake in differing treatments of British history. Manso's epigram privileges Bede's account of history in which the Pope sends a (obviously Catholic) bishop to convert the heathen Saxons. This is the key moment of transformation of the British isles into a land whose people follow the Christian faith. It is therefore understandable that counter-Reformation polemicists in the sixteenth century

[11] Stella P. Revard, ed., *John Milton: Complete Shorter Poems* (Blackwell, 2009), 132-133 .
[12] See Bede, *Historical Works* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP, 1930), vol.1.II.1.

privileged Bede's account as the definitive document for the history of the British church. The clearest example here is the Catholic Thomas Stapleton's 1565 Antwerp translation of Bede as *The History of the Church of Englande*, which features a polemical preface describing the 'Differences betweene the Primitiue Faithe of England Continewed Almost these thousand yeares, and the late pretensed [sic] faith of protestants: gathered out of the History of the churche of England compiled by Venerable Bede an English man, aboue DCCC. yeares paste.' (▷3v).[13] Manso's epigram invokes Bede's role as a polemical weapon in counter-Reformation debates.

Milton's invocation of Arthur and British history more broadly has, therefore, a subtly inflected polemical edge -- especially in the context of Manso's epigram. Milton plunges more deeply into British history, travelling back to a primitive time before Augustine's conversion of the Saxons.[14] The first chapter of Matthew Parker's *De Antiquitate Britannicae Ecclesiae* (London, 1572), 'De vetustate Britannicae Ecclesiae testimonia' argues that after the conversion of the ancient British (pre-Saxon) inhabitants to Christianity, the 'Britannos' 'nunquam postea desciuisse ad veteres gentium errores' (never afterwards withdrew to the old errors of the people).[15] Moreover, this was an especially pure kind of Christianity because it derived most closely from Christ himself: the Apostles had directly converted the British to Christianity. So in conflicts between Protestants in England and Catholics abroad this sort of ancient British

---

[13] These disputes have been explored well by Donna Hamilton, 'Catholic Use of Anglo-Saxon Precedents, 1565-1625', *Recusant History* 26 (2003): 537-55.
[14] For more generally on British history and polemic see Felicity Heal, 'What can King Lucius do for you? The Reformation and the Early British Church', *English Historical Review* 120 (2005): 593-614.
[15] Matthew Parker, *De Antiquitate Britannicae Ecclesiae* (London, 1572), 8.

history (or perhaps, better, pseudo-history) was immensely useful. It allowed the British to claim a priority for their church, and hence a doctrinal superiority, which the European Catholic church could not claim. So any British epic Milton wrote would always be a religiously polemical epic. In some respects, this is fine: Milton was of course one of the most famous polemicists of his day. But Milton was writing in very fast changing circumstances. In the 1630s polemic might mainly have been anti-Catholic polemic. But in the 1640s, polemic was definitively targeted against the dominant wing of the English church itself. Milton's polemic turned inwards. And in that period, too, Milton embarked on a huge programme of historical study. To contextualize why Milton might have abandoned his British epic -- why circumstances had rendered it inappropriate or irrelevant -- we need to follow Milton's reading in history very carefully. It is this reading to which we now turn.

Young Milton's Encounters with History

Milton would have been no stranger to antiquarian, historical writing from the time he was at school onwards. Various figures in his milieu had connections to the world of history writing. Milton was taught at St Paul's by Alexander Gil the Elder. Gil contributed a commendatory poem to John Speed's *Theatre of the Empire of Great Britaine* (1611), one of the most important works of chorographic history published in the early seventeenth century. Gil was himself interested in history: in the preface to his celebrated *Logonomia Anglica*, he attempted to provide a historical account of language change, which took into

account the pressure of war and violent rupture on language.[16] At Oxford, Milton's great friend Charles Diodati contributed to the University's volume of elegies for William Camden.[17]

Milton's *Commonplace Book* (*CPB*) is a record of his reading in the late 1630s and 1640s. However, it is not an unproblematic, transparent record, and we need to sketch briefly what kind of book this is. First of all, this book does not seem to constitute Milton's 'notes on reading' from the 1630s: it seems much more likely to constitute 'notes on notes on reading'. The guides to commonplace-book keeping available in the seventeenth century (brilliantly analysed by Ann Blair) recommended the keeping of not only rough notes from reading, but also at least one distilled collection of that reading, under subject headings. The analogy was often made between accountants' financial legers, one which might record income and expenditure on a transaction-by-transaction basis, the other which would synthesize the totals (at the end of the day, for instance).[18] Secondly, this is a work of moral philosophy, as its three subject headings of 'Ethics', 'Politics' and 'Economics' would have immediately signalled

---

[16] Alexander Gil, *Alexander Gil's Logonomia Anglica (1619)*, ed. and trans., B. Danielsson and A. Gabrielson (Stockholm: Almquist & Wiksell, 1972).

[17] On Diodati, see David C. Dorian, *The English Diodatis* (New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 1950). Interestingly, it seems very likely to have been William Chillingworth through whom Diodati got the opportunity to contribute to the Camden volume. Diodati is clearly the odd member out in the volume, both because he is the youngest contributor, and because most of the poets who contributed to the volume, Degory Wheare, ed., *Camdeni Insignia* (Oxford, 1624), had some connection with one of the institutions with which Camden was connected (Westminster School; Broadgates Hall; or Christ Church). Only two, Chillingworth and Diodati, were from Trinity. Chillingworth was an older member of Trinity at the same time as Diodati, and so seems more likely to have been able to find his way into the Camden volume. Chillingworth is also connected with Diodati in the late 1620s, when we find Chillingworth reporting Alexander Gil the younger's indiscrete comments about Laud to the Bishop; Diodati was there when the comments were made.

[18] See Ann Blair, 'Note Taking as an Art of Transmission', *Critical Inquiry* 31 (2004): 85-107, 90-97. On the massive literature on commonplace books, see in particular Peter Beal 'Notions in Garrison: The Seventeenth-Century Commonplace Book', in W.S. Hill, ed., *New Ways of Looking at Old Texts* (Binghamton, 1993), 131-47.

to any good Cambridge educated boy from the period.[19] In particular, the *CPB* reflects Milton's reading in history. Two kinds of history are represented: civil and ecclesiastical. It is important to note first of all that, although modern historians of historiography frequently either work on antiquarianism (broadly meaning British history) or on church history, few scholars are familiar with both fields. This was not a division of labour which would have been appreciated in the seventeenth century. Degory Wheare's *De Ratione et Methodo Legendi utrasque Historias, Civiles et Eccelsiasticas* (Oxford, 1637) was one of the most popular and influential guides in the seventeenth century to the order in which historians should be read.[20] The work initially guides the reader through primary and secondary materials relating to British history, advising that the reader should begin by looking at some of the key secondary studies, especially Camden's *Britannia*, and move on to the primary materials afterwards. In Section 32 of the work, he then introduces the *'Ad Historiam Ecclesiasticam transitio*', and recommends beginning by studying the early church through reading the major sixteenth-century Church historians, such as Baronius, before moving on to Eusebius and others.[21] So it is important to separate Milton's reading into two groups, civil and ecclesiastical, while remembering that both are parts of a larger programme of historical reading.

---

[19] Jill Kraye, 'Moral Philosophy', in *The Cambridge History of Renaissance Philosophy*, eds., Charles B. Schmitt, Quentin Skinner, and E. Kessler (Cambridge: CUP, 1988), 171-97.

[20] It is translated as *The Method and Order of Reading Both Civil and Ecclesiastical Histories* (London, 1685) and reprinted several times. It is possible that Milton may have used a combination of the first edition of Wheare's work, *De Ratione et Methodo Legendi Historias Dissertatio* (Oxford, 1625) to guide his reading in British history, followed by the expanded edition in 1637 for his reading in ecclesiastical history. The comparison between the works recommended for study in the latter volume and the works of ecclesiatical history Milton was reading is very close.

[21] It is interesting that Milton never cites Baronius in his *CPB*; he is, however, an ecclesiastical historian he must have consulted. The best account of Baronius can be found in Jean-Louis Quantin, *Le Catholicisme Classique et Les Pères de l'Eglise: un retour aux sources (1669-1713)* (Paris, Institut d'études augustiniennes, 1999), 200ff.

In civil history, we have works on British history, especially Holinshed's *Chronicles* (1589), Speed's *Theatre of the Empire of Great Britain* (1611) and Camden's *Annales...Regnante Elizabetha* (1615). It is useful to distinguish such contemporary secondary literature on British history from Milton's reading in the sources of British history, which includes works such as Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica* and William of Malmesbury's *De Gestis Regum Anglorum*.[22] Milton was also filling in his knowledge of contemporary European history, particularly with Jacques de Thou's *Historia sui Temporis* (Geneva, 1620), the second most frequently cited work. The majority of his reading, however, was in church history, and we can group that reading into several clusters. The first is works concerned with the ancient Christian Church. In this area, he read both primary source documents (the early fathers themselves) and early ecclesiastical historians. In the primary source documents, we have several of the important early fathers represented: Ignatius, Basil, Tertullian, Justin Martyr and Cyprian.[23] He also read all the significant early Ecclesiastical historians, who continued one another's works: Eusebius, the first ecclesiastical historian, was followed by Socrates, Theodoret, Sozomen and Evagrius. Milton probably encountered all these historians in Greek in a single volume: *Ecclesiasticae Historiae Autores* (Paris, 1544). Later Byzantine church historians, such as Procopius, reflect

---

[22] Milton would have read Bede in Jerome Commelin, *Rerum Britannicarum* (Heidelberg, 1587), a collection of early British historians. Bede was the British historian with whom continental European readers were most likely to be familiar, both because of his importance to counter-Reformation polemic and because he provided material for editions of the church councils. On the former, see Felicity Heal, 'Appropriating History: Catholic and Protestant Polemics and the National Past', HLQ 68 (2005): 109-32. He read William of Malmesbury in the most important source-book of medieval English historians so far published, *Rerum Anglicarum Scriptores* (London, 1596). He also cites Henry of Huntington from the same volume.

[23] The starting point for any study of the Fathers in the Anglican Church is now Jean-Louis Quantin, *The Church of England and Christian Antiquity: The Construction of a Confessional Identity in the Seventeenth Century* (OUP, 2009).

another cluster, and one which begins to overlap with political and civil history. Finally, many of the major works relating to the history of the Reformation are represented, including Johannes Sleidan's *Ioan. Sleidani Commentarii de Statu Religionis et Reipublicae* (Strassburg, 1555) and Paolo Sarpi's history of the Council of Trent.[24]

There has been much excellent work which attempts to ascertain the order in which Milton read these works, and on which libraries he might have used to read them.[25] But to make an assessment of the kinds of historicism which interested the young Milton, and which he was preparing to practice in his poetry and prose, we need to think briefly about how he read the works in his *Commonplace Book*. The structuring of notes under headings mitigates against detailed engagement with historical context or even historical narrative. The entries in the *CPB* frequently read like historical exempla, fragmented from their original context. So although we can see from the book that Milton was attempting a systematic reading of civil and ecclesiastical history in this period, it does not really prepare us for the kind of engagement with the processes of historical transmission, and the corruption of that tradition, which we find in a work like *Of Prelatical Episcopacy* (of which, more later).[26]

---

[24] On Sleidan as a historian see Alexandra Kess, *Johann Sleidan and the Protestant Vision of History* (University of St Andrews: St Andrews Studies in Reformation History, 2004). The best available account of Paolo Sarpi in English can be found in J.G.A. Pocock, *Barbarism and Religion: Volume 2: Narratives of Civil Government* (Cambridge: CUP, 1999)

[25] On the chronology of Milton's *CPB* see the classic article, James Holly Hanford, 'The Chronology of Milton's Private Studies', *Proceedings of the Modern Language Association* 36:2 (1921): 251-314. On where Milton did his reading see Edward Jones, '"Filling in a Blank in the Canvas": Milton, Horton, and the Kedermister Library', *Review of English Studies* 53 (2002): 31-60. On Milton's lost 'index theologicus', see Gordon Campbell, 'Milton's Index Theologicus and Bellarmine's Disputationes *De Controversiis Christianae Fidei Adversus Huius Temporis Haereticos*', *Milton Quarterly* 11 (1977): 12-16.

[26] For more on the impact of the culture of commonplacing on thought see Ann Moss, *Printed Commonplace-Books and the Structuring of Renaissance Thought* (Oxford: OUP, 1996).

This sort of engagement with historical process and context is further mitigated against by the fact that it seems very likely that Milton was using the technologies of information storage and retrieval provided by the editions he was using. This has not really been stressed sufficiently before by Miltonists: while Milton *may* have read the whole of the church fathers, say, all the way through, the *CPB* alone does not suggest this. There are two clear examples from the *CPB* of this sort of use of finding aids within books which should be mentioned here briefly: one is Milton's use of Fronton du Duc's edition of Basil in parallel Greek and Latin; the second is Milton's use of Nicholas Rigault's edition of Tertullian.[27] Milton cites Basil's distinction between a king and a tyrant: 'the one considers at every point his own advantage, the other provides what is helpful to his subjects'.[28] If we look up this reference in Basil, we can see that the editors have already marked this little *sententia* in the margin: 'Tyrannus a Rege quid differt' (I.456). It is not significant here that Basil is an early Greek father, that he invented monasticism, or anything else much about the historical context of his writing. This is a memorable phrase, already invited to be extracted from Basil's corpus by the editors of the Paris edition. The second instance of Milton using such finding technologies can be seen in his engagement with Tertullian. There are four references to Tertullian. Two are to the same work, *De Spectaculis*, a book which Milton clearly has read all the way and thought about because he paraphrases it (I.489-90). However, the other two notes are rather

---

[27] The best available study of editions of Basil in the Renaissance is Irena Backus, *Lectures Humanistes de Basile de Césarée: traductions latines, 1439-1618* (Paris, 1990). Nicolas Rigault deserves a full study, but for a very valuable short overview see Ingrid de Smet, 'Nicolas Rigault', *Centuriae Latinae II: Cent une figures humanistes de la Renaissance aux Lumières* (Geneva: Droz, 2006), 727-733.

[28] John Milton, *The Complete Prose Works of John Milton*, ed. Don M. Wolfe, et al., 8 vols. (New Haven: Yale UP, 1953-1982), 453). Henceforth, *CPW*.

more opportunistic. One is on 'gluttony' (*gula*), which Tertullian describes as a 'man-slayer' (*homicida*). Milton gives the specific page reference to Rigault's edition for this (703). There is no necessary connection between Tertullian and writing about gluttony: this is once again a historically decontextualized *sententia*. It is very likely to have been retrieved by Milton using Rigault's index, in which we find several entries under 'gula', one of which is specifically 'gula homicida' (oi^{r}). This is reinforced by the fourth entry on Tertullian, which comes under the very long heading 'Rex', which fills two pages of the *CPB*. Milton picks out a *sententia* from Rigault's edition on the role of the king as father of the country: 'qui pater patriae est, quomodo dominus est?' This passage could easily be accessed again using Rigault's index, with the heading 'paterfamilias, non dominus', which takes the reader straight to the passage Milton quotes. What is still not clear is whether Milton might have been brought to these references by a secondary work which cited Tertullian on gluttony, say, and then looked up these references in the index to find an accurate quotation; or whether he might have entered the heading 'gula' in his *CPB*, and then looked into Rigault's index to Tertullian to find what he had to say on the subject. However, for our present purposes this distinction is immaterial: Milton's historical engagement with these two sources of the early church is slight and context-free.

Attention to the *CPB* entries which may very well have relied on such finding-aids throws light on references to books where no such finding aids were available. Milton's use of church historians such as Eusebius was of a quite different order to his use of Basil and Tertullian. The 1544 Paris edition is simply

blank, unadorned, unindexed Greek prose.[29] This encourages an engagement with the historical progression recounted by Eusebius, from the earliest apostolic times until his own day. This is clearest in Milton's long entry on 'Marriage'. He begins by considering Eusebius' account of the early church, and says that 'The Apostles are shown to have contracted marriage by Eusebius'. He then cites Eusebius' earliest continuator, Socrates, paying specific attention to the textual state of Socrates' works: 'either he wrote this himself or someone afterwards, as could easily happen, inserted these words as his own opinion' (394). Milton follows up these citations from the early historians by citing one of the earliest church fathers, Ignatius, before giving a round-up of Clement of Alexandria and Cyprian's accounts of marriage. What is at stake here is that Milton is using these accounts for their historical, factual content: what can they tell us about what the early church was like? This sort of detailed antiquarian engagement with sources must be distinguished from the more opportunistic, decontextualized treatment of Basil. The *CPB* is a witness not only to Milton's reading in historians, but also to different forms of historicism and historical reading. Making such fine distinctions allows us to understand the multiple and distinct historical kinds of historicism which will feed into the anti-prelatical tracts.

History in the Anti-Prelatical Tracts: The Early Church

[29] Although see Constance Nicholas, 'The Edition of the Early Church Historian used by Milton,' *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 51 (1952): 60-2. She notes that Milton cites Sozomen in both Latin and Greek, and hence concludes that he may have used the *Historiae Ecclesiasticae Scriptores Graeci* (Geneva, 1612), which prints a parallel Latin and Greek text.

In the early 1640s, Milton had his first opportunity to put his historical reading into use, in the religious polemics which arose over episcopacy.[30] Joseph Hall had been urged by Laud (who had suspected Hall of sympathising with Puritans and anti-episcopalians) to write a defence of episcopacy. This work, *Episcopacie by Divine Right Asserted*, was followed by Hall's *An Humble Remonstrance to the High Court of Parliament*. A group of ministers, including Thomas Young, Milton's former tutor and correspondent, formed a grouping called 'Smectymnuus' to write a response to Hall.[31] The Smectymnuans issued their *An Answer to a Book Entitled an Humble Remonstrance*. Appended to this work is a postscript, almost certainly by Milton, in which the antipathy between bishops and monarchs in British history from Augustine's embassy to the Anglo-Saxons onwards is recounted in detail.[32] This is Milton's first entry into the anti-prelatical debates, in support of the group led by his former tutor. Hall responded to the Smectymnuans with *A Defence of the Humble Remonstrance*. This spurred Milton into his first full anti-prelatical tract, published anonymously in 1641: *Of Reformation*. This book attempts to show that not only is episcopacy not justified by Scripture or by the practice of the early church, in practice episcopacy has always historically been a great hindrance to other kinds of ecclesiastical reformation.

At a slight angle to the debate between Hall and the Smectymnuans were the interventions of the great Irish scholar and Archbishop of Armagh, James

---

[30] The recent survey of this topic, David Weil Baker, '"Dealt with at his owne weapon": Anti-Antiquarianism in Milton's Prelacy Tracts', *Studies in Philology* 106:4 (2009): 207-234, is unfortunately unaware of many of the finer nuances in debates on church history.
[31] On the Smectymnuans see Tom Webster, *Godly Clergy in Early Stuart England: The Caroline Puritan Movement, c.1620-1643* (Cambridge: CUP, 1997), 319-326.
[32] A strong case for Milton's authorship is made in David L. Hoover and Thomas N. Corns, 'The Authorship of the Postscript to *An Answer to a Booke Entituled, An Humble Remonstrance*', *Milton Quarterly* 38 (2004): 59-127.

Ussher.[33] Hall had been urging Ussher to intervene in the episcopacy debate: he was still a hugely respected figure in the 1640s, and moreover had stood out against the Laudian church and the Earl of Strafford's reforms in Ireland.[34] He thus maintained a credibility with ministers across the spectrum of views on episcopacy. Ussher ultimately would try to seek a more moderate way through the controversy by producing a programme for reduced episcopacy.[35] However, at this stage, Ussher's position's is not dissimilar to Hall's, and he publishes a tract which attempts to give a detailed historical reconstruction of the early church: *The Judgement of Doctor Rainoldes* (London, 1641). He would expand this tract in a collection of treatises on episcopacy, which he himself probably edited, called *Certain Brief Treatises* (Oxford, 1641), into 'Of the Original of Metropolitans and Bishops'. Milton responded to the first version of this tract in *Of Prelatical Episcopacy*: this short work, as we will see, is young Milton's most thorough-going exercise in historical, factual reconstruction. In the meantime, Hall stepped back into the debate in response to Smectymnuus, with *A Defence of the Humble Remonstrance*, which provoked Milton's *Animadversions*. After the publication of *Certain Brief Treatises*, Milton publishes a response which is a watershed in his own career, the first tract to which he gives his name: *The Reason of Church Government*. This work is also a watershed because in it we see Milton shifting the terms of the debate away from the historical reconstruction of

---

[33] On Ussher's involvement in the episcopacy controversy see Alan Ford, *James Ussher: Theology, History and Politics in Early-Modern Ireland and England* (Oxford: OUP, 2007). Hugh Trevor-Roper, 'James Ussher', in *Catholics, Anglicans, and Puritans: Seventeenth Century Essays* (London: Secker & Warburg, 1987).

[34] On Ussher's antipathetic relationship with Laud and Strafford see Amanda L. Capern, 'The Caroline Church: James Ussher and the Irish Dimension', *Historical Journal* 39:1 (1996): 57-85.

[35] Circulated in MS and then published by Nicholas Bernard posthumously, as James Ussher, *The Reduction of Episcopacy Unto the Form of Synodical Government Received in the Ancient Church* (London, 1656).

the practices of the early church, towards a systematic theological analysis of the scriptural grounds for episcopacy. In this tract we witness the end of the young Milton's uses of non-Scriptural history (Fathers, British history); he would never approach theological debate in the same way again.[36] The seeds for that shift away from history are already contained in the debates over episcopacy in the early 1640s, and to understand them we need to step back from the mélêe of pamphlet publication to put the religious politics of ecclesiastical history writing into context.

Hall's *Episcopacie by Divine Right Asserted* established the terms and methodologies on which this debate was going to be conducted: what was the structure of authority like in the early church? To find out, disputants needed a mastery not just of Scripture, but of the church Fathers. The first question raised here is what is the relationship between the Fathers and Scripture.[37] Across the religious divides of the Reformation, almost everyone referred at some level to the authority of the Fathers of the Church.[38] Thomas Young might have been no friend of episcopacy, but his work on the Sabbath, *Dies Dominica*, cited Ignatius' epistle to the Magnesians on its title page, and book 1, chapters 2-3 are a tissue

---

[36] Ultimately, this would lead to the production of *De Doctrina*. On that work's systematic theology, see Gordon Campbell, et al., eds., *Milton and the Manuscript of* De Doctrina Christiana (OUP, 2007).

[37] John Downe's treatise, 'Not the Consent of Fathers but Scripture the Ground of Faith', published as part of a collection of tracts *A Treatise of the True Nature and Definition of Justifying Faith* (Oxford, 1635), is a good example of the moderate Calvinist position in the Laudian church. He argues that if the Scriptures are deemed to be difficult to interpret, then the Fathers are even worse, and so do not provide an unambiguous guide to Scripture: 'To proceed, the Scriptures you say are obscure and ambiguous, and therefore you may not rest vpon them saue onely as they are expounded of the Fathers. If so, then if the Fathers also bee obscure and ambiguous, neither may you rest your Faith vpon them. Now certainly the Fathers are as darke and doubtfull as the Scripture' (235).

[38] See the two chapters by Jean-Louis Quantin, 'The Fathers in Seventeenth-Century Catholic Theology' and 'The Fathers in Seventeenth-Century Anglican Theology', in Irena Backus, ed., *The Reception of the Church Fathers in the West: From the Carolingians to the Maurists* (Leiden, 1997), ii.842-65.

of citations from (especially the Latin) fathers on the early church.[39] Richard Baxter, himself no mean authority on the Fathers, in his translation of *Dies Dominica* in the 1670s describes Young as 'eminent in his time...especially for his acquaintance with the writings and teachings of former ages'.[40] But Protestant *sola scriptura* principles tended to diminish the authority of the Fathers, at least to beneath the level of Scripture: according to one line of thought, Fathers could be used to help interpret knotty passages of Scripture, but they did not count as authorities on doctrine in their own right.[41] This encouraged a search for scriptural authority for episcopacy, which both Ussher and Hall felt they had found in the seven Angels of the Church of Asia in Revelation, which they glossed as a reference to the Church's seven bishops.[42] However, another line of thinking on the relationship between scripture and the fathers suggested that the Fathers could count as authorities on matters which were not mentioned in the Scriptures, or mentioned in some way which was unclear. The most authoritative statement of this principle to be found in the seventeenth century is Henry Hammond's very brief treatise, 'Of the way of Resolving Controversies, which are not clearly stated and resolved in the Scriptures'.[43] He points out that Scriptures were written for their original audience, who didn't need certain matters of day-to-day reality and practice explained to them: 'Because in those *times* wherein...the *Scriptures* of the *New Testament* were written, these things were

---

[39] Thomas Young, *Dies Dominica* (London, 1639), 5-18.
[40] Thomas Young, *Dies Dominica, or The Lords Day*, trans. Richard Baxter (Oxford, 1672), A6r-v.
[41] John E. Booty, *John Jewel as Apologist of the Church of England* (London, 1963), 126-149, remains a very valuable account.
[42] For more on reading the book of Revelation in the Renaissance, see Irena Backus, *Reformation Readings of the Apocalypse: Geneva, Zurich and Wittenberg* (Oxford: OUP, 2000).
[43] Henry Hammond, *A Letter of Resolution to Six Quaeres of Present Use in the Church of England* (London, 1653), 1-33. For more on Hammond see John W. Packer, *The Transformation of Anglicanism, 1643-1660, with special reference to Henry Hammond* (Manchester: Manchester UP, 1969).

already so exactly known in their *Originals*, and in all other *circumstances* of them, that any larger *description* of them was perfectly *superfluous*' (B6v). To supply these points missing from the Scriptures, God 'hath *graciously* provided a competent *supply* by those *Records* of *Primitive* and *pure Antiquity*' (B7r), which survive among the Fathers. The history of the early church could reveal things that weren't worth mentioning in Scripture, and thus were of parallel authority to the Scripture.

The larger distinction here is between treating the fathers as authorities on doctrine or as witnesses to the practices of the ancient church.[44] Hall stresses (crucially) that as well as being witnesses to the practice of the church, the early fathers, in particular, are sources of doctrine, because they establish what practices were passed directly from Christ, to the Apostles, to the Apostolic Fathers (Ignatius, Clement of Rome, etc.). This is why the early church (and the closer to Christ's time the better) is so important in these debates: it is, logically, likely to be purer, less corrupt, than the later church.[45] Theologians, historians and polemicists disagreed on whether or not it was necessary to trace the practices of the church all the way back to Christ, or if only tracing them back to the Apostles was sufficient. Hall is clear that, in his eyes, proof of Apostolic practice is sufficient: 'That not onely the government, which was directly commanded, and enacted; but that which was practised and recommended by the Apostles to the Church, is justly to be held for an Apostolicall Institution'

---

[44] On the related development of positive theology in France see Quantin, *Le Catholicisme Classique*, 105ff.

[45] On nostalgia for the early church see Bruno Neveu, 'L'érudition ecclésiastique du XVIIe siècle et la nostalgie de l'antiquité chrétienne', in Keith Robbins, ed., *Religion and humanism* (Blackwell: Oxford, 1981), 195-223. More broadly on views of the early church in the Reformation and Counter-Reformation see Irena Backus, *Historical Method and Confessional Identity in the Era of the Reformation (1378-1615)* (Leiden: Brill, 2003), esp.326-391.

(E3v). The Apostles, Hall points out, wouldn't break the process of historical transmission and arbitrarily abandon the rulings of Christ. He is bolstered here by a passage from Tertullian, who points out 'That shall clearlely appeare to be delivered by the Apostles, which shall have been religiously observed in the Churches of the Apostles' (F4v). He goes on to say that we clearly must trust the apostles, if not as authorities on doctrine, at least as recorders of the simple facts of the early church. It would be absurd, he points out, if no father 'ever saw, or spake the truth, not of doctrine onely, but not of fact' (I3r). A further means to eek out these facts about the early church from the historical record is provided by a principle taken from Augustine, 'That which is held by the universall Church, and not ordained by any Councell, but hath beene alwayes retained in the Church, is most truly believed to be delivered by no other than Apostolicall authority'. This not only helps to discover early church practices (i.e., something is universal if there is evidence for it AND it is not ordained specifically in any council), but also provides a means of safely distinguishing between early church practices which are essential, and those which are local or non-essential. In all these arguments, fact necessarily entails doctrine. Historical reconstruction of the early church is therefore of direct relevance to contemporary clerical authority. Although earlier it was necessary to emphasize the similarity between civil and ecclesiastical history (both come under the broad heading of Milton's historical reading), here it is important to disaggregate the two: civil history does not have the same universalist implications that ecclesiastical history does.[46] Ecclesiastical history, for Hall and others who follow the kinds of logical

[46] On the importance of this distinction, see the classic, Arnaldo Momigliano, 'The Origins of Ecclesiastical Historiography', in *The Classical Foundations of Modern Historiography* (Oxford: OUP, 1990), 132-152.

treatment of the Fathers he pursues, has a direct, immediate impact on present policy.

Essential to any kind of reconstruction of the early church were not just historical principles on how to extrapolate from the limited sources available in the Fathers, but also how to establish proper texts of the Fathers themselves. In Europe in the seventeenth century, a new emphasis was being placed on the process of removing textual errors from the Fathers. Thomas James, Bodley's first librarian, had lain out in his *A Treatise of the Corruption of Scripture, Councels, and Fathers* a programme for editorial work on the Fathers which would seek to purge them of interpolations he believed had been inserted for polemical Popish ends.[47] The greatest such philological and editorial project in England in the seventeenth century was Henry Savile's edition of Chrysostom in Greek.[48] The 1610s and 1620s also saw in a Renaissance in Jesuit patristic scholarship, partly in response to the work of Savile, led by Fronton du Duc and Jacques Sirmond.[49] In the 1630s, Patrick Young, the Royal Librarian in England, published the next European masterpiece of patristic scholarship, his edition of the first epistle of Clement.[50] A new awareness of such textual corruption had particularly focussed on editorial research into the Ignatian epistles. Ignatius had

---

[47] See the superb recent essay, Paul Nelles, 'The Uses of Orthodoxy and Jacobean Erudition: Thomas James and the Bodleian Library', *History of Universities* 22 (2007): 21-70.
[48] Essential reading on this edition is: Jean-Louis Quantin, 'Du Chrysostome latin au Chrysostome grec. Une histoire européenne (1588-1613)', in *Chrysostomosbilder in 1600 Jahren: Facetten der Wirkungsgeschichte eines Kirchenvaters*, eds., Martin Wallraff und Rudolf Brändle (Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2008), 267-346.
[49] An excellent account can be found in Jean-Louis Quantin, 'L'orthodoxie, la censure et la gloire: la difficile édition princeps de l'épître de Barnabé, de Rome à Amsterdam (1549-1646)', in Mariarosa Cortesi, *"Editiones Principes" Delle Opere Dei Padri Greci e Latini* (SISMEL: Firenze, 2006), 103-162, 115-120.
[50] Young deserves a full modern treatment. In the absence of one, there is the nineteenth-century biography and edition of his correspondence, Patrick Young, *Patricius Junius (Patrick Young) Bibliothekar der Könige Jacob I und Carl I von England. Mitteilungen aus seinem Briefwechsel*, ed. J. Kemke (Leipzig, 1898).

made a very clear distinction between 'episcopos' and 'presbuteros', but scholars and polemicists alike were aware that the present collection of Ignatian epistles both contained entire epistles which were spurious and interpolations within genuine epistles.[51] Such textual confusion encouraged the Protestant sceptic, and darling of the Great Tew Circle, Jean Daillé to publish his *Traicté de l'employ des Saincts Peres* (Geneva, 1632), which argued that the Fathers were far too textually corrupt to constitute any kind of authority at all.[52]

It must be emphasized that in the debate between Hall and the Smectymnuans, Hall was far more knowledgeable about contemporary scholarship on the Fathers. Hall was directly in touch with the two greatest patristic editors in Britain, James Ussher and Patrick Young, and was clearly familiar with Young's edition and its importance long before Milton.[53] Hall was far more familiar with the Greek fathers than the Smectymnuans seem to have been. Most of the Smectymnuans' citations are from the Latin fathers: Jerome, Augustine, and from Cyprian's writings in Latin.[54] Moreover, the Smectymnuans do not even engage with the textual debates on the interpolations into Ignatius, which would have enormously supported their arguments. The Greek writings of the Apostolic fathers were of far greater value as contemporary witnesses to the practice of the early church. Hall's greater familiarity with contemporary

---

[51] The best survey of this issue can be found in a masterpiece of nineteenth-century polyglot erudition, J.B. Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers*, 5 vols. (London, 1889-90), II:1. Hugh de Quehen, 'Politics and Scholarship in the Ignatian Controversy', *The Seventeenth Century* 13 (1998): 69-84 is largely derivative of Lightfoot's work.

[52] Hugh Trevor-Roper's account of Great Tew remains useful, 'The Great Tew Circle' in *Catholics, Anglicans, Puritans*. On their interest in Daillé see Quantin, *Church of England*, 209-251.

[53] Hall points out that Young's edition of Clement was based on a manuscript sent to Charles by the Patriarch of the Greek Church, Cyril Lukaris (see Hall, *Episcopacie*, T4r-v). For more on the contacts between the Greek and Laudian Churches see Hugh Trevor-Roper, 'The Church of England and the Greek Church in the Time of Charles I', From Counter-Reformation to Glorious Revolution (London: Secker and Warburg, 1992), 83-111.

[54] Hall rather tartly refers to '*Cyprian*, whom you frequently cite' in his *Defence of the Humble Remonstrance*, B4r.

scholarship gave him a huge polemical advantage. Milton's awareness of philological debates in patristic scholarship was patchy. He was fairly ecumenical in the editions of the Fathers he used. He made use of the Jesuit Fronton du Duc's edition of Basil, which was itself an extraordinary ecumenical project, and he carefully studied Vedelius' Ignatius. But interestingly he does not quote from the Eton Chrysostom.[55] And only *The Reason of Church Government* mentions the Epistle of Clement, and then in a second-hand way.

Smectymnuus did offer a challenge to this historical methodology. They point out that just because an institution has endured for a long time, it doesn't mean that the institution has anything to recommend it should continue to endure. As they put it, 'It is a good observation of *Cyprian*, that Christ said, *Ego sum via, veritas & vita*, not *Ego sum consuetudo*; and that *Consuetudo sine veritate est vetustas erroris*, Christ is Truth, and not Custom. and Custome without Truth, is a mouldy errour: and as Sr *Francis Bacon* saith, *Antiquity without Truth, is a Cypher without a Figure*' (C3r).[56] However, they all broadly accept the way Hall has laid out the debate: they engage with him on historical grounds. Their central point is that there is no Scriptural warrant to show that a bishop was of greater authority over a presbyter: they do not accept Bishop Hall's analogy between the superiority of Apostles over Disciples and Bishops over Presbyters. They are also clear that the Bible offers no historical warrant for thinking the bishop is superior to the presbyter: this is the Bible treated as a historical document to the practice of the early church. They also argue that the witnesses of the early

[55] Given evidence elsewhere in this volume that Milton may have used Eton college library it seems even more surprising that he does not cite this edition in the *CPB*.
[56] The citation of Bacon should not be taken too far: it does not imply anything other than a superficial acquaintance with the Baconian project.

fathers aren't necessary, because the Bible is perfectly clear and authoritative on this matter.[57] However, crucially, they do not attack the authority of the Fathers wholesale - for instance, by dismissing them as textually corrupt - because they also need to rely on the later Fathers to bolster their argument. They cite Jerome to the effect that '*Bishops* and *Presbyters* are originally the same...that Imparitie that was in his [Jerome's] time betweene Bishops and Elders. was grounded upon Ecclesiastical Custome, and not upon divine Institution;...that this was not his private judgement, but the judgement of Scripture' (D3v-D4r). However, they do not engage much with the contemporary source documents relating to the early Church (beyond Scripture): this is the consequence of their unfamiliarity with the Greek sources. The tradition of the church still edges forwards from the times of Christ, to the Apostles and to the Apostolic fathers. The Smectymnuans also accept that the laws of the Apostles are divine laws, but are much less happy to extrapolate from the early sources (i.e. fathers alive at the same time as the apostles, but not themselves apostles) to find out what the Apostles practiced. The Apostolic law needed to be laid down absolutely explicitly, not inferred by historical deduction. There might be some polemical advantage here: although they insist that episcopacy is not divinely ordained, their arguments don't entail the opposite claim that episcopacy is divinely prohibited. Emphasizing the *lack* of detail about the early church leaves open the possibility that some sort of reduced episcopacy might turn out to be sufficiently in-line with early church

[57] See e.g. C4r.

practice as to be warrantable. Wiggle-room within the fast-moving episcopal debate in the early 1640s was thus preserved.[58]

So how does this debate shape the historicism of Milton's pamphlets? It is useful to treat the first three anti-Prelatical tracts (*Of Reformation* to *Animadversions*) as a group, which all share in common similar historical methodologies. Milton presents church history as a developing tradition from the time of Christ onwards. We can see this most clearly in *Of Prelatical Episcopacy*, where he begins by dealing with Scripture, then moves on to the Ignatian epistles, then Irenaeus, Tertullian, and so on through the early church. We need to distinguish this approach to history from the far more opportunistic engagement with *exempla* that we have found earlier in the *CPB*. The entry under 'marriage', discussed briefly above, is more similar to the tracing of historical continuities (and discontinuities) which Milton engages with in the anti-Prelatical tracts.[59]

It is important, however, to distinguish Milton's historical methodologies from the Smectymnuans, even if he was broadly supportive at this stage of their conclusions. Milton's is a heavily primary source based account of history. We have seen that the Smectymnuans made little use of the writings of Ignatius and relied heavily on the later Latin fathers. But Milton's works are steeped in primary source documents, including some of the Greek Apostolic Fathers. He dismisses Theodoret, for instance, as an inadequate witness to the early antiquity of the church because he is one of the 'authorities of later times, and

---

[58] James Ussher's desire to maintain flexibility within ecclesiastical polemics is emphasized in Ford, *James Ussher*, 241.
[59] I doubt the *CPB* was a targeted preparation for writing to the early tracts, despite the overlap in the materials cited.

therefore not to be receiv'd for their Antiquities sake to give in evidence' (634). But Milton also goes much further than the Smectymnuans in critiquing those primary source documents. It has been pointed out since the nineteenth century that Milton used Nicholas Vedelius' textual commentary on Ignatius to fuel his own polemic against the mangled and interpolated textual state of that Apostolic father. However, his critique of the early church is much broader than this. He argues that the councils, too, were subject to interpolation around the year 1000AD.[60] This is a point he makes in both *Of Prelatical* and in *Animadversions* with slightly different emphases.[61] But as well as arguing that the ancient church is irrecoverable because of textual corruption, he more radically counters the prevailing nostalgia for the early church which can be found across early modern denominations. Milton argues that corruption had set into the early church, even in Apostolic times. In *Of Reformation*, for instance, he points out that: '*Ignatius* in his early dayes testifies to the Churches of *Asia*, that even then Heresies were sprung up' (*CPW*, 549). This is to go much further than the Smectymnuans, who preferred instead to make the crucially different argument that past practice wasn't a necessary guide to present church policy, especially if that practice can't be shown to be *de iure Apostolica*. For Milton, the established church is nearly constantly corrupt. This might be one of the reasons he pays far more attention to pre-Reformation heretics than the other Smectymnuans. He emphasizes throughout the anti-prelatical tracts that Wicklif was a forebear of the sixteenth century reformers: God 'knockt once and twice and came againe, opening our

[60] The best book-length survey of the European editing of the Councils is Henri Quentin, *Jean-Dominique Mansi et les grandes collections conciliaires* (Paris, 1900). A new study of this topic would be of enormous value.
[61] See *CPW*, 629, 684-5.

drousie eye-lids leasurely by that glimmering light which *Wicklef*, and his followers dispers't' (*CPW*, 704). Martyrs such as Wicklif, but also the Hussites or the Waldinensians, constitute the only visible remnant of the true church of God. This revaluation of Protestant martyrs as witnesses to the continuity of the visible church throughout the centuries is continuous with the thinking of figures such as Foxe and George Abbot.[62] But Milton is unusual in not combining that sense of the continuity of the invisible church with any sense that the visible church preserved itself from corruption, even in Apostolic times.[63] His historical critique is far more radical, reckless even, than that of the Smectymnuans, because it threatens to eliminate the entirety of church history as a worthwhile body of precedent for modern doctrine.

From 'The Postscript' to the anti-Prelatical tracts, through *Of Reformation*, and to *Of Prelatical*, Milton is moving backwards in time. He begins the controversy in post-Augustinian British history, after the Archbishopric of Canterbury has been established. His aim is to show, not that episcopacy was not historically practiced (of course it was), but that it inevitably led to conflict with the monarchy. The institution of episcopacy could be shown to be, historically, a corrupting force within the state. In *Of Reformation*, Milton is keen to show something of the same thing: episcopacy has been a hindrance to the progress of the Reformation, and this can be demonstrated historically from the

---

[62] George Abbot, *A Treatise of the Perpetuall Visbilitie and Succession of the True Church in All Ages* (London, 1624). On this see Anthony Milton, *Catholic and Reformed: The Romand and Protestant Churches in English Protestant Thought, 1600-1640* (Cambridge: CUP, 1995), ch.6 and the excellent essay, Euan Cameron, 'Medieval Heretics as Protestant Martyrs', in D. Wood, ed., *Martyrs and Martyrologies* (Oxford, 1993; Studies in Church History 30), 185-207.
[63] Compare George Abbott, *A Treatise of the Perpetuall Visibilitie and Succession of the True Church in all Ages* (London, 1624).

more recent sixteenth-century past.[64] But it is at this point Milton already begins to render such historical arguments irrelevant. In launching such a wholesale, thoroughgoing attack on the early church and its records, Milton placed himself on a trajectory which would lead to Biblical history being the only kind of history with any validity: either as ascertainable fact, or as divine authority for current practice. We see this process culminating in the very different kinds of arguments Milton uses to respond to Lancelot Andrewes in *The Reason of Church Government*. In that work, we also witness a corresponding diminishment of interest in engaging with primary historical sources. Although he cites Clement and the Shepherd of Hermas, he does so explicitly from a secondary source: he is arguing that the early church was already rent by schism, which 'wee finde in *Clements* Epistle of venerable authority written to the yet factious *Corinthians*, that they were still govern'd by Presbyters. And the same of other Churches out of *Hermas*, and divers other the scholers of the Apostles by the late industry of the learned *Salmatius* appeares'.[65] The kind of sustained engagement with the historical accretion of every kind of corruption (textual, spiritual) is abandoned. The historical arguments found in 'The Postscript' would no longer be relevant to ecclesiastical or theological debate for Milton, although he would continue to use such arguments in the political tracts, such as *The Tenure of Kings and Magistrates*.

Conclusion: The Turn Away from a British Epic

---

[64] See *CPW*, 528ff.
[65] *De Episcopis et Presbyteris, contra D. Petavium Loiolitam Dissertatio Prima* (Leiden, 1641), 250-53. A full study of Milton's reading of Salmasius would be desirable.

Let us return, by way of conclusion, to the second speculative question with which I began this essay. Why did Milton abandon his Arthur epic? This survey of Milton's developing historical methodologies may have offered some ways of approaching this question. I showed at the outset that Arthur was bound-up with beliefs about the early British church, the pre-Augustinian church which was believed to have been founded in Apostolic times. By the time the anti-prelatical tracts were being written, such an Arthurian epic might start to look rather unattractive. First of all, it was fairly clear that the early British church was an episcopal church.[66] In fact, Hall issues a challenge on precisely this point in his *Defence of the Humble Remonstrance*: 'I challenge you before that awfull Bar, to which you have appealed, name but one yeare ever since Christianity had footing in England, (which was under the British or Roman Government) wherein there were no Bishops in this Land; If you can name neither yeare nor Author, be ashamed to say this truth hath had any contradiction, or else I hope the Readers will be ashamed of you.' (40). This is a challenge Milton never answers, partly because his developing historical methodologies were rendering it irrelevant: the ancient British church couldn't be any authority for the present church government. But of course, if this sort of argument were being rendered irrelevant, then an epic which would partly revolve around defending this sort of national church would also be increasingly irrelevant. When polemic was waged against Catholics, the ancient British church was a helpful answer to the perennial 'where was your Church before Luther?' question. But in polemic between episcopacy and presbytery, the

[66] Spelman gives evidence that British bishops attended the council of Arles (which he dates to 314AD) in *Concilia, Decreta, Leges, Constitutiones, in Re Ecclesiarum Orbis Britannici* (London, 1639), 39-43.

ancient British church was far more useful for the Bishops than it was for Milton and the Smectymnuans. And not only irrelevant, but actively undesirable to defend, if that church was likely to be episcopal - and possibly, according to Milton's emphasis on the almost immediate spread of heresy after Christ's lifetime, likely to be schismatic too. Speed's *History of Great Britaine* (a work cited many times in the *CPB*) specifically praises Arthur as a great founder of the abbey of Glastonbury: 'Also in the same Charter amongst many other Kings, there is mention made of King Arthur, to be a great Benefactor vnto that Abbey [of Glastonbury]; whose Armes vpon the stone walles, both in the Chapell (called S. Ioseph) and in diuers other places of the Abbey, are cut: which is an Eschucheon, whereon a Crosse with the Virgin Mary in the first quarter is set, and is yet to this day remaining ouer the Gate of entrance, and is held to be also the Armes of that Abbey'.[67] So the sort of historical reading Milton was undertaking in the late 1630s and 1640s would have revealed a doctrinally suspect Arthur, the defender of an ancient British church that might well not have been worth defending.

Finally, there is Milton's gathering scepticism about historical sources. It seems very unlikely to me that he initially accepted the Arthur legend as historical fact, and then was persuaded of its untruth. By the 1630s a century of English antiquarianism had already done massive damage to the credibility of the Arthur story. But there is, perhaps, another religious dimension here. It is easy to laugh at Renaissance beliefs that Joseph of Arimathea or St Paul founded Christianity in Britain in Apostolic times. But these stories were responding, after a fashion, to the authority of the Fathers. Both Origen and Tertullian had

[67] John Speed, *The History of Great Britaine* (London, 1611), 207.

stated there were Christians in Britain in their own times, and even earlier. This put Christians in Britain at least around the year 100. These two Fathers were constantly cited in any treatment of the British church: Archbishop Matthew Parker's *De Antiquitate Britannicae Ecclesiae*, which we encountered at the start of this essay, cites both of them on its first page.[68] Parker goes on to use these Fathers as evidence that the church in Britain 'primum per Apostolos propagato...non a Romana sede' (Ai^{r}). As I have been trying to show throughout this article, the history of the early church is not siphoned off from other national histories. Any attack on the authority of the Fathers threatened to undermine faith in the ancient British church altogether. Milton's reading in civil and ecclesiastical history was unlikely to have had much of an effect on his views on the historicity of Arthur, but it was likely to have subjected the religious society of which he was the leader to a vigorous and withering critique.

[68] Matthew Parker, *De Antiquitate Britannicae Ecclesiae* (London, 1572), 1. For modern editions of Tertullian and Origen's references to Britain see: Tertullian, *Aduersos Iudaeos*, 7.4. in *Corpus Christianorum. Series Latina* (Turnhout, 1953-), 1354; Origen, *Homilia IV in Ezechielem*, 1 in *Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Graeca* (Paris, 1857-1912), 698.

Epilogue

This thesis has ranged widely over the intellectual history and literature of early-modern England. By doing so, I hope it has achieved certain things. One is to recapture something of the unity of early-modern culture: a culture where Anglo-Saxon philology was the natural partner of Arabic studies, where the most well-regarded poet of the period could be called upon to become a civic historian, and where erudite and poetic writing went hand-in-hand. Even the most wide-ranging intellectual historians are often ultimately working within the many praxes of that broad discipline. This thesis has tried to show some ways in which erudition interpenetrated with other aspects of British cultural life -- even to those, like many of the audiences at Middleton's plays, say -- who were not brilliant *érudits* themselves. This brings me to my first (of three) suggestions for further research with which this thesis will briefly conclude. Historians of science are used to thinking about the passages from a broadly-conceived humanistic culture in the early-modern period to an atomized and disciplined culture in the nineteenth century. But this is very much the story of which this thesis is a small fragment, too. This thesis presents several possibilities for broad thrusts of research into this subject area. One would be a history of the learned poem. Although the poet-scholar is by no means an exclusively early-modern phenomenon. Eighteenth-century poets like Thomas Gray were taking their cue from contemporary developments in

antiquarianism.[1] Although not quite erudition, Wordsworth's assimilation of German philosophy to create a 'philosophic song' in the early nineteenth-century might also be situated along this trajectory.[2] And contemporary British late modernism has thrown up a poet of real magnitude in the form of J.H. Prynne, whose poetry not only borrows the language of many diverse disciplines, but also the methodologies and practices of intellectual exclusion which structure those disciplines.[3] Poetry here implicitly offers a purchase on disciplinary fragmentation which would be inaccessible to conventional intellectual history.

The rise of scholarly history is part of a broader story about the rise of modernity: of history's instantiation within the university, the turning of history into a discipline, and the codification of the kinds of loosely conceived methodologies we have been tracing into research methodologies which can be taught and passed on to graduate students through seminars.[4] This is also, necessarily, a story about the separation of history from other disciplines. Although I have tried to play down the necessary connection between chorography and antiquarianism, there is a large narrative to be told of the rise of academic geography as a subject. As Lesley Cormack has shown, it mathematical geography was already beginning to separate in this period from what we might now think of as human geography -- chorographic and descriptive approaches to human settlement and behaviour patterns across

---

[1] Philip Connell, 'British Identities and the Politics of Ancient Poetry in Later Eighteenth-Century England'. *The Historical Journal* 49 (2006): 161-92.
[2] Simon Jarvis, *Wordsworth's Philosophic Song* (Cambridge: CUP, 2007).
[3] Thomas Roebuck and Matthew Sperling, '"The Glacial Question, Unsolved": A Specimen of Commentary on lines 1-31', *Glossator* 2 (2010): 39-78.
[4] William Clark, *Academic Charisma and the Origins of the Research University* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006). See the review by Kristine Louise Haugen, 'Academic Charisma and the Old Regime', *History of the Universities* 22:1 (2007): 199-228.

time.[5] As I quickly realized at the start of this project, the story of the rise of antiquarian scholarship has been told many, many times. But the specific relationship between antiquarianism and geography, and the rise of academic geography as a separate subject area, awaits a full study. This seems another possible avenue of research into the questions this thesis raises about the comparative unity of early-modern culture, and what exactly the reasons and the mechanisms for the fragmentation of that culture were.

The second broad conclusion was described at the outset of the thesis: modern fixation, especially by literary critics, on discovering a back-dated nationalism in the early modern period has increasingly begun to obscure more than it reveals. Instead, the thesis has tried to show that we need to see scholarship both within the transnational world of Latin philology and within regionally devolved research networks which are perhaps not entirely imaginable in a modern university-based research culture. We also need to see the literature of the period within these complex regional networks -- for different reasons and in different ways, drama and poetry are shaped by regional affiliations and complexities, and in turn give shape to them. But this implies what seems to me a very significant research question. How does the opposite view come about? How does nationalism come to be back-projected onto the scholars and literary writers of the early-modern period? How are sentiments of patriotism transformed by the culture of the eighteenth century into avatars of

[5] Cormack, Lesley B., '"Good Fences Make Good Neighbors": Geography as Self-Definition in Early Modern England'. *Isis* 82 (1991): 639-661.

nationalism?[6] So the story told in this thesis could equally well be a story about eighteenth-century antiquarianism: how does eighteenth-century antiquarianism read and revaluate the work of the seventeenth-century? How does it politicize it? For all the vast literature on eighteenth-century antiquarianism, the question of the relationship between that later generation of antiquaries and those who came before them has yet to be brought into precise focus.

Finally, for all this thesis has tried to demonstrate the potential benefits of thinking about a ramifying intellectual within an insular context, we need a history of scholarship which is capable of genuinely comparative work. Are the kinds of methodologies and dynamics of historical research described in this thesis entirely conceivable in France or Italy in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries? In other words, what this thesis suggests would be ideal is to approach the history of scholarship in several countries through the kind of insular lens used in this thesis. In particular, it would be superb to explore differing European attitudes to antiquarians' use and organisation of documents. Does the dynamic between the local and national archive begin to emerge in all European countries simultaneously? It would furthermore be ideal to investigate the impact of religion on these questions. It is tempting to conclude that English Protestantism -- with its emphasis on the survival of the true church, even within small, geographically marginal groups -- has a particular tendency to value the sort of localism this thesis describes. Those sort of questions would be more easily answered through comparative work on Catholic erudition -- which

---

[6] In this area, of course, Linda Colley, *Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707-1837* (New Haven: Yale UP, 1992) has pointed the way, but her work does not treat historiography with the nuance of a historian of scholarship.

has been so much less thoroughly mapped than the world of Protestant scholarship.[7] These are simply three areas which help to highlight simultaneously the conclusions of this thesis, and also its provisionality, and the need for further work to probe the manifold relationships between literature and scholarship in early-modern Europe and beyond.

[7] The best introduction to Catholic erudition remains Bruno Neveu, *Érudition et religion aux XVIIe et XVIIIe siècles* (Paris: Albin Michel, 1994).

Works Cited

Unpublished Manuscripts

British Library:
Add. MS 6046
Add. MS.14047
Add. MS. 18040
Add. MS 25384.
Add. MS. 25707
Add. MS 28330
Add. MS 34599
Add. MS 34600
Add. MS 34601
Add. MS 36294
Add. MS 74948
Burney MS 363
Cotton MS Julius C.III
Cotton Julius C.VI
Cotton Julius C. F.VI
Cotton Nero D.X
Cotton Vespasian D.XVII
Cotton MS Titus F.VII-VIII
Cotton Titus F.x
Cotton MS Cleopatra A.IV
Cotton MS Faustina A.V
Cotton Faustina E.V
Egerton 3806
Harley 374
Harley 1328
Harley 3873
Harley 7001

Bodleian Library, Oxford:
Add.C.296
Ashmole 799.ii
Ashmole 849
Baroccianus 182
Bodl. 241
Bodl.470
Dodsworth 117, 124, 127, 135
Douce 280
Dugdale 48
Eng. Lett. b 1
Gough Berks. 12
Gough Ireland 2
Langbaine 14
Rawl.D.1083
Rawl. Letters 89
Rawl. Poetry 31

(Selden mss):
Arch. Selden B.4
Arch. Selden B.6
Arch. Seld. B.8
Arch. Selden B.8 B
Selden Supra 63
Selden Supra 64
Selden Supra 79
Selden Supra 109
Selden Supra 111
Selden Supra 121
Selden Supra 123
Selden Supra 124
Smith 1
Smith 21
Smith 74
Smith 84
Top. gen. e.29
Top.Kent.e.6

Oxford College Libraries:
Queen's MS 280
Christ Church MS 184

Westminster Abbey Library:
WAM 9622
WAM 9827

Primary

Abbot, George. *A Treatise of the Perpetuall Visbilitie and Succession of the True Church in All Ages.* London, 1624.

Aleman, Mateo. *The Rogue, or The life of Guzman de Alfarache*. Trans. James Mabbe. London, 1622.

Antonine Itinerary. *Pomponius Mela. Iulius Solinus. Itinerarium Antonini Aug. Vibius Sequester. P. Victor de regionibus urbis Romæ. Dionysius Afer De situ orbis Prisciano interprete.* Venice, 1518.

Francis Bacon. *The Works of Sir Francis Bacon*. Ed. James Spedding et al. 14 vols. London: Longman, 1861-1879.

Bale, John. *Illustrium maioris Britanniae scriptorum Summarium*. London, 1548.

Basil of Caeserea. *Opera omnia*. Ed. Fronton du Duc. Paris, 1618; 2 vols.

Bede. *Historical Works.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP, 1930.

Beaumont, John. *Bosworth-Field, with a taste of the variety of other poems, left by Sir Iohn Beaumont, Baronet, deceased*. London, 1629.

---, *The Shorter Poems of Sir John Beaumont: A Critical Edition with an Introduction and Commentary*. Ed. Roger D. Sell. Abo: Abo Akademi, 1974.

Bergier, Nicolas. *Histoire des grands chemins de l'Empire Romain.* Paris, 1622.

Robert Bowyer. *The Parliamentary Diary of Robert Bowyer, 1606-1607.* Ed. David Harris Willson. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1931.
Braithwaite, Richard. *A Strappado for the Diuell. Epigrams and Satyres alluding to the time, with diuers measures of no lesse Delight*. London, 1615.
Breton, Nicholas. *The Melancholike Humours*. London, 1600.
Brome, Richard. *The Northern Lasse*. London, 1632.
Brooke, Christopher. *The Ghost of Richard the Third*. London, 1614.
Brooke, Ralph. *A Discouerie of diuers errors published in print in the much commended Britannia.* n.p., 1594.
Browne, William *Britannias Pastorals*. *The second booke*. London, 1616.
---, *The Poems*. George Goodwin. 2 vols. London: George Routledge & Sons; New York: Dutton, 1894.
---, *The Shepheards Pipe*. London, 1614.
Butcher, Richard. *The Survey and Antiquitie of the Towne of Stamford in the County of Lincoln*. London, 1646.
Calendar of state papers, domestic series, of the reigns of Edward VI, Mary, Elizabeth, 1547-1580: preserved in the State Paper Department of Her Majesty's Public Record Office. 7 vols. London: Longman, 1856-1871.
Camden, William ed. *Anglica, Normannica, Hibernica, Cambrica, a Veteribus Scripta.* Frankfurt, 1603.
---, *Britain.* trans. Philemon Holland. London, 1609.
---, *Britannia.* London, 1607.
Caradoc of Llancarvan, *Historie of Cambria, now Called Wales*, tr. Humphrey Llwyd, corr. and cont. by David Powel. London, 1584.
Chapman, George. *Georgicks of Hesiod*. London, 1616.
Chester, Robert. *Love's Martyr*. London, 1601.
Commelin, Jerome. *Rerum Britannicarum.* Heidelberg, 1587.
Coryat, Thomas. *Coryats Crudities*. London, 1611.
Cosin, John. *The Correspondence of John Cosin.* Ed. George Ornsby. Durham, Publications of the Surtees Society, 1869-1872, vols.52 and 55.
Daniel, Samuel. *A Panegyrike Congratvlatorie Delivered To The Kings Most Excellent Maiestie at Bvrleigh Harrington*. London, 1603.
Dio. *Dio's Roman History*. Ed. and trans. E. Cary. 8 vols. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP, 1914-1927.
Doddridge, John. *The History of the Antient and moderne Estate of The Principality of Wales, Dutchy of Cornewall, and Earldome of Chester*. London, 1630.
Donne, John. *The Sermons of John Donne*. Eds. Evelyn M. Simpson and George Potter. 10 vols. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1954.
Downe, John. 'Not the Consent of Fathers but Scripture the Ground of Faith'. *A Treatise of the True Nature and Definition of Justifying Faith.* Oxford, 1635.
Drayton, Michael. *The Battaile of Agincovrt*. London, 1627.
---, *Poems by Michael Drayton Esquyer*. London, 1619.
---, *Poly-Olbion*. London, 1612.
---, *The Works*. Ed. J. Hebel. 5 vols. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1941.
Du Bartas, Guillaume De Saluste Sieur. *The Divine Weeks and Works Translated by Josuah Sylvester*. Ed. Susan Snyder. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979.
Duchesne, André, ed. *Historiae Normanorum Scriptores Antiqui*. Paris, 1619.
Dugdale, William. *The History of St Paul's Cathedral*. London, 1658.
Duppa, Bryan, ed. *Jonsonus Virbius, or the Memorie of Ben: Johnson Revived By the Friends of the Muses*. London, 1638.
Edmondes, Clement. *Observations vpon Caesars Comentaries*. London, 1609.

Edwards, Richard. *The works of Richard Edwards: Politics, Poetry and Performance in Sixteenth-Century England*. Ed. Ros King. Manchester: Manchester UP, 2001.
Erizzo, Sebastiano. *Discorso sopra le medaglie antiche.* Venice, 1571.
Fabyan, Robert. *The Chronicle of Fabian*. London, 1559.
Ferrabosco, Alfonso. *Ayres*. London, 1609.
Filmer, Edward. *French Court-Aires, with their Ditties Englished*. London, 1629.
Fletcher, John. *The Dramatic Works of the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon*. Ed. Fredson Bowers et al. 11 vols. Cambridge: CUP, 1966-1996.
---, *The Faithfull Shepherdess*. London, 1609?.
Heinsius, Daniel. *Danielis Heinsii Sacrarum Exercitationum ad Novum Testamentum* (Leiden, 1639)
---, *Danielis Heinsii Poemata Auctiora. Editore Nicolao Heinsio, Dan. Fil*. (Leiden, 1640).
Holland, Hugh. *Pancharis*. London, 1603.
Horace. *Satires, Epistles and Ars Poetica*. Ed. and trans. H. Rushton Fairclough. 1923. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1978.
The Husband. London, 1614.
Galloway, David, ed. *Norwich, 1540-1642.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1984.
---, ed. *Records of Early English Drama: Norwich, 1540-1642*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1984, pp.180-3.
Gibson, James M., ed. *Records of Early English Drama: Kent: Diocese of Canterbury*. 3 vols. Toronto and London: University of Toronto Press, 2002.
Gil, Alexander. *Alexander Gil's Logonomia Anglica (1619).* Eds. and Trans. B. Danielsson and A. Gabrielson. Stockholm: Almquist & Wiksell, 1972.
Goltzius, Hubert. *C. Iulius Caesar Sive Historiae Imperatorum Caesarumque Romanorum Ex Antiquis Numismatibus Restitutate Liber Primus.* Bruges, 1563.
Greene, Robert. *The Life and Complete Works of Robert Greene*. Ed. A.B. Grosart. London: Huth Library, 1881-6.
---, *The Plays and Poems of Robert Greene*. Ed. J. Churton Collins. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1905.
Gruter, Janus, ed. *Inscriptiones antiquae totius orbis Romani.* Heidelberg, 1603.
Haddan, Arthur West and Stubbs, William, eds. *Councils and ecclesiastical documents relating to Great Britain and Ireland.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1869-1878.
Hall, Joseph. *Defence of the Humble Remonstrance.* (London, 1641)
Hammond, Henry. *A Letter of Resolution to Six Quaeres of Present Use in the Church of England.* London, 1653.
Harry, George Owen. *The Genealogy of the High and Mighty Monarch, James, by the grace of God, King of great Brittayne, &c. with his lineal descent from Noah, by diuers direct lines to Brutus, first Inhabiter of this Ile of Brittayne; and from him to Cadwalader, the last King of the British blood; and from thence, sundry wayes to his Maiesty: wherein is playnly shewed his rightfull Title, by lawfull descent from the said Cadwalader, as well to the Kingdome of Brittayne, as to the Principalities of Northwales and Southwales*. London, 1604.
Holinshed, Raphael. et al. *The Historie of Scotland, conteyning the beginning, increase, proceedings, continuance, Actes and Gouernmente of the Scottish nation*. London, 1577.
Hooker, John. *A Pamphlet of the Offices, and duties of euerie particular sworne Officer, of the Citie of Excester*. London, 1584.
Hotman, François and Jean Hotman. *Francisci et Joannis Hotomanorum ... et clarorum virorum ad eos epistolæ. Quibus accedit, epistolarum miscellanearum appendix. Ex bibl. J.G. Meelii.* Ed. Jan Willem van Meel Amsterdam, 1700.
James, Thomas. *Ecloga Oxonio-Cantabrigiensis.* London, 1600.
Jonson, Ben. *The Complete Masques*. Ed. Stephen Orgel. New Haven and London: Yale

UP, 1969.
---, *Poems*. Ed. Ian Donaldson. London: Oxford UP, 1975.
---, *Works*. Ed. C.H. Herford, Percy Simpson, and Evelyn Simpson. 11 vols. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1985.
Justel, Christophe, ed. *Codex Canonum Ecclesiae Africanae. Chrstiophorus Ivsetllus ex MSS. codicibus edidit, Graecam versionem adiunxit, & notis illustrauit.* Paris, 1615.
Klausner, David N., ed. *Records of Early English Drama: Wales*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press Incorporated, 2005.
---, ed., *Wales.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press Incorporated, 2005.
Krumbacher, Karl. *Geschichte der Byzantinischen Litteratur von Justinian bis zum Ende des Oströmischen Reiches.* Munich, 1897.
William Laud. 'An Historical Account of All Material Transactions Relating to the University of Oxford From Arch-Bishop's Laud's Being Elected Chancellor to the Resignation of that Office'. Eds. W. Scott and J. Bliss. *The Works of the Right Reverend Father in God William Laud.* Oxford, 1847-60; 7 vols.
Leland, John. *Cygnea Cantio.* London, 1545.
---, *De Viris Illustribus.* Ed. James Carley. Toronto, 2010.
Librorum Manuscriptorum in Bibiliotheca Jacobi Waraei Equitis Avr. Catalogus. Dublin, 1658.
Lipsius, Justus. *De Admiranda Magnitudine Romana.* Antwerp, 1598.
Lhuyd, Humphrey. *The Breuiary of Britayne*. Trans. Thomas Twyne. London, 1573.
Ortelius, Abraham, *Abrahami Ortelii (geographi Antverpiensis) et virorum eruditorum ad eundem et ad Jacobum Colium Ortelianum...epistulae*. Ed. J.H. Hessels. Cambridge, 1887; Osnabrück: Zeller, 1969.
Martianus Capella. *Martiani Minei Capellæ ... de nuptiis Philologiæ, & septem artibus liberalibus libri novem optime castigati.* Leiden, 1539.
May, Thomas. *Pharsalia*. London, 1627.
---, *The Victorious reign of Edward the third*. London, 1634.
Melanchthon, Philip. *Chronicon Carionis.* Wittenberg, 1580.
Meibomius, Marcus. *Antiquae Musicae Auctores Septem. Graece et Latine.* Amsterdam, 1652.
Merula, Paulus. *Paulli...Merulae Cosmographiae generalis libri tres.* Leiden, 1605.
Middleton, Thomas. *Thomas Middleton: The Collected Works.* Eds. Gary Taylor, John Lavagnino, et al. Oxford: OUP, 2007.
---, *The Mayor of Quinborough*. London, 1661.
---, *Hengist, King of Kent : or, The mayor of Queenborough*. Ed. R.C. Bald. London: For the trustees of Amherst College, C. Scribner's Sons, 1938.
Milton, John. *John Milton: Complete Shorter Poems.* Ed. Stella P. Revard. Oxford: Blackwell, 2009.
---, *The Complete Prose Works of John Milton.* Ed. Don M. Wolfe, et al. 8 vols. New Haven: Yale UP, 1953-1982.
Miraeus, Aubertus. *Chronicon Cisterciensis Ordinis.* Cologne, 1614.
Montague, Richard. *Diatribae vpon the first part of the Late History of Tithes.* London, 1621.
de Morales, Ambrosio. *Las antiguedades de las ciudades de España.* Alcala, 1575.
Munday, Anthony. *Londons loue, to the Royal Prince Henrie meeting him on the riuer of Thames, at his returne from Richmonde, with a worthie fleete of her cittizens, on Thursday the last of May, 1610*. London, 1610.
Occo, Adolphus. *Imperatorum Romanorum Numismata a Pompeio Magno ad Heraclium.* Augsburg, 1601.
Owen of Henllys, George. *The Description of Pembrokeshire.* ed. Dillwyn Miles. Dyfed: Gomer Press, 1994.
Parker, Matthew. *De Antiquitate Britannicae Ecclesiae.* London, 1572.
Peiresc, Nicolas Fabri de. *Lettres de Peiresc à Divers*. Ed. Philippe Tamizey de Larroque. Paris,

1898.
Powel, Daniel. *The Love of Wales to their soueraigne Prince, Expressed in a true Relation of the solemnity held at Ludlow in the Countie of Salop, vpon the fourth of Nouember last past. Anno Domini. 1616*. London, 1616.
R.A. *The Valiant Welshman*. London, 1615.
Ralegh, Walter. *The History of the World*. 1614.
Reynolds, John. *Vox Coeli*. London, 1624.
Roe, Thomas. *Negotiations.* London, 1740.
Rutter, Joseph. *The Shepherds Holy-day*. London, 1635.
Rosweydus, Herbertus. *Lex talionis xii tabularum cardinali Baronio ab I. Casaubono dicta, retaliante H. Ros-weydo.* Antwerp, 1614.
Rud, Thomas. *Disquisitio de vero auctore hujus 'Historiae Dunelmensis ecclesiae', Symeonis monachi Dunhelmensis libellus* ed. Thomas Bedford. London, 1732.
Sackville, Thomas. *The Mirror for Magistrates*. Ed. Lily B. Campbell. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1938.
Salusbury, John. *Poems by Sir John Salusbury and Robert Chester*. Ed. Carelton Brown. Bryn Mawr, Pennsylvania: Bryn Mawr College, 1913.
Saumaise, Claude. *De Episcopus et Presbyteris, contra D. Petavium Loiolitam Dissertatio Prima.* Leiden, 1641.
Savile, Henry, ed. *Rerum Anglicarum Scriptores.* London, 1596.
Scaliger, Joseph. *Illustriss. Viri Iosephi Scaligeri Iulii Caes. A Burden F. Epistolae omnes quae reperiri potuerunt, nunc primum collectae ac editae.* Leiden: Elzevir, 1627.
Schottus, Andreas, ed. *Itinerarium Antonini Augusti, et Burdigalense, quorum hoc nunc primum est ed., illud ad diuersos codice emendatum, & H. Suritæ comm. Explicatum.* Cologne, 1600.
Selden, John. *De Diis Syris.* London, 1617.
---, *De Iure Naturali et Gentium.* London, 1640.
---, 'De Scriptoribus hisce nun primum editis' in Roger Twysden, ed. *Historiae Anglicanae Scriptores X.* London, 1652. VI-XX.
---, ed. *Eutychii Aegyptii, Patriarchae Orthodoxorum Alexandrini.* London, 1642.
---, *Marmora Arundelliana.* London, 1628.
---, *Titles of Honor.* London, 1614.
---, *Titles of Honor.* London, 1631.
---, *Uxor Ebraica.* London, 1646.
Shakespeare, William. *Mr William Shakespeares comedies, histories & tragedies*. London, 1623.
Smith, Thomas, ed. *Camdeni et Illustrium Virorum Epistolae.* London, 1691.
Spanheim, Ezechiel. *Dissertatio de Praestantia et Usu Numismatum Antiquorum.* Rome, 1664.
Speed, John. *The History of Great Britaine.* London, 1611.
---, *Theatre of the Empire of Great Britaine.* London, 1611.
Spelman, Henry *Concilia, Decreta, Leges, Constitutiones, in Re Ecclesiarum Orbis Britannici.* London, 1639.
---, *The History and Fate of Sacrilege.* London, 1698
Spenser, Edmund. *A View of the State of Ireland*. in *The Historie of Ireland.* Ed. James Ware. Dublin, 1633
Stafford, Anthony. *The Femall Glory*. London, 1635.
Stephens, John. *Cinthias Reuenge*. London, 1613.
---, *Essayes and characters, ironicall and instructiue. The second impression. With a new satyre in defence of common law and lawyers: mixt with reproofe against their common enemy. With many new characters & divers other things added; & euery thing ammended. By Iohn Stephens the younger, of Lincolnes Inn, Gent.* London, 1615.

Tacitus. *The Annales of Cornelius Tacitus. The description of Germanie*. Trans. Richard Greneway. London, 1598.
Thornborough, John. *The Ioifull and blessed reuniting of the two mighty & famous kindomes, England & Scotland*. London, 1604.
The Troublesome Raigne of Iohn King of England. London, 1591.
Trussell, John. *A continuation of the collection of the history of England, beginning where Samuel Daniell esquire ended, with the raigne of Edward the Third, and ending where the honourable Vicount Saint Albones began, with the life of Henry the Seventh, being a compleat history of the beginning and end of the dissention betwixt the two houses of Yorke and Lancaster*. London, 1636.
Twyne, John. *De Rebus Albionicis.* London, 1590.
Ussher, James. *Britannicarum Ecclesiarum Antiquitates.* Dublin, 1639.
---, *The Reduction of Episcopacy Unto the Form of Synodical Government Received in the Ancient Church.* London, 1656.
Verstegan, Richard*. A Restitution of Decayed Intelligence in Antiquities*. Antwerp, 1605.
Vulcanius, Bonaventura, ed. *Gothicarum et Langobardicarum rerum scriptores aliquot veteres.* Leiden, 1618.
W., R. *Mount Tabor*. London, 1639.
Ware, James, ed., *The Historie of Ireland Collected by Three Learned Authors.* Dublin, 1633.
---, *Jacobi Waraei Equitis Aurati De Hibernia & Antiquitatibus ejus Disquisitiones. Editio Secunda.* London, 1628.
Walbancke, Matthew, ed. *Annalia Dubrensia*. London, 1636.
Webb, John. *The Most Notable Antiquity of Great Britain, vulgarly called Stone-Heng on Salisbury Plain*. London, 1655.
Wheare, Degory, ed. *Camdeni Insignia.* Oxford, 1624.
---, *De Ratione et Methodo Legendi Historias Dissertatio.* Oxford, 1625.
---, *De Ratione et Methodo Legendi utrasque Historias, Civiles et Eccelsiasticas.* Oxford, 1637.
---, *The Method and Order of Reading Both Civil and Ecclesiastical Histories.* London, 1685.
Wickham, Glynne, Herbert Berry and William Ingram, eds. *English Professional Theatre, 1530-1660*. Cambridge: CUP, 2000.
Wilson, Robert. *The Three Lords and Three Ladies of London.* London, 1590.
Wither, George. *The Shepheards Hunting. being, certaine eglogs written during the time of the authors imprisonment in the Marshalsey*. London, 1615.
---, *The Hymnes and Songs of the Church*. London, 1623.
William of Malmesbury. *Chronicles of the Kings of England*. Ed. J.A. Giles. London, 1847.
Wilson, Robert. *The Three Lords and Three Ladies of London*. London, 1590.
Wood, Anthony. *Athenae Oxonienses: An Exact History of all the Writers and Bishops Who have had their Education in the most ancient and famous Vniuersity of Oxford.* Oxford, 1691-92; 2 vols.
Young, Patrick. *Patricius Junius (Patrick Young) Bibliothekar der Könige Jacob I und Carl I von England. Mitteilungen aus seinem Briefwechsel*. Ed. J. Kemke. Leipzig, 1898.
Young, Thomas. *Dies Dominica.* London, 1639.
---, *Dies Dominica, or The Lords Day.* trans. Richard Baxter. Oxford, 1672.

Secondary

Aarsleff, Hans. 'The Study and Use of Etymology in Leibniz'. *From Locke to Saussure: Essays on the Study of Language and Intellectual History.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1982.
Adams, Eleanor N. *Old English Scholarship in England from 1566-1800.* New Haven: Yale, 1917.
Adams, Simon. '"Because I am of that countrye & mynde to plant myself there": Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, and the West Midlands'. *Leicester and the Court: Essays on Elizabethan Politics.* Manchester: Manchester UP, 2002. Ch.14.
Adamson, J.S.A. 'Chivalry and Political Culture in Caroline England'. *Culture and Politics in Early Stuart England*. Eds. Kevin Sharpe and Peter Lake. Houndmills: The Macmillan Press, 1994. Pp.161-197.
Adrian, John M. 'Tudor Centralization and Gentry Visions of Local Order in Lambarde's *Perambulation of Kent*'. *English Literary Renaissance* (2006): 307-334.
Aers, David, ed. *Culture and History 1350-1600: Essays on English Communities, Identities and Writing*. New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1992.
Allen, Don Cameron. *The Legend of Noah: Renaissance Rationalism in Art, Science and Letters.* Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1949.
Alpers, Svetlana. *The Art of Description: Dutch Art in the Seventeenth Century*. Chicago: Chicago UP, 1989.
Amussen, Susan D. and Mark A. Kishlansky. *Political Culture and Cultural Politics in Early Modern England*. Manchester and New York: Manchester UP, 1995.
Anders, Ian Gadd and Alexandra Gillespie. *John Stow (1525-1605) and the making of the English past: studies in Early Modern Culture and the History of the Book.* London: British Library, 2004.
Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism.* London: Verso, 1983.
Arblaster, Paul. *Antwerp & the World: Richard Verstegan and the International Culture of Catholic Reformation.* Leiden: Leuven University Press, 2004.
Archer, Ian. *The Pursuit of Stability: Social Relations in Elizabethan London.* Cambridge: CUP, 1991.
---, 'Discourses of History in Early Modern London', *Huntington Library Quarterly* 68 (2005): 205-226.
Archer, John Michael. *Citizen Shakespeare: Freemen and Aliens in the Language of the Plays*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.
Ardolino, Frank. 'Greene's Use of the History of Oxford in *The Honourable History of Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*'. *American Notes and Queries* 18 (2005): 20-25.
---, 'The Protestant Context of George Peele's "Pleasant Conceited" *Old Wives Tale*,' *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England* 18 (2005): 146-165.
Armitage, David, ed. *British Political Thought in Literature, History and Theory.* Cambridge: CUP, 2006.
Asch, Ronald G. and Adolf M. Birke, eds. *Princes, Patronage and the Nobility: The Court at the Beginning of the Modern Age c.1450-1650*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1991.
Ashe, Laura. *Fiction and History in England, 1066-1200.* Cambridge: CUP, 2007.
Astington, John H. 'Buckingham's Patronage and *The Gypsies Metamorphosed*'. *Theatre Survey* 43 (2002): 133-147.
---, 'Rereading Illustrations of the English Stage'. *Shakespeare Survey* 50 (1997): 151-170.
Aston, T.H., ed., *The History of the University of Oxford: Volume IV: The Seventeenth Century*. Ed. Nicholas Tyacke. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997.
Backus, Irena. *Historical Method and Confessional Identity in the Era of the Reformation (1378-1615).* Leiden: Brill, 2003.
---, *Lectures Humanistes de Basile de Césarée: traductions latines, 1439-1618.* Paris: Institut

d'études augustiniennes, 1990.
---, *Reformation Readings of the Apocalypse: Geneva, Zurich and Wittenberg.* Oxford: OUP, 2000.
---, ed. *The Reception of the Church Fathers in the West: From the Carolingians to the Maurists.* Leiden: Brill, 1997.
Baker, David J. 'Where is Ireland in The Tempest?'. *Shakespeare and Ireland: History, Politics, Culture.* Eds. Mark Thornton Burnett and Ramona Wray. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1997. Pp. 68-88.
Baker, John. 'The Third University of England'. *The Common Law Tradition: Lawyers, Books and the Law.* London and Rio Grande: The Hambledon Press, 2000.
Baldo, Jonathan. '"Into a thousand parts": Representing the Nation in Henry V'. *English Literary Renaissance* (2008): 55-82.
Barkan, Leonard. *Unearthing the Past: Archaeology and Aesthetics in The Making of Renaissance Culture.* New Haven & London: Yale UP, 1999.
Barnes, T.D. 'Two Senators under Constantine'. *The Journal of Roman Studies* 65 (1975): 40-49.
Barr, James. 'Why the World was Created in 4004 BC: Archbishop Ussher and Biblical Chronology'. *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library* 67:2 (1985): 575-608.
Barroll, Leeds. 'The Court of the First Stuart Queen'. *The Mental World of the Jacobean Court*. Ed. Linda Levy Peck. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1991. Pp.191-208.
Barrow, Julia and Wareham, Andrew, eds. *Myth, rulership, church and charters: essays in honour of Nicholas Brooks.* Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008.
Barry, Jonathan. 'Civility and Civic Culture in Early Modern England: the Meanings of Urban Freedom'. *Civil Histories: Essays Presented to Sir Keith Thomas*. Eds. Peter Burke, Brian Harrison, and Paul Slack. Oxford: OUP, 2000. Pp. 181-96.
Bartolucci, Guido. *La Reppublica Ebraica di Carlo Sigonio: Modelli politici dell'età moderna.* Bologna, 2007.
Barton, Anne. *Ben Jonson: Dramatist*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1984.
---, 'Harking Back to Elizabeth: Ben Jonson and Caroline Nostalgia'. *English Literary History* 48 (1981): 706-731.
Beal, Peter. *Index of English Literary Manuscripts*. 5 vols. London: Mansell, 1980.
---, 'Notions in Garrison: The Seventeenth-Century Commonplace Book'. *New Ways of Looking at Old Texts* Ed. W.S. Hill. Binghamton: Medieval & Renaissance Texts & Studies, 1993. Pp. 131-47.
Beddard, R.A. 'Thomas Allen and John Selden and the 1616 edition of Fortescue's De Laudibus Legum Angliae'. *Book Collector* 53 (2004): 533-541.
Bednarz, James. 'The Collaborator as Thief: Ralegh's (Re)Vision of *The Faerie Queene*'. *English Literary History* 63 (1996): 279-307.
Beer, Anna. *Sir Walter Ralegh and His Readers in the Seventeenth Century: Speaking to the People*. London: Macmillan, 1997.
Bentley, G.E. *The Jacobean and Caroline Stage: Dramatic Companies and Players*. 5 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1941.
Berg, Sara van den. 'Ben Jonson and the Ideology of Authorship'. *Ben Jonson's 1616 Folio*. Eds. Jennifer Brady and W.H. Herndeen. Newark: Delaware UP, 1991. Pp.111-137.
Berger, Thomas. 'Looking for Shakespeare in Caroline England'. *Viator* 27 (1996): 323-359.
Bergeron, David M. *Textual Patronage in English Drama, 1570-1640*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006.
Berkhout, Carl and Milton Gatch, eds. *Anglo-Saxon Scholarship: The First Three Centuries.* Boston, 1982.

Berkowitz, David S. *John Selden's Formative Years: Politics and Society in Early Seventeenth-Century England.* Washington: Folger Shakespeare Library, 1988.
Bernays, Jacob. *Joseph Justus Scaliger.* Berlin, 1855.
Berry, Elizabeth K. *Henry Ferrers see Henry Ferrers : an early Warwickshire antiquary, 1550-1633.* Oxford: Dugdale Society, 1965.
Berry, Herbert and James Stokes. 'Actors and Town Hall in the Sixteenth Century'. *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England* 6 (1993): 37-55.
---, 'The Bell Savage Inn and Playhouse in London'. *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England* 19 (2006): 121-143.
Best, R.I. Best, O'Brien, M.A. and Bergin, Osborn, eds. *The Book of Leinster, formerly Lebar na Núachongbála*, 5 vols. Dublin: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies, 1954-1983.
Bignamini, Ilaria, ed. *Archives and Excavations: Essays on the History of Archaeological Excavations in Rome and Southern Italy from the Renaissance to the Nineteenth Century.* Ed. Ilaria Bignamini. London: The British School at Rome, 2004.
Birley, Eric. *Research on Hadrian's Wall.* Kendal: Titus Wilson & Son, Ltd., 1961.
Blackstone, Mary A. 'Performance and the Intertextual Negotiation of Community: The Example of Elizabethan Leicester'. *Research Opportunities in Renaissance Drama* 43 (2004): 75-105.
Blaine, Marlin E. 'Drayton's Agincourt in 1606: History, Genre, and National Consciousness'. *Renaissance Papers* (1996): 53-65.
Blair, Ann. 'Note Taking as an Art of Transmission'. *Critical Inquiry* 31:1 (2004-2005): 85-107.
Bland, Mark. '"As far from all Reuolt": Sir John Salusbury, Christ Church MS 184 and Ben Jonson's first ode'. *English Manuscript Studies, 1100-1700* 8 (2000): 43-78.
---, 'Ben Jonson and the Legacies of the Past'. *Huntington Library Quarterly* 67:2 (2004): 371-400.
---, 'Francis Beaumont's Verse Letters to Ben Jonson and "The Mermaid Club"'. *English Manuscript Studies 1100-1700* 12 (2005): 139-179.
---, '"Invisible Dangers": Censorship and the Subversion of Authority in Early Modern England'. *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America* 90 (1996): 151-93.
---, 'Jonson and the Legacies of the Past'. *Huntington Library Quarterly* 67 (2004): 371-400.
---, 'Jonson, *Biathanatos* and the Interpretation of Manuscript Evidence'. *Studies in Bibliography: Papers of the Bibliographical Society of the University of Virginia* 51 (1998): 154-182.
---, 'William Stansby and the Production of *The Workes of Beniamin Jonson*, 1615-16'. *The Library* 20 (1998): 1-34.
Blank, Paula. 'Jonson's family values'. *Form and reform in Renaissance England: Essays in honour of Barbara Kiefer Lewalski*. Eds. Amy Boesky and Mary Thomas. Newark: Delaware UP, 2000. Pp.127-149.
Blayney, Peter. 'The Publication of Playbooks'. *A New History of Early English Drama*. Eds. John D. Cox and David Scott Kastan. New York: Columbia UP, 1997. Pp. 357-382.
Blumenberg, Hans. *The Legitimacy of the Modern Age* .Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1983.
Boesky, Amy and Mary Thomas, eds. *Form and reform in Renaissance England: Essays in honour of Barbara Kiefer Lewalski*. Newark: Delaware UP, 2000.
Boling, Ronald J. 'Anglo-Welsh Relations in Cymbeline'. *Shakespeare Quarterly* 51 (2000): 33-66.
Bonner, A.R. and James, P. 'Two letters in Hebrew addressed to Sir Thomas Bodley'. *Bodleian Library Record* 8 (1971): 258-262.
Booty, John E. *John Jewel as Apologist of the Church of England.* London, 1963.
Boran, Elizabethananne. '"Propagating religion and endeavouring the reformation of the whole world": Irish Bishops and the Hartlib circle in the mid-seventeenth century'. *Taking Sides? Colonial and Confessional Mentalités in Early Modern Ireland.* Eds. Vincent

P. Carey and Ute Lotz-Heumann. Dublin: Four Courts, 2003. Pp. 165-184.
---, 'The Libraries of Luke Challoner and James Ussher, 1595-1608'. *European Universities in the Age of Reformation and Counter Reformation*. Ed. Helga Robinson-Hammerstein. Dublin: Four Courts Press, 1998. Pp. 75-115.
Borchardt, Frank L. 'Etymology in Tradition and the Northern Renaissance'. *Journal of the History of Ideas* 29 (1968): 415-429.
Borst, Arno. *Der Turmbau von Babel: Geschichte der Meinungen über Ursprung und Vielfalt der Sprachen und Völker.* Stuttgart: A. Hiersemann, 1957-63; 4 vols.
Bots, Hans and Françoise Waquet. *La république des lettres.* Paris: Berlin, 1997.
Boutcher, Warren. 'Pilgrimage to Parnassus: Local Intellectual Traditions, Humanist Education, and the Cultural Geography of Sixteenth Century England'. *Pedagogy and Power: Rhetorics of Classical Learning*. Eds. Yun lee Too and Niall Livingston. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1996. Pp.110-148.
Bowers, Rick. 'Tamburlaine in Ludlow'. *Notes and Queries* 243 (1998): 361-3.
Bracken, James K. 'Books from William Stansby's Printing House, and Jonson's Folio of 1616'. *The Library* 18 (1988): 18-29.
Braddick, Michael J. *State formation in early modern England, c. 1550-1700.* Cambridge: CUP, 2000.
Bradshaw, Brendan. 'Geoffrey Keating: Apologist of Irish Ireland'. *Representing Ireland: Literature and the Origins of Conflict, 1534-1660.* Eds Brendan Bradshaw, Andrew Hadfield, and Willy Maley. Cambridge: CUP, 1993. Pp. 191-208.
Bradshaw, Brendan, Andrew Hadfield and Willy Maley, eds. *Representing Ireland: Literature and the Origins of Conflict, 1534-1660.* Cambridge: CUP, 1993.
---, and Peter Roberts, eds. *British Consciousness and Identity: The Making of Britain, 1533-1707*. Cambridge: CUP, 1998.
Brady, Jennifer and W.H. Herndeen. *Ben Jonson's 1616 Folio*. Newark: Delaware UP, 1991.
---, 'Progenitors and Other Sons in Ben Jonson's *Discoveries*'. *New Perspectives on Ben Jonson*. Ed. James Hirsh. London: Associated University Presses, 1997. Pp.16-34.
Bravo, Benedetto. *Philologie, histoire, philosophie de l'histoire.* Wrocław : Zakład Narodowy Imienia Ossolińskich, Wydawnictwo Polskiej Akademii Nauk, 1968.
Briggs, Julia. 'Middleton's Forgotten Tragedy Hengist, King of Kent'. *Review of English Studies* 41 (1990): 479-495.
---, 'New Times and Old Stories: Middleton's Hengist'. *Literary Appropriations of the Anglo-Saxons*. Eds. Donald Scragg and Carole Weinberg. Cambridge: CUP, 2000.
Broadway, Jan. *'No historie so meete': Gentry culture and the development of local history in Elizabethan and early Stuart England.* Manchester: Manchester UP, 2006.
---, *William Dugdale and the Significance of County History in Early Stuart England*. Stratford-upon-Avon: Dugdale Society Occasional Papers, 1999.
Brink, Jean R. *Michael Drayton Revisited*. Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1990.
Brooks, Douglas A. '"If He Be at His Book Disturb Him Not": The Two Jonson Folios of 1616.' *Ben Jonson Journal* 4 (1997): 81-101.
---, ed. *Printing and Parenting in Early Modern England*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005.
Brown, Cedric C. 'Courtesies of Place and Arts of Diplomacy in Ben Jonson's Last Two Entertainments for Royalty'. *The Seventeenth Century* 9 (1994): 147-171.
Brown, Peter. 'Arnaldo Dante Momigliano 1908-1987'. *Proceedings of the British Academy* 74 (1988): 405-442.
Bruckner, Lynne Dickson. 'Ben Jonson's Branded Thumb and the Imprint of Textual Paternity'. *Printing and Parenting in Early Modern England*. Ed. Douglas A. Brooks. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2005. Pp.109-130.
Bruster, Douglas and Robert Weimann. *Prologues to Shakespeare's Theatre: Performance and*

Liminality in Early Modern Drama. London: Routledge, 2004.
Burke, Peter. 'Images as Evidence in Seventeenth-Century Europe'. *Journal of the History of Ideas* 64 (2003): 273-296.
---, Brian Harrison, and Paul Slack, eds. *Civil Histories: Essays Presented to Sir Keith Thomas*. Oxford: OUP, 2000.
Burgess, Glen. *Absolute Monarchy and the Stuart Constitution*. New Haven: Yale UP 1996.
---, ed. *The New British History: Founding a Modern State 1603-1715*. London: Tauris, 1999.
---, Rowland Wymer and Jason Lawrence, eds. *The Accession of James I: Historical and Cultural Consequences*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006.
Burman, Thomas E.. *Reading the Qur'an in Latin Christendom.* Philadelphia, 2007.
Burnett, Charles and Nicholas Mann, ed. *Britannia Latina.* London, 2005. Pp. 86-128.
Burnett, Stephen. *From Christian Hebraism to Jewish Studies: Johannes Buxtorf (1564-1629) and Hebrew Learning in the Seventeenth Century.* Leiden: Brill, 1996.
Burt, Richard. *Licensed by Authority: Ben Jonson and the Discourses of Censorship*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1993.
Butler, Martin. 'Ben Jonson and the Limits of Courtly Panegyric'. *Culture and Politics in Early Stuart England*. Eds. Kevin Sharpe and Peter Lake. Houndmills: Macmillan Press, 1994. Pp.91-115.
---, 'Ben Jonson's *Pan's Anniversary* and the Politics of Early Stuart Pastoral'. *English Literary Renaissance* 22 (1992): 369-404.
---, 'The Dates of Three Poems by Ben Jonson'. *Huntington Library Quarterly* 55 (1992): 279-294.
---, 'Jonson's Folio and the Politics of Patronage'. *Criticism* 35 (1993): 377-90.
---, 'Late Jonson'. *The Politics of Tragicomedy*. Eds. Jonathan Hope and Gordon McMullan. London: Routledge, 1992. Pp.166-188.
---, *Re-Presenting Ben Jonson*. Houndmills: Macmillan Press, 1999.
---, and David Lindley. 'Restoring Astraea: Jonson's Masque for the Fall of Somerset'. *English Literary History* 61 (1994): 807-827
---, 'The Riddle of Jonson's Chronology Revisited'. *The Library* 4 (2003): 49-63.
---, '"Servant, but not Slave": Ben Jonson at the Jacobean Court'. *Proceedings of the British Academy* 90 (1996): 65-93.
---, 'Sir Francis Stewart: Jonson's Overlooked Patron'. *Ben Jonson Journal* 2 (1995): 101-127.
---, 'The Stuart Masque and the Invention of Britain'. *The Stuart Court and Europe*. Ed. Malcolm Smuts. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1996. Pp.65-85.
---, 'Stuart Politics in *A Tale of a Tub*'. *Modern Language Review* 85 (1990): 12-28.
---, *Theatre and Crisis 1632-1642*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1984.
---, '"We Are One Man's All": Jonson's *The Gipsies Metamorphosed*'. *Yearbook in English Studies* 21 (1991): 253-73.
Cain, Tom. '"Satyres, That Girde and Fart at the Time": *Poetaster* and the Essex Rebellion'. *Refashioning Ben Jonson: Gender, Politics and the Jonsonian Canon*. Eds. Julie Sanders, Kate Chedgzoy and Susan Wiseman. Houndmills: Macmillan Press, 1998. Pp.48-70.
Calhoun, Thomas O. and Thomas L. Gravell. 'Paper and Printing in Ben Jonson's *Sejanus* (1605)'. *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America* 87 (1993): 13-64.
Cameron, Euan. 'Medieval Heretics as Protestant Martyrs'. *Martyrs and Martyrologies*. Ed. D. Wood. Oxford: Published for the Ecclesiastical History Society by Blackwell Publishers, 1993.
Campbell, Gordon. 'Milton's Index Theologicus and Bellarmine's *Disputationes De*

Controversiis Christianae Fidei Adversus Huius Temporis Haereticos', *Milton Quarterly* 11 (1977): 12-16.
---, et al., eds. *Milton and the Manuscript of* De Doctrina Christiana. OUP, 2007.
---, and Thomas N. Corns. *John Milton: Life, Work, and Thought*. Oxford: OUP, 2008.
Cannan, Paul D. 'Ben Jonson, Authorship, and the Rhetoric of English Dramatic Prefatory Criticism'. *Studies in Philology* 99 (2002): 178-201.
Canny, Nicholas. *Making Ireland British, 1580-1650.* Oxford: OUP, 2001.
Carey, Vincent, P. and Ute Lotz-Heumann. *Taking Sides? Colonial and Confessional Mentalités in Early Modern Ireland.* Eds. Vincent P. Carey and Ute Lotz-Heumann. Dublin: Four Courts, 2003.
Carley, James. 'John Leland in Paris: the Evidence of his Poetry'. *Studies in Philology* 83 (1986): 1-50.
---, 'The Manuscript Remains of John Leland, "The King's Antiquary"', *TEXT: Transactions of the Society for Textual Scholarship* 2 (1985): 111-120.
---, and Colin G.C. Tite eds. *Books and Collectors, 1200-1700: Essays Presented to Andrew Watson.* London: The British Library, 1997.
Carlson, David R. *English Humanist Books : Writers and Patrons, Manuscripts and Print, 1475-1525.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1993.
---, 'Manuscripts after Printing: Affinity, Dissent, and Display in the Texts of Wyatt's Psalms'. *Prestige, Authority and Power in Late Medieval Manuscripts and Texts*. Ed. Felicity Riddy. York: York Medieval Press, 2000. 171-188.
---, 'Royal Tutors in the Reign of Henry VII'. *Sixteenth Century Journal* 22 (1991): 253-79.
---, 'The Writings of Bernard André (c.1450-c.1522)'. *Renaissance Studies* 12 (1998): 229-50.
---, 'The Writings and Manuscript Collections of the Elizabethan Alchemist, Antiquary, and Herald Francis Thynne'. *Huntington Library Quarterly* 52:2 (1989): 203-272.
Capern, Amanda L. 'The Caroline Church: James Ussher and the Irish Dimension'. *Historical Journal* 39:1 (1996): 57-85.
Cavanagh, Dermot. *Language and Politics in the Sixteenth-Century History Play*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.
Centerwall, Brandon S. 'A reconsideration of Ben Jonson's contribution to Sir Walter Ralegh's *The History of the World* (1614)'. *Ben Jonson Journal* 7 (2000): 539-54.
Chambers, E.K. *The Elizabethan Stage*. 4 vols. Oxford: OUP, 1923.
Chaplin, Gregory. '"Divided Amongst Themselves": Collaboration and Anxiety in Jonson's *Volpone*'. *English Literary History* 69 (2002): 57-81.
Christianson, Paul. *Discourse on History, Law and Governance in the Public Career of John Selden, 1610-1635*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1996.
Clark, William. *Academic Charisma and the Origins of the Research University*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006.
Clucas, Stephen and Rosalind Davies, eds. *The Crisis of 1614 and The Addled Parliament: Literary and Historical Perspectives*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003.
Cogswell, Thomas. '"The Path to Elizium 'Lately Discovered": Drayton and the Early Stuart Court'. *Huntington Library Quarterly* 54 (1991): 207-33.
---, 'Underground verse and the transformation of early Stuart political culture'. *Political Culture and Cultural Politics in Early Modern England*. Eds. Susan D. Amussen and Mark A. Kishlansky. Manchester and New York: Manchester UP, 1995. Pp.277-300.
Cokayne, G.E. *Some Account of the Lord Mayors and Sheriffs of the City of London During the First Quarter of the Seventeenth Century, 1601-1625*. London, 1897.
Colclough, David. '*Parrhesia*: The Rhetoric of Free Speech in Early Modern England'. *Rhetorica* 17 (1999): 177-212.
Colley, Linda. *Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707-1837*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1992.

Collinson, Patrick. 'The Monarchical Republic of Elizabeth I'. *The Tudor Monarchy*. Ed. John Guy. London: Arnold, 1997.
---, 'John Stow and nostalgic antiquarianism'. Ed. J.F. Merritt. *Imagining Early Modern London: Perceptions and Portrayals of the City from Stow to Strype, 1598-1720*. Cambridge: CUP, 2001. Pp.27-51.
Comyn, David and Patrick S. Dineen, eds. *The History of Ireland.* 4 vols. London: Irish Texts Society, 1902-1914.
Connell, Philip. 'British Identities and the Politics of Ancient Poetry in Later Eighteenth-Century England'. *The Historical Journal* 49 (2006): 161-92.
Connor, W.J. 'The Fairfax archives: a study in dispersal'. *Archives* 11:50 (1973): 76-85.
Considine, John. *Dictionaries in Early Modern Europe: Lexicography and the Making of Heritage.* Cambridge: CUP, 2008.
Coren, Pamela. 'Prince Henry and Ferrabosco's *Ayres* of 1609'. *Notes and Queries* 51 (2004): 301-3.
Cormack, Bradin. *A Power to Do Justice: Jurisdiction, English Literature, and the Rise of the Common Law, 1509-1625.* Chicago: Chicago UP, 2007.
Cormack, Lesley B. '"Good Fences Make Good Neighbors": Geography as Self-Definition in Early Modern England'. *Isis* 82 (1991): 639-661.
Cortesi, Mariarosa, ed. *"Editiones Principes" Delle Opere Dei Padri Greci e Latini.* Firenze: SISMEL, 2006.
Costello, W. *The Scholastic Curriculum at Early Seventeenth-Century Cambridge.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP, 1958.
Coudert, Allison P. and Jeffrey S. Shoulson, eds. *Hebraica Veritas? Christian Hebraists and the Study of Judaism in Early Modern Europe.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004.
Cowen Orlin, Lena ed. *Material London, ca.1600.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2000.
Cox, John D. and David Scott Kastan. *A New History of Early English Drama*. New York: Columbia UP, 1997.
Cram, David. 'Edward Lhuyd and the Doctrine of the Permutation of Letters'. *Sprachdiskussion und Beschreibung von Sprachen im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert*. Eds. Gerda Haßler and Peter Schmitter. Münster: Nodus Publikationen, 1999.
---, 'Francis Willughby's Catalogue of Welsh Words (1662)'. *The National Library of Wales Journal* 32:1 (2001): 1-55.
---, 'On wild etymology and descriptive profligacy: A contrastive case study'. *A Companion in Linguistics: A Festschrift for Anders Ahlqvist on the Occasion of his Sixtieth Birthday*. Eds Bernadette Smelik, Rijkolf Hofman, Camiel Hamans and David Cram. Nijmegen: Stichting Uitgeverij de Keltische Draak, 2005. Pp. 219-230.
Crawford, M.H. and C.R. Ligota, eds. *Ancient History and the Antiquarian: Essays in Memory of Arnaldo* Momigliano. London: The Warburg Institute, 1995.
Crawford, Michael H. ed. *Antonio Agustín between Renaissance and Counter-Reform.* London: Warburg Institute, 1993.
Crawford, M.H., C.R. Ligota and J.B. Trapp eds. *Medals and Coins from Budé to Mommsen.* London: The Warburg Institute, 1990.
Crick, Julia. 'The art of the unprinted: transcription and English antiquity in the age of print'. *The Uses of Script and Print, 1300-1700.* Eds Julia Crick and Alexandra Walsham. Cambridge: CUP, 2004. Pp. 116-34.
Croft, Pauline. 'Sir John Doddridge, King James I, and the Antiquity of Parliament'. *Parliaments, Estates, and Representation* 12 (1992): 95-107.
Cromartie, Alan. 'The Constitutionalist Revolution: The Transformation of Political Culture in Early Stuart England'. *Past and Present* 163 (1999): 76-120.

Crupi, Charles W. *Robert Greene*. Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1986.
Cummings, Robert. 'Liberty and History in Jonson's Invitation to Supper'. *Studies in English Literature* 40 (2000): 103-22.
Cunnally, John. *Images of the Illustrious: Numismatic Presence in the Renaissance.* Princeton, 1999.
Cunningham, Bernadette. *The World of Geoffrey Keating: History, Myth and Religion in Seventeenth-Century Ireland.* Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2000.
Cust, Richard. 'Catholicism, Antiquarianism, and Gentry Honour: The Writings of Sir Thomas Shirley'. *Midland History* 23 (1998): 46-47.
---, and Ann Hughes, eds. *Conflict in Early Stuart England: Studies in Religion and Politics, 1603-1642*. London and New York: Longman, 1989.
---, *The Forced Loan and English Politics: 1626-1628*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1987.
---, 'Honour, rhetoric and political culture: the earl of Huntingdon and his enemies'. *Political culture and cultural politics in early modern England*. Eds. S.D. Amussen and M. Kishlansky. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1995. Pp.84-111.
---, 'Purveyance and politics in Jacobean Leicestershire'. *Regionalism and revision*. Eds. P. Fleming, A. Gross and J.R. Lander. London: Hambledon, 1999. Pp.145-62.
Davies, Glenys. 'Sir Robert Cotton's Collection of Roman Stones: A Catalogue with Commentary'. *Sir Robert Cotton as Collector: Essays on an Early Stuart Courtier and his Legacy*. Ed. C.J. Wright. London and Toronto: The British Library and University of Toronto, 1997. Pp.129-67.
Davis, Natalie Zemon. 'Beyond the Market: Books as Gifts in Sixteenth-Century France'. *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 33 (1983): 69-88.
Davison, Peter. 'Commerce and Patronage: The Lord Chamberlain's Men's Tour of 1597'. *Shakespeare Performed: Essays in Honor of R.A. Foakes*. Ed. Grace Ioppolo Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2000. Pp.56-71.
Dawson, Hannah. *Locke, Language and Early-Modern Philosophy.* Cambridge: CUP, 2007.
Deitz, Luc. 'Iohannes Wower of Hamburg: Philologist and Polymath. A Preliminary Sketch of his Life and Works'. *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 58 (1995): 132-151.
DeMolen, Richard L. 'The Library of William Camden'. *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 128:4 (1984): 327-409.
Denham-Young, N. and H. Craster. 'Roger Dodsworth and his Circle'. *Yorkshire Archaeological Journal* 32 (1934): 5-32.
Depuydt, Joost. 'Le cercle d'amis et de correspondants autour d'Abraham Ortelius'. *Abraham Ortelius (1527-1598): Cartographe et Humaniste.* Turnhout: Brepols, 1998.
---, '"Vale, Verum Antiquae Historiae Lumen": Antiquarianism in the Correspondence between Justus Lipsius and Abraham Ortelius'. *Iustus Lipsius Europae Lumen et Columen: Proceedings of the International Colloquium Leuven 17-19 September 1997*. Eds G. Tournoy, J. de Landtsheer and J. Papy. Leuven: Leuven UP, 1999. Pp.34-46.
de Quehen, Hugh. 'Politics and Scholarship in the Ignatian Controversy'. *The Seventeenth Century* 13 (1998): 69-84.
de Smet, Ingrid. 'Nicolas Rigault', *Centuriae Latinae II: Cent une figures humanistes de la Renaissance aux Lumières.* Geneva: Droz, 2006.
Deutsch, Yaacov. '"A View of the Jewish Religion": Conceptions of Jewish Practice and Ritual in Early Modern Europe'. *Archiv für Religionsgeschichte* 3 (2001): 273-295.
Dibon, Paul. *Regards Sur La Hollande Du Siècle D'Or.* Naples: Vivarium, 1990.
---, and Françoise Waquet. *Johannes Fridericus Gronovius: pèlerin de la république des lettres.* Geneva: Droz, 1984.
Di Donato, Ricardo. 'Materiali per una Biografia Intelletuale di Arnaldo Momigliano'. *Athenaeum* 83 (1995): 213-244.

Dillon, Janette. *Theatre, Court and City, 1595-1610: Drama and Social Space in London*. Cambridge: CUP, 2000.
Donaldson, Ian. *Jonson's Magic Houses: Essays in Interpretation*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997.
---, *Jonson's Walk to Scotland: Inaugural Lecture, 21 May 1992.* Edinburgh: Quadriga, 1993.
---, 'Looking Sideways: Jonson, Shakespeare and the Myths of Envy'. *Ben Jonson Journal* 8 (2001): 1-22.
Doelman, James. 'Born with Teeth: Christopher Brooke's *The Ghost of Richard the Third* (1614)'. *The Seventeenth Century* 14 (1999): 115-129.
Donovan, Kevin. 'The Final Quires of the Jonson 1616 *Workes*: Headline Evidence'. *Studies in Bibliography* 40 (1987): 106-20.
---, 'Forms of Authority in the Early Texts of *EMO*'. *Re-Presenting Ben Jonson*. Ed. Martin Butler. Houndmills: Macmillan Press, 1999. Pp.59-75.
Dorian, David C. *The English Diodatis.* New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 1950.
Douglas, Audrey and Sally-Beth Maclean. *REED in Review: Essays in Celebration of the First Twenty-Five Years*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2006.
Droixhe, Daniel. *La Linguistique et l'appel de l'histoire (1600-1800): Rationalisme et révolutions positvistes.* Genève: Droz, 1978.
Duncan-Jones, Katherine. 'A Feather from the Black Swan's Wing: Hugh Holland's *Owen Tudyr* (1601)'. *English Manuscript Studies: 1100-1700* 11 (2002): 93-108.
Düring, Tobias. 'Writing Performance: How to Elegize Elizabethan Actors'. *Shakespeare Survey* 58 (2005): 60-71.
Dutton, Richard. 'The Lone Wolf: Jonson's Epistle to *Volpone*'. *Refashioning Ben Jonson: Gender, Politics and the Jonsonian Canon*. Eds. Julie Sanders, Kate Chedgzoy and Susan Wiseman. Houndmills: Macmillan Press, 1998. Pp.114-133.
Dyer, Christopher and Richardson, Catherine, eds. *William Dugdale, Historian, 1605-1686: His Life, his Writings and his County.* Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2009.
Edwards, Ben. 'Reginald Bainbrigg, *scholemaister*, and his stones'. *Archaeology of the Roman Empire: A tribute to the Life and Works of Professor Barri Jones.* Ed. N.J. Higham. Oxford: Archaeopress, 2001. Pp. 25-33.
Edwards, J.N. 'Reginald Bainbrigg, Westmorland Antiquary'. *Transactions of the Cumberland & Westmorland Antiquarian & Archaeological Society* 3 (2003): 119-125.
Elliot, J.H. 'A Europe of Composite Monarchies'. *Past and Present* 137 (1992): 48-71.
---, and L.W.B. Brockliss, eds. *The World of the Favourite*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1999.
Elsky, Martin. *Authorizing Words: Speech, Writing and Print in the English Renaissance*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1989.
---, 'Ben Jonson's poems of place and the culture of land: from the military to the domestic'. *English Literary Renaissance* 31 (2001): 392-411.
---, 'Microhistory and Cultural Geography: Ben Jonson's 'To Sir Robert Wroth' and the Absorption of Local Community in the Commonwealth'. *Renaissance Quarterly* 53 (2000): 500-28.
---, 'The mixed genre of Ben Jonson's *To Penshurst* and the perilous springs of Netherlandish landscape'. *Ben Jonson Journal* 9 (2002): 1-35.
Eros, John F. 'A 17th-Century Demonstration of Language Relationship: Meric Casaubon on English and Greek'. *Historiographia Linguistica* 3 (1976): 1-15.
Escobedo, Andrew. *Nationalism and Historical Loss in Renaissance England: Foxe, Dee, Spenser, Milton.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell UP, 2004.
---, 'From Britannia to England: Cymbeline and the Beginning of Nations'. *Shakespeare Quarterly* 59 (2008): 60-87.
Evans, E. 'Of the Antiquity of Parliaments in England: Some Elizabethan and Early Stuart

Opinions'. *History* 23 (1938-39): 206-21.
Evans, Robert C. *Ben Jonson and the Poetics of Patronage*. London and Toronto: Associated UP, 1989.
---, *Habits of Mind: Evidence and Effects of Ben Jonson's Reading*. Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press; London: Associated UP, 1995.
---, '*Sejanus*: Ethics and Politics in the Early Reign of James'. *Refashioning Ben Jonson: Gender, Politics and the Jonsonian Canon*. Eds. Julie Sanders, Kate Chedgzoy and Susan Wiseman, eds. Houndmills: Macmillan Press, 1998. Pp.71-92.
---, '"This Art Will Live": Social and Literary Responses to Ben Jonson's *New Inn*'. *Literary Circles and Cultural Communities in Renaissance England*. Eds. Claude J. Summers and Ted-Larry Pebworth. Columbia: Missouri UP, 2000. Pp.75-91.
Farmer, Norman. 'Fulke Greville and Sir John Coke: An Exchange of Letters on a History Lecture and Certain Latin Verses of Sir Philip Sidney'. *Huntington Library Quarterly* 33 (1970): 217-236.
Feibel, Juliet. 'Vortigern, Rowena, and the Ancient Britons: Historical art and the Anglicization of National Origin'. *Eighteenth-Century Life* 24: 1 (2001): 1-21.
Fellows-Jensen, Gillian. 'John Aubrey, Onomast?'. *Nomina* 23 (2000): 89-106.
Feingold, Mordechai. 'The Humanities' and 'Oriental Studies'. T.H. Aston, ed. *The History of the University of Oxford: Volume IV: The Seventeenth Century.* Eds. Nicholas Tyacke. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997-; 8 vols. IV.211-357 and IV.449-503.
---, 'Patrons and Professors: The Origins and Motives for the Endowments of University Chairs – in Particular the Laudian Professorship of Arabic'. *The 'Arabick' Interest of the Natural Philosophers in Seventeenth-Century England.* Ed. G.A. Russell. Leiden: Brill, 1994. Pp.109-127.
---, 'When Facts Matter'. *Isis* 87 (1996): 131-139.
---, 'The Origins of the Royal Society, Revisited'. *The Practice of Reform in Health, Medicine and Science, 1500-2000*. Eds. Margaret Pelling and Scott Mandelbrote. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005. 167-183, 175-76.
Ferrary, Jean-Louis. *Onofrio Panvinio et les antiquités romaines.* Rome: École française de Rome, 1996.
Findlay, Alison. *Playing Spaces in Early Women's Drama*. Cambridge: CUP, 2006
Findlen, Paula, ed. *Athanasius Kircher: The Last Man Who Knew Everything*. New York and London: Routledge, 2004.
---, *Possessing Nature: Museums, Collecting, and Scientific Culture in Early Modern Italy.* Berkeley, Los Angeles and London, 1994.
Finkelpearl, Philip J. *Court and Country in the Plays of Beaumont and Fletcher*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1990.
--. 'John Fletcher as Spenserian Playwright: *The Faithful Shepherdess* and *The Island Princess*'. *Studies in English Literature* 27 (1987): 285-302.
Fischlin, Daniel and Mark Fortier, eds. *Royal Subjects: Essays on the Writings of James VI and I*. Detroit: Wayne State UP, 2002.
Fish, Stanley. 'Authors-Readers: Jonson's Community of the Same'. *Representations* 7 (1984): 26-58.
Fleming, P. A. Gross and J.R. Lander, eds. *Regionalism and revision*. London: Hambledon, 1999. Pp. 145-62.
Fletcher, Anthony and Peter Roberts, eds. *Religion, culture and society in early modern Britain: Essays in honour of Patrick Collinson*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1994.
Flower, R. 'Laurence Nowell and the Discovery of England in Tudor Times'. *British Academy Papers on Anglo-Saxon England*. Ed. E.G. Stanley. Oxford: OUP, 1990. Pp. 1-27.
Ford, Alan. *James Ussher: Theology, History and Politics in Early-Modern Ireland and England*.

Oxford: OUP, 2007.
Ford, Richard T. 'Law's Territory (A History of Jurisdiction)'. *Michigan Law Review* 97 (1999): 843-930.
Foster, Elizabeth Reed, ed. *Proceedings in Parliament 1610*: *House of Commons*. 2 vols. New Haven: Yale UP, 1966. Vol. 2.
Fox, Cyril and Bruce Dickens, eds. *The Early Cultures of North-West Europe.* Cambridge: CUP, 1950.
Franciscan Fathers, ed. *Father Luke Wadding.* Dublin: Clonmore & Reynolds, 1957.
Friis, Astrid. *Alderman Cockayne's Project and the Cloth Trade: The Commercial Policy of England in its Main Aspects, 1603-1625*. Trans. A. Fausbøl. Copenhagen, 1927.
Fuchs, Barbara. 'Pirating Spain: Jonson's commendatory poetry and the translation of empire'. *Modern Philology* 99 (2002): 341-56.
Fück, J. *Die arabischen Studien in Europa bis in den Anfang des 20. Jahrhunderts.* Leipzig: O. Harrassowitz, 1955.
Fussner, F.S. *The Historical Revolution: English Historical Writing and Thought 1580-1640.* London: Routledge, 1962.
Gadd, Ian Anders and Patrick Wallis, eds. *Guilds, Society & Economy in London 1450-1800.* London: Centre for Metropolitan History, 2002.
Gants, David L. 'Patterns of Paper Use in *The Workes of Beniamin Jonson* (William Stansby, 1616)'. *Studies in Bibliography* 51 (1998): 127-53.
---, 'The Printing, Proofing and Press-Correction of Ben Jonson's Folio *Workes*'. *Re-Presenting Ben Jonson*. Ed. Martin Butler. Houndmills: Macmillan Press, 1999. Pp.39-58.
Garganigo, Alex. 'Coriolanus, the Union Controversy, and Access to the Royal Person'. *Studies in English Literature* 42 (2002): 335-359.
Geertz, Clifford. 'Centers, Kings, and Charisma: Reflections on the Symbolics of Power'. *Local Knowledge: Further Essays in Interpretive Anthropology*. London: Harper Collins, 1983. Pp.121-146.
Gellner, Ernst. *Nations and Nationalism.* Oxford: Blackwell, 1983.
Genette, Gerrard. *Paratexts*. Trans. Jane E. Lewin. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1987.
Giddens, Eugene. 'The Final Stages of Printing Ben Jonson's *Works*, 1640-1'. *Proceedings of the Bibliographical Society of America* 97 (2003): 57-68.
Gildas, *The Epistle of Gildas, The most Ancient British Author*. London, 1638.
Goldberg, Jonathan. *James I and the Politics of Literature*. Baltimore: John Hopkins UP, 1983.
Goldie, Mark. 'The Unacknowledged Republic: Officeholding in Early Modern England'. *The Politics of the Excluded*. Ed. Tim Harris. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2001. Pp.153-194.
Goldgar, Anne. *Impolite Learning: Conduct and Community in the Republic of Letters, 1680-1750*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1995.
Gordon, Cosmo A.. 'Letter to John Aubrey from Professor James Garden'. *Scottish Gaelic Studies* 8:1 (1955): 18-26.
Gottfried, Rudolf B.. 'The Early Development of the Section on Ireland in Camden's *Britannia*', *English Literary History* 10:2 (1943): 117-130.
Graham, Timothy, ed. *The Recovery of Old English: Anglo-Saxon Studies in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries.* Kalamazoo, Mich., 2000.
Grafton, Anthony. 'Arnaldo Momigliano: A Pupil's Notes'. *American Scholar* 60 (1991): 235-241.
---, 'Dating history: the Renaissance and the reformation of chronology'. *Daedalus* (2003): 74-85.
---, and Joanna Weinberg. *"I have always loved the Holy Tongue": Isaac Casaubon, the Jews and a Forgotten Chapter in Renaissance Scholarship.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP,

2011.
---, 'Jean Hardouin: The Antiquary as Pariah', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institute*s 62 (1999): 241-267.
---, 'J.J. Scaliger's Indices to J. Gruter's *Inscriptiones Antiquae*: A Note on Leiden University Library MS Scal. 11'. *Lias* 2 (1975): 109-113.
---, *Joseph Scaliger: A Study in the History of Classical Scholarship.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983 and 1993; 2 vols.
---, 'Momigliano's Method and the Warburg Institute: Studies in his Middle Period'. *Momigliano and Antiquarianism: Foundations of the Modern Cultural Sciences.* Ed. Peter Miller. Toronto: Toronto UP, 2007. Pp. 97-119.
---, 'Polyhistor into Philolog: Notes on the Transformation of German Classical Scholarship'. *History of the Universities* 3 (1983): 159-192.
---, 'Protestant versus Prophet: Isaac Casaubon on Hermes Trismegistus'. *Defenders of the Text: The Traditions of Scholarship in an Age of Science, 1450-1800.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard, 1991. Pp.145-161.
---, 'Rhetoric, Philology and Egyptomania in the 1570s: J.J. Scaliger's Invective Against M. Guilandinus's Papyrus'. *Journal of the Warburg and Couratuld Institutes* 42 (1979): 167-194.
---, 'The Messrs. Casaubon: Isaac Casaubon and Mark Pattison'. *Worlds Made by Words Scholarship and Community in the Modern West*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP, 2009. Pp. 216-230.
---, 'Tradition and Technique in Historical Chronology'. *Ancient History and the Antiquarian: Essays in Memory of Arnaldo Momigliano*. Eds M.H. Crawford and C.R. Ligota. London: The Warburg Institute, 1995.
---, and Ann Blair. *Transmission of Culture in early modern Europe*. Philadelphia: Pennsylvania UP, 1990.
---, *Worlds Made by Words: Scholarship and Community in the Modern West.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP, 2009.
Grant, Teresa H. and Barbara Ravelhofer, eds. *English Historical Drama, 1500-1660: Forms Outside the Canon*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.
Green, Peter. 'Ancient History and the Modern Historian'. *Times Literary Supplement* (1955): 412.
Greenfield, Liah. *Nationalism: Five Roads to Modernity.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP, 1992.
Griffiths, Paul, Adam Fox and Steve Hindle, eds. *The Experience of Authority in Early Modern England.* Houndmills: Macmillan, 1996.
Griffiths, Huw. 'The Geographies of Shakespeare's Cymbeline'. *English Literary Renaissance* 34 (2004): 339-358.
Grosart, Alexander B., ed., *The Complete Works in Verse and Prose of Samuel Daniel*. 5 vols. London: Hazell, Watson & Viney, 1885-1896.
Grundy, Joan. *The Spenserian Poets: A Study in Elizabethan and Jacobean Poetry*. London: Edward Arnold, 1969.
Guiney, Louise Imogen. *Recusant Poets: Saint Thomas More to Ben Jonson*. London & New York: Sheed & Ward, 1938.
Guy, John, ed. *The Tudor Monarchy*. London: Arnold, 1997.
Gwynn, Aubrey. 'Archbishop Ussher and Fr Brendan O'Connor'. *Father Luke Wadding.* Ed. Franciscan Fathers. Dublin: Clonmore & Reynolds, 1957. Pp. 263-83.
Haan, Estelle. *From Academia to Amicitia: Milton's Latin Writings and the Italian Academies.* Philadelphia: American Philosophical Academy, 1998.
Habermas, Jürgen. *The Philosophical Discourse of Modernity: Twelve Lectures.* Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1987.
Hadfield, Andrew. 'Michael Drayton's Brilliant Career'. *Proceedings of the British*

Academy 125 (2003): 119-147.
---, 'Was Spenser's View of the Present State of Ireland Censored? A Review of the Evidence'. *Notes and Queries* 139 (1994): 459-63.
Halasz, Alexandra. '"So beloved that men use his picture for their signs": Richard Tarlton and the Uses of Sixteenth-Century Celebrity'. *Shakespeare Studies* 23 (1995): 19-38.
Ham, R.E. 'The Four Shire Controversy'*. Welsh History Review* 8 (1977): 381-400.
Hamilton, Alastair. 'Isaac Casaubon the Arabist: "Video Longum Esse Iter"'. *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 72 (2009): 143-168.
---, 'The English Interest in Arabic-Speaking Christians'. *The 'Arabick' Interest of the Natural Philosophers in Seventeenth Century England.* Leiden, 1994. Pp.30-53.
---, Maurits H. Van Den Boogert and Bart Westerweel, eds. *The Republic of Letters and the Levant.* Leiden: Brill, 2005.
---, 'The Study of Islam in Early Modern Europe'. *Archiv für Religionsgeschichte* 3 (2001): 169-182.
---, *William Bedwell: Arabist.* Leiden: Thomas Browne Institute, 1985.
Hamilton, Donna. 'Catholic Use of Anglo-Saxon Precedents, 1565-1625'. *Recusant History* 26 (2003): 537-55.
Hanford, James Holly. 'The Chronology of Milton's Private Studies'. *Proceedings of the Modern Language Association* 36:2 (1921): 251-314.
Hansen, Melanie. 'Identity and Ownership: Narratives of the Land in the English Renaissance'. *Writing and the English Renaissance*. Eds. William Zunder and Suzanne Trill. London: Longman, 1996. Pp.87-105.
Harmsen, Theodor. *Antiquarianism in the Augustan Age: Thomas Hearne 1678-1735.* Oxford and Bern.: Peter Lang, 2000.
---, 'High-Principled Antiquarian Publishing: The Correspondence of Thomas Hearne (1678-1735) and Thomas Smith (1638-1710)'. *Lias* 23 (1996): 69-98.
Harpham, Geoffrey Galt. 'Roots, Races, and the Return to Philology'. *Representations* 106 (2009): 34-62.
Häfner, Ralph ed. *Philologie und Erkenntnis: Beiträge zu Begriff und Problem frühneuzeitlicher "Philologie".* Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 2001.
Haigh, Christopher, ed. *The Reign of Elizabeth I.* Houndmills: Macmillan, 1984.
Hamper, William, ed. *The Life, Diary and Correspondence of Sir William Dugdale.* London: Harding, Lepard, and Co., 1827.
Harlow, C.G. 'Robert Reyce of Preston, 1555-1638'. *Proceedings of the Suffolk Institute of Archaeology* 32 (1973): 43-70.
Harris, Jason. 'The Practice of Community: Humanist Friendship during the Dutch Revolt'. *Texas Studies in Literature and Language* 47 (2005): 299-343.
Harris, Oliver. '"Motheaten, Mouldye, and Rotten": The Early Custodial History and Dissemination of John Leland's Manuscript Remains'. *Bodleian Library Record* 18 (2005): 460-501.
Harris, Tim, ed. *The Politics of the Excluded*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2001.
Haskell, Francis. *History and its Images: Art and the Interpretation of the Past.* New Haven: Yale UP, 1993.
Harvey, Elizabeth D. and Katharine Eisaman Maus, eds. *Soliciting Interpretation: Literary Theory and Seventeenth-Century English Poetry*. Chicago: Chicago UP, 1990.
Haßler, Gerda and Peter Schmitter, eds. *Sprachdiskussion und Beschreibung von Sprachen im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert*. Münster: Nodus Publikationen, 1999.
Haugen, Kristine Louise. 'Richard Bentley: Scholarship and Criticism in Eighteenth-Century England'. Ph.D. thesis. University of Princeton University, 2001.
---, 'Academic Charisma and the Old Regime', *History of the Universities* 22:1 (2007): 199-

228.
Haverfield, Francis. 'Cotton Julius F. vi. Notes on Reginald Bainbrigg of Appleby, on William Camden and on some Roman inscriptions'. *Transactions of the Cumberland and Westmorland Antiquarian and Archaeological Society* 11 (1910–11): 343-378.
Hayes, Tom. *The Birth of Popular Culture: Ben Jonson, Maid Marian and Robin Hood*. Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne UP, 1992.
Hazeltine, Harold Dexter. 'Selden as legal historian: A Comment in Criticism and Appreciation'. *Festschrift Heinrich Brunner zum Siebzigsten Geburtstag, dargetracht von Sehülern and Verehrem.* Weimar, 1910. Pp.579-630.
Heal, Felicity. 'Appropriating History: Catholic and Protestant Polemics and the National Past'. HLQ 68 (2005): 109-32.
---, 'What can King Lucius do for you? The Reformation and the Early British Church'. *English Historical Review* 120 (2005): 593-614.
Helgerson, Richard. *Forms of Nationhood.* Chicago: Chicago UP, 1992.
---, 'Staging Exclusion,' *Forms of Nationhood.* Chicago: Chicago UP, 1992.
---, *The Elizabethan Prodigals*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1976.
Hepple, Leslie W. 'Sir Robert Cotton, Camden's *Britannia*, and the early history of Roman Wall studies'. *Archaeologia Aeliana.* 5th ser. 27 (1999): 1-19.
---, '"The Museum in the Garden": Displaying Classical Antiquities in Elizabethan and Jacobean England'. *Garden History* 29:2 (2001): 109-20.
Herendeen, Wyman. 'A New Way to Pay Old Debts: Pretexts to the 1616 Folio'. *Ben Jonson's 1616 Folio*. Eds. Jennifer Brady and W.H. Herendeen. Newark: Delaware UP, 1991. Pp.38-63.
---, *William Camden: A Life in Context.* Boydell, 2007.
---, *From Landscape to Literature : the River and the Myth of Geography.* Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne University Press, 1986.
Herklotz, Ingo. 'Arnaldo Momigliano's "Ancient History and the Antiquarian": A Critical Review'. *Momigliano and Antiquarianism: Foundations of the Modern Cultural Sciences*. Ed. Peter N. Miller. Toronto: Toronto UP, 2007. Pp. 127-153.
---, *Cassiano dal Pozzo und die Archäologie des 17. Jahrhunderts.* München: Hirmer, 1999.
---, 'Excavations, Collectors and Scholars in Seventeenth-Century Rome'. *Archives and Excavations: Essays on the History of Archaeological Excavations in Rome and Southern Italy from the Renaissance to the Nineteenth Century.* Ed. Ilaria Bignamini. London: The British School at Rome, 2004. Pp.55-88.
---, 'Historia Sacra und mittelalterliche Kunst während der zweiten Hälfte des 16. Jahrhunderts in Rom'. *Baronio e l'arte. Atti del convegno internazionale di studfi.* Ed. Romeo Maio. Sora: Centro di Studi Sorani "Vincenzo Patriarca", 1985. Pp.21-74.
---, 'The Academia Basiliana. Greek Philology, Ecclesiastical History and the Union of the Churches in Barberini Rome'. *I Barberini e la Cultura Europea del Seicento: Atti del convegno internazionale Palazzo Barberini alle Quattro Fontane, 7-11 dicembre 2004.* Eds., Lorenza Mochi Onori, Sebastian Schütze, Francesca Solinas. Roma: De Luca Editori D'Arte, 2007.
Herron, Thomas. *Spenser's Irish Work : Poetry, Plantation, and Colonial Reformation.* Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007.
Hiatt, Alfred. 'Diplomatic Arts: Hickes against Mabillon in the Republic of Letters'. *Journal of the History of Ideas* 70:3 (2009): 351-373.
Higden, Ranulph. *Polycronycon*. London, 1495.
N.J. Higham, ed. *Archaeology of the Roman Empire: A tribute to the Life and Works of Professor Barri Jones.* Ed. N.J. Higham. Oxford: Archaeopress, 2001. Pp. 25-33.
W.S. Hill, ed. *New Ways of Looking at Old Texts* Ed. W.S. Hill. Binghamton: Medieval & Renaissance Texts & Studies, 1993. Pp. 131-47.

Hindle, Steve. 'Hierarchy and community in the Elizabethan parish: the Swallowfield articles of 1596'. *Historical Journal* 42 (1999): 835-51.
---, *On the Parish?: The Micro-Politics of Poor Relief in Rural England, c.1550-1750.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2004.
Hinsley, Curtis M. 'Digging for Identity: Reflections on the Cultural Background of Collecting'. *American Indian Quarterly* 20 (1996): 180-196.
Hirschfeld, Heather. 'Collaborating across Generations: Thomas Heywood, Richard Brome, and the Production of *The Late Lancashire Witches*.' *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 30 (2000): 339-74.
---, 'Early Modern Collaboration and Theories of Authorship'. *Proceedings of the Modern Language Association* 116 (2001): 609-22.
---, '"Work upon That Now": The Production of Parody on the English Renaissance Stage'. *Genre* 32 (1999): 175-200.
Hobbs, Mary. 'Drayton's "Most Dearely-Loved Friend Henery Reynolds Esq."'. *Review of English Studies* 96 (1973): 414-27.
---, *Early Seventeenth-Century Verse Miscellany Manuscripts*. Aldershot: Scholar Press, 1992.
Hobsbawm, Eric J. *Nations and Nationalism since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality.* Cambridge: CUP, 1992.
Historical Manuscripts Commission. *Papers of British Antiquaries and Historians.* London: TSO, 2003.
Holt, P.M. 'The Study of Arabic Historians in Seventeenth-Century England: The Background and the Work of Edward Pococke'. *Studies in the History of the Near East.* London: Cass, 1973. Pp.27-49.
Hoover, David L. and Thomas N. Corns. 'The Authorship of the Postscript to *An Answer to a Booke Entituled, An Humble Remonstrance*'. *Milton Quarterly* 38 (2004): 59-127.
Hope, Jonathan and Gordon McMullan, eds. *The Politics of Tragicomedy*. London: Routledge, 1992.
Hopkins, Lisa. 'Play Houses: Drama at Bolsover and Welbeck'. *Early Theatre* 2 (1999): 25-44.
---, *Shakespeare on the Edge: Border-crossing in the Tragedies and the* Henriad. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005.
---, Lisa Hopkins. 'Welshness in Shakespeare's English Histories'. *Shakespeare's History Plays: Performance, Translation and Adaptation in Britain and Abroad*. Ed. Ton Hoenselaars. Cambridge: CUP, 2004. Pp. 60-74.
Hughes, Ann. 'Local History and the Origins of the Civil War'. *Conflict in Early Stuart England: Studies in Religion and Politics, 1603-1642*. Eds. Richard Cust and Ann Hughes. London and New York: Longman, 1989. Pp.224-253.
Hunt, William. 'Civic Chivalry and the English Civil War'. *Transmission of Culture in early modern Europe*. Eds. Anthony Grafton and Ann Blair. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1990. Pp.204-237.
Hunter, Joseph, ed. *A Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of the Honourable Society of Lincoln's Inn.* London, 1838.
Hunter, Michael. *John Aubrey and the realm of learning.* London: Duckworth, 1975.
---, 'The Problem of "Atheism" in Early Modern England'. *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 35 (1985): 135-157.
Hutton, Ronald. *Blood and Mistletoe: the History of the Druids in Britain.* New Haven: Yale UP, 2009.
Ingram, William. 'The Costs of Touring', *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England* 6 (1993): 57-62.
Ioppolo, Grace, ed. *Shakespeare Performed: Essays in Honor of R.A. Foakes*. Newark:

University of Delaware Press, 2000.
---, *Dramatists and their Manuscripts in the Age of Shakespeare, Jonson, Middleton and Heywood: Authorship, authority and the playhouse*. London & New York: Routledge, 2006.
---, 'Sexual Treason, Treasonous Sexuality, and the Eventful Politics of James I in Middleton's Hengist, King of Kent'. *Ben Jonson Journal* 3 (1996): 87-107.
Jansson, Maija. *Proceedings in Parliament, 1614*. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1988.
Jardine, Lisa. 'The Place of Dialectic Teaching in Sixteenth-Century Cambridge'. *Studies in the Renaissance* 21 (1974): 31-62.
Jarvis, Simon. *Wordsworth's Philosophic Song*. Cambridge: CUP, 2007.
Jones, Edward. '"Filling in a Blank in the Canvas": Milton, Horton, and the Kedermister Library'. *Review of English Studies* 53 (2002): 31-60.
Jones, Ernest. 'Stuart Cymbeline'. *Essays in Criticism* 2 (1961): 84-99.
Jones, Norman L. and Daniel Woolf, eds. *Local Identities in Early Modern England.* London and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.
Jones, H. Stuart. 'The Foundation and History of the Camden Chair'. *Oxoniensia* 8-9 (1943-44): 169- 192.
Jaumann, H. 'Respublica Litteraria/Republic of Letters. Concept and Perspectives of Research', *Die Europäische Gelehrtenrepublik im Zeitalter des Konfessionalismus.* Ed. H. Jaumann. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2001.
Jaumann, Herbert ed. *Die Europäische Gelehrtenrepublik im Zeitalter des Konfessionalismus.* Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2001.
Jenkins, Philip. 'Seventeenth-Century Wales: Definition and Identity'. Eds. Brendan Bradshaw and Peter Roberts. *British Consciousness and Identity: The Making of Britain, 1533-1707*. Cambridge: CUP, 1998.
Jowett, John. ''Fall before this Booke': The 1605 Quarto of *Sejanus*'. *TEXT* 4 (1988): 279-295.
Kathman, David. 'Grocers, Goldsmiths, and Drapers: Freemen and Apprentices in the Elizabethan Theatre'. *Shakespeare Quarterly* (2004): 1-49.
---, 'Citizens, Innholders, and Playhouse Builders, 1543-1622'. *Research Opportunities in Medieval and Renaissance Drama* 44 (2005): 38-64.
Katz, David. *Philo-Semitism and the Readmission of the Jews to England 1603-1655.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982.
Katz, David S.. 'The Language of Adam in Seventeenth-Century England'. *History & Imagination: Essays in Honour of Hugh Trevor-Roper.* Eds Hugh Lloyd-Jones, Valerie Pearl and Blair Worden. London, Duckworth, 1981. Pp. 132-45.
Kay, Dennis. 'Poems by Sir Walter Aston, and a Date for the Donne/Godyer Verse Epistle "*Alternis Vicibus*"'. *Review of English Studies* 37 (1986): 198-210.
Kelliher, Hilton. 'Donne, Jonson, Richard Andrews, and the Newcastle Manuscript'. *English Manuscript Studies 1100-1700* 4 (1993): 134-73.
---, 'Francis Beaumont and Nathan Field: New Records of the Early Years'. *English Manuscript Studies 1100-1700* 8 (2000): 1-42.
Kelley, Donald R. *Foundations of Modern Historical Scholarship: Language, Law and History in the French Renaissance.* New York and London: Columbia UP, 1970.
Keenan, Siobhan. *Travelling Players in Shakespeare's England*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002.
Kendrick, Thomas D. *British Antiquity*. London: Methuen, 1950.
Ker, Neil R. 'Sir John Prise'. *The Library* 10:1 (1955): 1-24.
---, 'Thomas James's Collation of Gregory, Cyprian and Ambrose'. *Bodleian Library Record* 4 (1952): 16-30.

Kerrigan, John. *Archipelagic English.* Oxford: OUP, 2008.
---, *On Shakespeare and Early Modern Literature*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2001.
Kess, Alexandra. *Johann Sleidan and the Protestant Vision of History.* University of St Andrews: St Andrews Studies in Reformation History, 2004.
Keynes, Simon. 'Anglo-Saxon Charters: Lost and Found'. *Myth, rulership, church and charters: essays in honour of Nicholas Brooks.* Eds. Julia Barrow and Andrew Wareham. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008. Pp.45-66.
Kidd, Colin. *British Identities Before Nationalism: Ethnicity and Nationhood in the Atlantic World, 1600-1800.* Cambridge: CUP, 1999.
---, *The Forging of Races: Race and Scripture in the Protestant Atlantic World, 1600-2000.* Cambridge: CUP, 2000.
Kiernan, Alvin B. *Shakespeare, the King's Playwright: Theatre at the Stuart Court 1603-1613*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1995.
Kingelhöfer, Eric. 'Edmund Spenser at Kilcolman Castle: the archaeological evidence'. *Post-Medieval Archaeology* 39 (2005): 133-154.
Knowles, James. 'Jonson In Scotland: Jonson's Mid-Jacobean Crisis'. *Shakespeare, Marlowe, Jonson: New Directions in Biography*. Eds. Takashi Kozuka and J.R. Mulryne. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006. Pp.259-277.
---, 'Marston, Skipwith and *The Entertainment at Ashby*'. *English Manuscript Studies: 1100-1700* 3 (1992): 137-192.
Knapp, Jeffrey. 'What Is a Co-Author?'. *Representations* 89 (2005): 1-29.
Knutson, Roslyn L. *The Repertory of Shakespeare's Company, 1594-1613*. Fayetteville: University of Arkansas Press, 1991.
---, *Playing Companies and Commerce in Shakespeare's Time*. Cambridge: CUP, 2001.
Kozuka, Takashi and J.R. Mulryne. *Shakespeare, Marlowe, Jonson: New Directions in Biography*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006.
---, 'Taking Liberties'. *Early Theatre* 9 (2006): 37-60.
Kraye, Jill. 'Moral Philosophy'. *The Cambridge History of Renaissance Philosophy.* Eds Charles B. Schmitt, Quentin Skinner, and E. Kessler. Cambridge, 1988. Pp. 171-97.
Krumbacher, Karl. *Geschichte der Byzantinischen Litteratur von Justinian bis zum Ende des Oströmischen Reiches.* Munich, 1897.
Kunst, Christiane. *Römische Tradition und Englische Politik : Studien zur Geschichte der Britannienrezeption zwischen William Camden und John Speed.* Hildesheim: Olms, 1994.
---, 'William Camden's *Britannia*: History and Historiography'. *Ancient History and the Antiquarian: Essays in Memory of Arnaldo* Momigliano. Eds., M.H. Crawford and C.R. Ligota. London: The Warburg Institute, 1995.
L.B.L. 'An Early Society of Antiquaries'. *Notes and Queries* Series 1:11. January 6, 1855: 5- 6.
Laplanche, François. 'A Propos d'Isaac Casaubon: La Controverse Confessionnelle et la Naissance de l'Histoire' *History of European Ideas* 9:4 (1988): 405-22.
---, 'L'Érudition Chrétienne aux XVIe et XVIIe Siècles et l'État des Hébreux'. *L'Écriture Sainte au temps de Spinoza et dans le Système Spinoziste.* Paris: Université de Paris-Sorbonne, 1992), 133-47.
Leedham-Green, Elisabeth. *Books in Cambridge Inventories: Book-Lists from Vice-Chancellor's Court Probate Inventories in the Tudor and Stuart Periods.* Cambridge: CUP, 1986; 2 vols.
---, and Teresa Webber, eds. *The Cambridge History of Libraries in Britain and Ireland*. Cambridge: CUP, 2006.
Leerssen, Joseph. 'Archbishop Ussher and Gaelic Culture'. *Studia Hibernica* 22-3 1982-3.
Lennon, Colm. *Richard Stanihurst the Dubliner 1547-1618.* Blackrock: Irish Academic Press, 1981.

Levack, Brian P. 'Law, sovereignty and the union'. *Scots and Britons: Scottish Political Thought and the Union of* 1603. Ed. Roger A. Mason. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1994. Pp. 213-237.
Levin, Richard. 'Tarlton in The Famous History of Friar Bacon and Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay'. *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England* 12 (1999): 84-98.
Levine, Joseph M. *Humanism and History: Origins of Modern English Historiography.* Ithaca, NY.: Cornell UP, 1987.
Levine, Nina. 'Citizens' Games: Differentiating Collaboration and *Sir Thomas More*'. *Shakespeare Quarterly* 58 (2007): 31-64.
Levy, Fritz J. 'Daniel Rogers as Antiquary'. *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance* 27 (1965): 444-62.
---, 'The Making of Camden's Britannia', *Bibliotheque d'Humanisme et Renaissance* 26 (1964): 76-97.
Lewalski, Barbara K. 'Lucy, Countess of Bedford: Images of a Jacobean Courtier and Patroness'. *Politics of Discourse: The Literature and History of Seventeenth-Century England*. Eds. Kevin Sharpe and Steven Zwicker. Berkley: California UP, 1987.
Lightfoot, J. B. *The Apostolic Fathers*. 5 vols. London, 1889-90.
Ligota, Christopher. 'Annius of Viterbo and Historical Method'. *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 50 (1987): 44-56.
---, and Quantin, Jean-Louis, eds. *History of Scholarship: A Selection of Papers from the Seminar on the History of Scholarship held annually at the Warburg Institute.* Oxford: OUP, 2006.
Lindley, David. 'Embarassing Ben: The Masques for Frances Howard'. *English Literary Renaissance* 16 (1986): 343-359.
Lipking, Lawrence. *The Life of the Poet: Beginning and Ending Poetic Careers*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1981.
Livingston, Niall and Yun lee Too, eds. *Pedagogy and Power: Rhetorics of Classical Learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1996.
Lloyd Jones, G. *The Discovery of Hebrew in Tudor England: A Third Language.* Manchester, 1983.
Lloyd Jones, Hugh. Valerie Pearl and Blair Worden eds. *History & Imagination: Essays in Honour of Hugh Trevor-Roper.* London, Duckworth, 1981.
Loewenstein, David. *Milton and the Drama of History: Historical Vision, Iconoclasm and the Literary Imagination.* Cambridge, 1990.
---, and Paul Stevens. *Early Modern Nationalism and Milton's England.* Toronto: Toronto UP, 2008.
Loewenstein, Joseph. *Ben Jonson and Possessive Authorship*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2002.
Loomba, Ania and Jonathan Burton, eds. *Race in Early Modern England: A Documentary Companion*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.
Loop, Jan. 'Johann Heinrich Hottinger (1620-1667) and the "Historia Orientalis"'. *Church History and Religious Culture.* 88 (2008): 169-203.
Love, Harold. 'Early Modern Print Culture: Assessing the Models'. *Parergon* 20 (2003): 45-64.
---, *Scribal Publication in Seventeenth-Century England*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993.
Lynn, Andrew N. 'The Impact of Ben Jonson, 1637-1700'. Ph.D. thesis, University of Cambridge, 2001.
Maccioni, P. Alessandra and Marco Mostert. 'Isaac Dorislaus (1595-1649): The Career of a Dutch Scholar in England'. *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society* 8 (1984): 419-70.
MacCulloch, Diarmaid. *Suffolk and the Tudors: Politics and Religion in an English County 1500-*

1600. Oxford: OUP, 1986.
Mack, Peter, ed. *Renaissance Rhetoric*. Houndmills: Macmillan Press, 1994.
Maclean, Gerald. *Time's Witness*. Wisconsin: Wisconsin UP, 1990.
Maclean, Ian. 'The Medical republic of Letters before the Thirty Years War'. *Intellectual History Review* 18 (2008): 15-30.
Maclean, Sally-Beth. 'Tour Routes: 'Provincial Wanderings' or Traditional Circuits?'. *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England* 6 (1993): 1-14.
---, 'Tracking Leicester's Men: the patronage of a performance troupe'. Eds. Paul Whitfield White and Suzanne R. Westfall. *Shakespeare and Theatrical Patronage in Early Modern England*. Cambridge: CUP, 2002. Pp.246-271.
Macray, William. *Annals of the Bodleian Library.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1890.
Maczak, Antoni. 'From Aristocratic Household to Princely Court: Restructuring Patronage in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries'. *Princes, Patronage and the Nobility: The Court at the Beginning of the Modern Age c.1450-1650*. Eds. Ronald G. Asch and Adolf M. Birke. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1991. Pp.315-327.
Maguire, Nancy Klein, ed. *Renaissance Tragicomedy: Explorations in Genre and Politics*. New York: AMS Press, 1987.
Malcolm, Noel. *Aspects of Hobbes*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2002.
---, 'Hobbes and the European Republic of Letters'. *Aspects of Hobbes.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2002.
---, ''Private and Public Knowledge: Kircher, Esotericism, and the Republic of Letters'. *Athanasius Kircher: The Last Man Who Knew Everything*. Ed. Paula Findlen. New York and London: Routledge, 2004. Pp. 297-308.
---, 'The Crescent and the City of the Sun: Islam and the Renaissance Utopia of Tomasso Campanella'. *Proceedings of the British Academy* 125 (2004): 41-67.
Mandelbrote, Giles and Taylor, Barry, eds. *Libraries Within the Library: The Origins of the British Library's Printed Collections.* London: The British Library, 2009.
---, and K.A. Manley, eds. *The Cambridge History of Libraries in Britain and Ireland: Volume II: 1640-1850.* Cambridge: CUP, 2006.
Maley, Willy. 'How Milton and Some Contemporaries Read Spenser's View'. *Representing Ireland: Literature and the Origins of Conflict, 1534-1660.* Eds Brendan Bradshaw, Andrew Hadfield, and Willy Maley. Cambridge: CUP, 1993. Pp. 191-208.
---, and Margaret Tudeau-Clayton, eds. *This England, That Shakespeare: New Angles on Englishness and the Bard.* Farnham: Ashgate, 2010.
---, *Nation, State and Empire in English Renaissance Literature: Shakespeare to Milton.* Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.
---, and Philip Schwyzer, *Shakespeare and Wales: From the Marches to the Assembly*. Farnham: Ashgate, 2010.
Manley, Lawrence. *Literature and Culture in Early Modern London*. Cambridge: CUP, 1995.
---, 'From Strange's Men to Pembroke's Men: *2 Henry VI* and *The First part of the Contention*'. *Shakespeare Quarterly* 54 (2003): 253-287.
Manning, Roger B.. 'Antiquarianism and the Seigneurial Reaction: Sir Robert and Sir Thomas Cotton and their Tenants', *Historical Research* 63 (1990): 277-288.
Marcus, Leah. 'Politics and Pastoral: writing the court on the countryside'. *Culture and politics in early Stuart England*. Eds. Kevin Sharpe and Peter Lake. London: Macmillan, 1994.
---, *The Politics of Mirth*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1986.
Marotti, Arthur F. *Manuscript, Print, and the English Renaissance Lyric*. Ithaca and London: Cornell UP, 1995.
---, 'Patronage, Poetry, and Print'. *Yearbook of English Studies* 21 (1991): 1-26.

Marshall, Tristan. *Theatre and Empire: Great Britain on the London Stages Under James I and VI*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 2000.
Martin, Anthony. 'The End of History: Thomas Norton's "v Periodes" and the Pattern of English Protestant Historiography'. *John Foxe and his World*. Eds. Christopher Highley and J.N. King. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2002. Pp. 37-53.
Mason, Roger A., ed. *Scots and Britons: Scottish Political Thought and the Union of 1603*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1994
Masten, Jeffrey. *Textual Intercourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1997.
Mawson, D.J.W. 'Another important copy of John Denton's manuscript'. *Transactions of the Cumberland and Westmorland Antiquarian and Archaeological Society* 78 (1978): 97-103.
May, Steve. 'Henry Gurney, a Norfolk Farmer, Reads Spenser and Others'. *Spenser Studies* 20 (2005): 183-223.
McCabe, Richard, A. 'Rhyme and Reason: Poetics, Patronage, and Secrecy in Elizabethan and Jacobean Ireland'. *Literary Milieux: Essays in Literary History*. Eds Richard McCabe and David Womersley. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2008. Pp. 30-51.
---, and David Womersley. eds. *Literary Milieux: Essays in Literary History*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2008.
McCoy, Richard C. 'Old English honour in an evil time: aristocratic principle in the 1620s'. *The Stuart court and Europe: Essays in politics and political culture*. Ed. R. Malcolm Smuts. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1996. Pp. 133-155.
McEachern, Claire. *The Poetics of English nationhood, 1590-1612*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1996.
McGann, Jerome. *The Textual Condition*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1991.
McKitterick, D. 'From Camden to Cambridge: Sir Robert Cotton's Roman Inscriptions *and their Subsequent History'. Sir Robert Cotton as Collector: Essays on an early Stuart courtier and his legacy.* Ed. Christopher John Wright. London: British Library, 1997. Pp. 105-28.
McMillin, Scott and Sally-Beth Maclean. *The Queen's Men and their Plays*. Cambridge: CUP, 1998.
McMullan, Gordon. *The Politics of Unease in the Plays of John Fletcher*. Amherst: Massachusetts UP, 1994.
---, 'The Colonisation of Britain on the Jacobean Stage'. Gordon McMullan and David Matthews, eds. *Reading the Medieval in Early Modern England*. Cambridge: CUP, 2007. Pp. 119-142.
---, and David Matthews, eds. *Reading the Medieval in Early Modern England*. Cambridge: CUP, 2007.
McPherson, David. 'Ben Jonson's Library and Marginalia: New Information from Hatfield House'. *Studies in Philology* 71 (1974), Texts and Studies Supplement, 1-106.
---, 'Ben Jonson Meets Daniel Heinsius, 1613'. *English Language Notes* 14 (1976-77): 105-109.
Megarry, Robert. *Inns Ancient and Modern: A Topographical and Historical Introduction to the Inns of Court, Inns of Chancery, and Serjeants' Inns.* London: Selden Society, 1972.
Ronald Mellor. 'Tacitus, Academic Politics, and Regicide in the Reign of Charles I: The Tragedy of Dr. Isaac Dorislaus'. *International Journal of the Classical Tradition* 11:2 (2004): 153-93.
Mendyk, Stan A.E. *'Speculum Britanniae': Regional Study, Antiquarianism, and Science in Britain to 1700.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1989.
Menzer, Paul. 'The Tragedians of the City? Q1 *Hamlet* and the Settlements of the 1590s'. *Shakespeare Quarterly* (2006): 162-182.
Merritt, J.F., ed. *Imagining Early Modern London: Perceptions and Portrayals of the*

City from Stow to Strype, 1598-1720. Cambridge: CUP, 2001.
Miller, David Lee. 'All Father: Ben Jonson and the Psychodynamics of Authorship'. *Printing and Parenting in Early Modern England*. Ed. Douglas A. Brooks. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2005. Pp.131-147.
Miller, Peter N. 'Introduction: Momigliano, Antiquarianism, and the Cultural Sciences'. *Momigliano and Antiquarianism: Foundations of the Modern Cultural Sciences.* Toronto: Toronto UP, 2007. Pp. 3-65.
---, 'Les Origines de la Bible Polyglotte de Paris: Philologia Sacra, Contre-Réforme et Raison d'État', *XVIIe Siècle* 194 (1997).
---, 'Making the Paris Polyglot Bible: Humanism and Orientalism in the Early Seventeenth Century'. *Die Europäische Gelehrtenrepublik im Zeitalter des Konfessionalismus.* Ed. Herbert Jaumann. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2001. Pp. 59-85.
---, *Momigliano and Antiquarianism: Foundations of the Modern Cultural Sciences.* Toronto: Toronto UP, 2007.
---, 'Nazis and Neo-Stoics: Otto Brunner and Gerhard Oestreich Before and After the Second World War'. *Past and Present* 176 (2002): 144-186.
---, *Peiresc's Europe: Learning and Virtue in the Seventeenth Century.* New Haven and London: Yale UP, 2000.
---, 'Peiresc, the Levant and the Mediterranean'. *The Republic of Letters and the Levant.* Eds Alastair Hamilton, Maurits H. Van Den Boogert and Bart Westerweel. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
---, 'Peiresc and the Study of Islamic Coins in the Early Seventeenth Century'. *The Rebirth of Antiquity: Numismatics, Archaeology and Classical Studies in the Culture of the Renaissance.* Princeton University Library Chronicle, Winter, 2008. Ed. Alan G. Stahl. Pp.315-387.
---, 'Studying the Middle Ages in Early Seventeenth-Century Paris, London and Aix: Another Look at "Peiresc and the English Scholars"', unpublished conference paper.
---, 'The Antiquary's Art of Comparison: Peiresc and Abraxas'. *Philologie und Erkenntnis: Beiträge zu Begriff und Problem frühneuzeitlicher "Philologie"*. Ed. Ralph Häfner. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 2001. Pp. 57-94.
---, 'The "Antiquarianization" of Biblical Scholarship and the London Polyglot Bible (1653-1657)', *Journal of the History of Ideas* 62 (2001): 463-482.
Mills, David. 'Where Have All the Players Gone? A Chester Problem'. *Early Theatre* 1 (1998): 129-137.
Milne, Kirsty. 'The Forgotten Greek Books of Elizabethan England'. *Literature Compass* 4:3 (2007): 677-687.
Milton, Anthony. *Catholic and Reformed: The Roman and Protestant Churches in English Protestant Thought, 1600-1640.* Cambridge: CUP, 1995.
Momigliano, Arnaldo. After Gibbon's Decline and Fall'. *Sesto contributo alla storia degli studi classici e del mondo antico.* Roma: Edizioni di storia e letteratura, 1980.
---, *Alien Wisdom: The Limits of Hellenization.* Cambridge: CUP, 1975.
---, 'Ancient History and the Antiquarian'. *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 13 3:4 (1950): 285-315.
---, 'Eighteenth-Century Prelude to Mr. Gibbon'. *Sesto contributo alla storia degli studi classici e del mondo antico.* Roma: Edizioni di storia e letteratura, 1980.
---, 'From Mommsen to Max Weber'. *History and Theory* 21 (1982): 16-32.
---, 'Gibbon's Contribution to Historical Method'. *Contributo alla storia degli studi classici.* Roma: Edizioni di storia e letteratura, 1955.
---, *Sesto contributo alla storia degli studi classici e del mondo antico.* Roma: Edizioni di storia e letteratura, 1980.
---, 'The Origins of Ecclesiastical Historiography'. *The Classical Foundations of Modern*

Historiography. Oxford: OUP, 1990.
---, 'The Herodotean and the Thucydidean Tradition'. *The Classical Foundations of Modern Historiography.* Oxford: OUP, 1990.
---, *The Classical Foundations of Modern Historiography*. Oxford: OUP, 1990.
---, 'The Place of Herodotus in the History of Historiography'. *Studies in Historiography.* London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1966.
---, 'The Rise of Antiquarian Research', *The Classical Foundations of Modern Historiography.* Berkeley, Los Angeles, Oxford: University of California Press, 1990.
Mommsen, Theodor. 'Firmicus Maternus'. *Hermes* 29 (1894): 468-472.
Morrill, John. ed. *Reactions to the English Civil War 1642-1649*. London: Macmillan, 1982.
---, *Revolt of the Provinces : Conservatives and Radicals in the English Civil War, 1630-1650.* London: Longman, 1980.
---, *Revolt in the Provinces: The People of England and the Tragedies of War 1630-1648.* London: Longman, 1990; rev. edn.
---, 'The War(s) of the Three Kingdoms'. *The New British History: Founding a Modern State 1603-1715*. Ed. Glen Burgess. London: Tauris, 1999. Pp. 65-91.
---, 'Thinking about the New British History'. *British Political Thought in Literature, History and Theory.* Ed. David Armitage. Cambridge: CUP, 2006. Pp. 23-46.
---, *'Uneasy Lies the Head that Wears a Crown': Dynastic Crises in Tudor and Stewart Britain 1504-1746.* Reading: University of Reading, 2005.
Mortimer, Sarah. *Reason and Religion in the English Revolution: the Challenge of Socinianism*. Cambridge: CUP, 2010.
Moss, Ann. *Printed Commonplace-Books and the Structuring of Renaissance Thought.* Oxford: OUP, 1996.
Mosshammer, Alden A. *The Chronicle of Eusebius and Greek Chronographic Tradition.* London: Associated University Presses, 1979.
Muchembled, Robert ed. *Cultural Exchange in Early Modern Europe.* Cambridge: CUP, 2006-7; 4 vols.
Mullaney, Stephen. *The Place of the Stage: Licence, Play and Power in Early Modern England*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988.
Muller, Richard A. *After Calvin: Studies in the Development of a Theological Tradition.* OUP, 2003.
Mulsow, Martin and Jan Assmann, eds. *Sintflut und Gedächtnis: Erinnern und Vergessen des Ursprungs.* München: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 2006.
Munro, Lucy. 'A Neglected Allusion to Pericles and Hengist, King of Kent in Performance'. *Notes and Queries* 51 (2004): 307-310.
Murray, John Tucker. *English Dramatic Companies, 1558-1642*. London: Constable and Company Limited, 1910.
Nativel, Colette, ed. *Centuriae Latinae.* Genève: Droz, 1997.
Neill, Michael. 'Broken English and Broken Irish: Nation, Language, and the Optics of Power in Shakespeare's Histories', *Shakespeare Quarterly* 45 (1994): 1-32.
Nelles, Paul. 'The Uses of Orthodoxy and Jacobean Erudition: Thomas James and the Bodleian Library'. *History of Universities* 22 (2007): 21-70.
Nennius, *The Historia Brittonum*, ed. David N. Dumville. 3 vols. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 1985.
Neveu, Bruno. 'L'érudition ecclésiastique du XVIIe siècle et la nostalgie de l'antiquité chrétienne'. *Religion and humanism*. Ed. Keith Robbins. Blackwell: Oxford, 1981. Pp. 195-223.
---, *Érudition et religion aux XVIIe et XVIIIe siècles*. Paris: Albin Michel, 1994.
Nicholas, Constance, 'The Edition of the Early Church Historian used by Milton,' *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 51 (1952): 60-2.
Norbrook, David. 'Life and Death of Renaissance Man'. *Raritan* 8 (1989): 89-110.

---, 'Lucan, Thomas May, and the Creation of a Republican Literary Culture'. *Culture and Politics in Early Stuart England*. Eds. Kevin Sharpe and Peter Lake. Houndmills: Macmillan Press, 1994. Pp.45-66.
---, '"The Masque of Truth": Court Entertainments and International Protestant Politics in Early Stuart Period'. *The Seventeenth Century* 1 (1986): 81-110.
---, 'The Monarchy of Wit and the Republic of Letters: Donne's Politics'. *Soliciting Interpretation: Literary Theory and Seventeenth-Century English Poetry*. Eds. Elizabeth D. Harvey and Katharine Eisaman Maus. Chicago: Chicago UP, 1990. Pp.3-36.
---, *Poetry and Politics in the English Renaissance*. 1984. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2002.
---, 'Rhetoric, Ideology and the Elizabethan World Picture'. *Renaissance Rhetoric*. Ed. Peter Mack. Houndmills: Macmillan Press, 1994. Pp.140-164.
---, 'The Life and Death of Renaissance Man'. *Raritan* 8 (1989): 89-110.
---, 'Women, the Republic of Letters, and the Public Sphere in the Mid-Seventeenth Century'. *Criticism* 46 (2004): 223-240.
Oakeshott, W. 'Sir Walter Ralegh's library'. *The Library*, 23 (1968): 285–32.
O'Callaghan, Michelle. *The "shepheards nation": Jacobean Spenserians and Early Stuart Political Culture 1612-1625*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2000.
---, '"Talking Politics": Tyranny, Parliament, and Christopher Brooke's *The Ghost of Richard the Third* (1614)'. *The Historical Journal* 41 (1998): 97-120.
---, 'Tavern societies, the Inns of Court, and the culture of conviviality in early seventeenth-century London'. Smyth, Adam, ed. *A pleasing sinne: drink and conviviality in seventeenth-century England*. Woodbridge, Suffolk: Brewer, 2004. Pp.37-51.
O Muraíle, Nollaig. *The Celebrated Antiquary Dubhaltach Mac Fhirbhisigh (c.1600-1671): His Lineage, Life and Learning.* Maynooth: An Sagart, 1996.
Onori, Lorenza Mochi, and Sebastian Schütze, Francesca Solinas, eds. *I Barberini e la Cultura Europea del Seicento: Atti del convegno internazionale Palazzo Barberini alle Quattro Fontane, 7-11 dicembre 2004.* Eds., Lorenza Mochi Onori, Sebastian Schütze, Francesca Solinas. Roma: De Luca Editori D'Arte, 2007.
Oram, William A. 'Spenser in Search of an Audience: The Kathleen Williams Lecture for 2004'. *Spenser Studies* 20 (2005): 23-47.
Ord, Melanie. 'Provincial Identification and Struggle over Representation in Thomas Coryat's *Crudities* (1611)'. *Archipelagic Identities: Literature and Identity in the Atlantic Archipelago, 1550-1800*. Eds. Philip Schwyzer and Simon Mealor. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004.
O'Sullivan, William. 'Correspondence of David Rothe and James Ussher, 1619-23'. *Collectanea Hibernica* 36-37 (1994-1995): 7-49.
---, 'A finding list of Sir James Ware's manuscripts', *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy, section* C 97 (1997): 69-99
Ovenden, Richard. 'Scipio Le Squyer and the Fate of Monastic Cartularies in the Early Seventeenth Century'. *The Library* 13:4 (1991): 323-337.
---, 'The libraries of the antiquaries (c.1580-1640) and the idea of a national collection'. *The Cambridge History of Libraries in Britain and Ireland*. Eds Elisabeth Leedham-Green and Teresa Webber. Cambridge: CUP, 2006. Pp.527-561.
Packer, John W. *The Transformation of Anglicanism, 1643-1660, with special reference to Henry Hammond.* Manchester: Manchester UP, 1969.
Palmer, Barbara D. 'Early Modern Mobility: Players, Payments, and Patrons'. *Shakespeare Quarterly* 56 (2005): 259-305.
Papy, Jan. 'An Antiquarian Scholar between Text and Image? Justus Lipsius, Humanist Education, and the Visualization of Ancient Rome'. *Sixteenth Century Journal* 35:1 (2004): 97-131.
Parenty, Hélène. *Isaac Casaubon, Helléniste: Des Studia Humanitatis à la philologie.* Geneva:

Droz, 2009.
Parry, Graham. *The Trophies of Time: English Antiquarians of the Seventeenth Century.* Oxford: OUP, 1995.
Pattison, Mark. *Isaac Casaubon 1559-1614.* London, 1875.
Pearn, B.R. 'Dumb-Show in Elizabethan Drama'. *Review of English Studies* 11 (1935): 385-405.
Peck, Linda Levy, ed. *The Mental World of the Jacobean Court*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1991.
---, 'Monopolizing Favour: Structures of Power in the Early Seventeenth-Century English Court'. *The World of the Favourite*. Ed. John H. Elliott and L.W.B. Brockliss. New Haven: Yale UP, 1999. Pp.54-70.
Pelling, Margaret and Scott Mandelbrote, eds., *The Practice of Reform in Health, Medicine and Science, 1500-2000.* Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005. 167-183, 175-76.
Peltonen, Markku. *Classical Humanism and Republicanism in English Political Thought 1570-1640*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1995.
Peterson, Richard S. *Imitation and Praise in the Poems of Ben Jonson*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1981.
Pfeiffer, Rudolf. *History of Classical Scholarship from 1300-1850.* Oxford, 1976.
---, 'Fabius Pictor and the Origins of National Historiography'. *The Classical Foundations of Modern Historiography.* Ed. Arnaldo Momigliano. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990.
Phythian-Adams, Charles. *Desolation of a City: Coventry and the Urban Crisis of the Later Middle Ages*. Cambridge: CUP, 1979.
Pincombe, Mike. 'Robert Dudley, *Gorboduc*, and "The masque of Beauty and Desire": A Reconsideration of the Evidence for Political Intervention'. *Parergon* 20 (2003): 19-44.
Pitcher, John. 'Samuel Daniel's Occasional and Dedicatory Verse: A Critical Edition'. D.Phil. thesis, University of Oxford, 1978.
Pocock, J.G.A., *Barbarism and Religion*. Cambridge, CUP, 1999-. 4 Vols. to date.
---, 'British History: A Plea for a New Subject'. *Journal of Modern History* 47 (1975): 601-24.
---, *The Ancient Constitution and the Feudal Law*. 1957. New York: Cambridge UP,1987.
Pomian, Krzysztof. 'De la lettre au périodique: la circulation des informations dans les milieux des historiens au XVIIe siècle'. *Organon* 10 (1974): 25-43.
Poole, William. *John Aubrey and the Advancement of Learning.* Oxford: Bodleian Library, 2010.
---, *The World Makers.* Oxford: Peter Lang, 2009.
Popkin, Richard. H. *The History of Scepticism from Erasmus to Spinoza.* Berkeley and London: California UP, 1979.
Powicke, Maurice. 'William Camden'. *Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association* 1 (1948): 67–84.
Poynton Mander, Gerald. *The History of the Wolverhampton Grammar School*. Wolverhampton: Steens, 1913.
Prescott, Anne Lake. 'Marginal Discourse: Drayton's Muse and Selden's "Story"'. *Studies in Philology* 88 (1991): 307-328.
Quantin, Jean-Louis. 'Du Chrysostome latin au Chrysostome grec. Une histoire européenne (1588-1613)'. *Chrysostomosbilder in 1600 Jahren: Facetten der Wirkungsgeschichte eines* Kirchenvaters. Eds., Martin Wallraff und Rudolf Brändle. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2008. Pp. 267-346.
---, *Le Catholicisme Classique et Les Pères de L'Église: Un retour aux Sources (1669-1713).* Paris, 1999.
---, 'Les Jésuites et l'érudition anglicane'. *XVIIe siècle* 237 (2007): 691-711.
---, 'L'Orthodoxie, La Censure et La Gloire: La Difficle Édition Princeps De L'Épître de Barnabé, de Rome à Amsterdam (1549-1646)'. *"Editiones Principes" Delle Opere Dei Padri Greci e Latini.* Ed. Mariarosa Cortesi. Firenze: SISIMEL, 2006.

---, 'Philologie et Théologie: Les Textes Patristique dans les Controverses Religieuses (XVIe-XVIIe Siècles)'. *Studia Borromaica* 21 (2007): 93-128.
---, *The Church of England and Christian Antiquity: The Construction of a Confessional Identity in the Seventeenth Century.* Oxford: OUP, 2009.
---, 'The Fathers in Seventeenth-Century Catholic Theology'. *The Reception of the Church Fathers in the West: From the Carolingians to the Maurists*. Ed. Irena Backus. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1997. 842-65.
---, 'The Fathers in Seventeenth-Century Anglican Theology'. *The Reception of the Church Fathers in the West: From the Carolingians to the Maurists*. Ed. Irena Backus. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
Quentin, Henri. *Jean-Dominique Mansi et les grandes collections conciliaires.* Paris, 1900.
Ramsay, Nigel. 'Libraries for antiquaries and heralds'. *The Cambridge History of Libraries in Britain and Ireland: Volume II: 1640-1850.* Eds Giles Mandelbrote and K.A. Manley. Cambridge: CUP, 2006.
Rappaport, Rhoda. *When Geologists Were Historians,1665-1750.* Cornell, 1997.
Rappaport, Steve. *Worlds within Worlds: Structures of Life in Sixteenth-Century London*. Cambridge: CUP, 1989.
Raylor, Timothy. *Cavaliers, Clubs, and Literary Culture: Sir John Mennes, James Smith, and the Order of the Fancy*. London and Toronto: Associated University Presses, 1994.
---, 'Newcastle's Ghosts: Robert Payne, Ben Jonson, and the 'Cavendish Circle'. *Literary Circles and Cultural Communities in Renaissance England*. Eds. Claude J. Summers and Ted-Larry Pebworth. Columbia: Missouri UP, 2000. Pp.92-114.
Reinmuth, H.S. 'Lord William Howard (1563-1640) and his Catholic associations'. *Recusant History* 12 (1973): 226-34.
Revard, Stella P. *The Tangles of Neaera's Hair: the making of the 1645 Poems.* Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1997.
Ribiero, Alvaro. 'Sir John Roe: Ben Jonson's Friend'. *Review of English Studies* 24 (1973): 153-64.
Richardson, Brenda. 'Robert Greene's Yorkshire Connexions: A New Hypothesis'. *Yearbook of English Studies* 10 (1980): 160-180.
Riddell, James. 'The Concluding Pages of the Jonson Folio of 1616'. *Studies in Bibliography* 47 (1994): 147-54.
---, 'The Printing of the Plays in the Jonson Folio of 1616'. *Studies in Bibliography* 50 (1997): 408-9.
Riggs, David. *Ben Jonson: A Life*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1989.
Rivet, A.L.F. and Jackson, Kenneth. 'The British Section of the Antonine Itinerary'. *Britannia* 1 (1970): 34-83.
Riddy, Felicity, ed. *Prestige, Authority and Power in Late Medieval Manuscripts and Texts*. York: York Medieval Press, 2000.
Robbins, Keith, ed. *Religion and humanism*. Ed. Keith Robbins. Blackwell: Oxford, 1981. Pp. 195-223.
Roberts, Brynley F. 'The Discovery of Old Welsh'. *Historiographia Linguistica* 26 (1999): 1-21.
Roberts, Julian. 'Extending the Frontiers: Scholar Collectors'. *The Cambridge History of Libraries in Britain and Ireland: Volume II: 1640-1850.* Eds., Giles Mandelbrote and K.A. Manley. Cambridge: CUP, 2006. Pp.292-321.
Roberts, Peter R. 'Wales and England after the Tudor "Union": Crown, Principality and Parliament, 1543-1624'. Claire Cross, David Loades, and J.J. Scarisbrick, eds. *Law and Government under the Tudors: Essays Presented to Sir Geoffrey Elton*. Cambridge: CUP, 1988. Pp.111-38.
Robinson, W.R. 'Dr. Thomas Phaer's Report on the Harbours and Customs Administration of Wales under Edward VI'. *Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies* (1972): 485-503.

Robinson Hammerstein, Helga, ed. *European Universities in the Age of Reformation and Counter Reformation*. Dublin: Four Courts Press, 1998.
Rockwood, Catherine. 'Topicality and Dissent in Jonson's *A Tale of a Tub*'. *Ben Jonson Journal* 10 (2003): 77-100.
Roebuck, Thomas and Laurie Maguire. *'Pericles* and the Language of National Origins'. *This England, That Shakespeare: New Angles on Englishness and the Bard.* Eds. Willy Maley and Margaret Tudeau-Clayton. Farnham: Ashgate, 2010.
---, and Matthew Sperling, '"The Glacial Question, Unsolved": A Specimen of Commentary on lines 1-31', *Glossator* 2 (2010): 39-78.
Rosenberg, Eleanor. *Leicester: Patron of Letters*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1955.
Rosenblatt, Jason P. and Winfried Schleiner. 'John Selden's Letter to Ben Jonson on Cross-Dressing and Bisexual Gods [with text]'. *English Literary Renaissance* 29 (1999): 44-74.
Rossi, Paolo. *The Dark Abyss of Time: The History of the Earth & the History of Nations from Hooke to Vico.* Chicago, 1984.
Roth, Cecil. 'Jews in Oxford after 1290'. *Oxoniensia* 15 (1950): 63-80.
---, 'Leone da Modena and his English Correspondents'. *Transactions of the Jewish Historical Society of England* 17 (1953): 39-43.
---, 'Oxford Starrs'. *Oxoniensia* 22 (1957): 63-77.
---, 'Sir Thomas Bodley, Hebraist'. *Bodleian Library Record* 7 (1966): 242-251.
Round, P.Z. 'Greene's Materials in *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*'. *Modern Language Review* 21 (1926): 19-21
Rowe, Nick. '"My Best Patron": William Cavendish and Jonson's Caroline Dramas'. *The Seventeenth Century* 9 (1994): 197-212.
Ruderman, David B. ed. *Essential Papers on Jewish Culture in Renaissance and Baroque Italy*. New York: New York University Press, 1992.
Russell, Conrad. *The Addled Parliament 1614: The Limits of Revision*. Reading: Reading UP, 1992.
---, *The Causes of the English Civil War: the Ford Lectures Delivered in the University of Oxford 1987-1988.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990.
---, *The Fall of the British Monarchies 1637-1642.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991.
Russell, G.A. ed. *The 'Arabick' Interest of the Natural Philosophers in Seventeenth Century England.* Leiden: Brill, 1994.
Salber Phillips, Mark. 'Reconsiderations on History and Antiquarianism: Arnaldo Momigliano and the Historiography of Eighteenth-Century Britain'. *Journal of the History of Ideas* 57 (1996): 297-316.
Samson Luborsky, Ruth. 'The Allusive Presentation of *The Shepheardes Calender*'. *Spenser Studies* 1 (1980): 29-67.
Julie Sanders. *Ben Jonson's Theatrical Republics*. Houndmills: Macmillan Press, 1998.
---, 'Jonson's Caroline Coteries'. *Shakespeare, Marlowe, Jonson: New Directions in Biography*. Eds. Takashi Kozuka and J.R. Mulryne. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006. Pp.279-294.
---, 'Jonson, *The Sad Shepherd* and the North Midlands'. *Ben Jonson Journal* 6 (1999): 49-68.
---, '*The New Inn* and *The Magnetic Lady*: Jonson's Dramaturgy in the Caroline Context'. *Jonsonians: Living Traditions*. Ed. Brian Woolland. Burlington: Ashgate, 2003. Pp.51-66.
---, and Kate Chedgzoy and Susan Wiseman, eds. *Refashioning Ben Jonson: Gender, Politics and the Jonsonian Canon*. Houndmills: Macmillan Press, 1998.
Sandys, J.E., *A History of Classical Scholarship*. Cambridge: CUP, 1906-1921. 3 vols.

Schoek, Richard J. 'Early Anglo-Saxon studies and legal scholarship in the Renaissance'. *Studies in the Renaissance* 5 (1958): 102-10.
Schwyzer, Philip. *Archaeologies of English Renaissance literature.* Oxford: OUP, 2007.
---, *Literature, Nationalism and Memory in Early Modern England and Wales.* Cambridge: CUP, 2004.
---, and Simon Mealor, eds. *Archipelagic Identities: Literature and Identity in the Atlantic Archipelago, 1550-1800*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2004.
---, 'Purity and Danger on the West Bank of the Severn: The Cultural Geography of *A Masque Presented at Ludlow Castle, 1634*', *Representations* 60 (1997): 22-48.
Scott, Alison V. 'Marketing the Gift: Jonson, Multiple Patronage, and Strategic Exchange'. *Parergon* 20 (2003): 135-159.
Scott Robinson, Benedict. 'John Foxe and the Anglo-Saxons'. *John Foxe and his World*. Eds Christopher Highley and John N. King. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2002.
Scragg, Donald and Carole Weinberg, eds. *Literary Appropriations of the Anglo-Saxons.* Cambridge: CUP, 2000.
Serjeantson, Richard and Woolford, Thomas. 'The Scribal Publication of a Printed Book: Francis Bacon's *Certaine Considerations Touching...the Church of England* (1604)'. *The Library* 10:2 (2009): 119-156.
Sedley, David N. *Plato's Cratylus*. Cambridge: CUP, 2003.
Sellin, Paul R. *Daniel Heinsius and Stuart England.* Leiden: Leiden UP, 1968.
Selywn, P. M.. '"Such speciall bookes of Mr Somersettes as were sould to Mr Secretary": the fate of Robert Glover's collections'. *Books and collectors, 1200–1700: essays presented to Andrew Watson.* London: British Library, 1997.
Shannon, Laurie. *Sovereign Amity: Figures of Friendship in Shakespearean Contexts*. Chicago: Chicago UP, 2002.
Shapiro, Barbara J.. *A Culture of Fact: England, 1550-1720.* Ithaca and London: Cornell UP, 2000.
Shapiro, James. 'The Scot's Tragedy and the Politics of Popular Drama', *English Literary Renaissance* 23 (1993): 428-449.
Sharpe, Kevin. *Criticism and Compliment: The Politics of Literature in the England of Charles I*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1987.
---, and Peter Lake, eds. *Culture and Politics in Early Stuart England*. Houndmills: Macmillan Press, 1994.
---, 'The Earl of Arundel, his Circle, and the Opposition to the Duke of Buckingham, 1618-1628'. *Faction and Parliament: Essays on Early Stuart History*. Ed. Kevin Sharpe. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978. Pp.209-44.
---, ed. *Faction and Parliament: Essays on Early Stuart History*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978.
---, *Politics and Ideas in Early Stuart England*. London and New York: Pinter Publishers, 1989.
---, and Steven Zwicker, eds. *Politics of Discourse: The Literature and History of Seventeenth-Century England*. Berkley: California UP, 1987.
---, *Remapping Early Modern England: The culture of seventeenth century politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2000.
---, *Sir Robert Cotton, 1586-1631: History and Politics in Early Modern England*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1979.
---, 'The Foundation of the Chairs of History at Oxford and Cambridge: An Episode in Jacobean Politics'. *History of Universities* 2 (1982): 127-52.
Sharpe, Richard. 'In Quest of Pictish Manuscripts'. *The Innes Review* 59:2 (2008): 145-167.
---, 'The English Bibliographical Tradition from Kirkstede to Tanner'. *Britannia Latina.* Eds Charles Burnett and Nicholas Mann. London, 2005. Pp. 86-128.

Shoulson, Jeffrey. '"Proprietie in this Hebrew poesy": George Wither, Judaism, and the formation of English national identity'. *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 98 (1999): 353-72.
Shrank, Cathy. 'Civility and the City in *Coriolanus'. SQ* (2003): 406-423.
---, *Writing the Nation in Reformation England, 1530-1580.* Oxford: OUP, 2004.
Skinner, Quentin. *Renaissance Virtues*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2002. Vol. 2 of *Visions of Politics*. 3 vols. 2002.
Slights, William W.E. *Managing Readers: Printed Marginalia in English Renaissance Books*. Michigan: Michigan UP, 2001.
Smith, Anthony D. *Myths and Memories of the Nation.* Oxford: OUP, 1999.
Smith, Roland M. 'Spenser, Holinshed, and the Leabhar Gabhála'. *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 43 (1944): 390-401.
Smuts, Malcolm R. 'Court Centred Politics and the Use of Roman Historians, 1590-1630'. *Culture and Politics in Early Stuart England*. Eds. Kevin Sharpe and Peter Lake. Houndmills: Macmillan Press, 1994. Pp.21-43.
---, *Court Culture and the Origins of a Royalist Tradition in Early Stuart England*. Philadelphia: Philadelphia UP, 1987.
---, 'Cultural Diversity and Cultural Change at the Court of James I'. *The Mental World of the Jacobean Court*. Ed. Linda Levy Peck. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1991. Pp.99-112.
---, ed. *The Stuart court and Europe: Essays in politics and political culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1996.
Smyth, Adam, ed. *A pleasing sinne: drink and conviviality in seventeenth-century England*. Woodbridge: Brewer, 2004.
Somerset, J.A.B. 'How chances it they travel?' Provincial touring, playing places, and the King's Men'. *Shakespeare Survey* 47 (1994): 45-60.
Somerville, Johann P. 'English and European Political Ideas in the Early Seventeenth Century: Revisionism and the Case of Absolutism'. *Journal of British Studies* 35 (1996): 168-94.
---, 'Ideology, Property and the Constitution'. *Conflict in Early Stuart England: Studies in Religion and Politics, 1603-1642*. Eds. Richard Cust and Ann Hughes. London and New York: Longman, 1989. Pp.47-71.
---, 'King James VI and I and John Selden: Two Voices on History and the Constitution'. *Royal Subjects: Essays on the Writings of James VI and I*. Eds. Daniel Fischlin and Mark Fortier. Detroit: Wayne State UP, 2002. Pp.290-322.
---, *Royalists and Patriots: Politics and Ideology in England 1603-1640*. 1986. Harlow: Pearson Education, 1999.
Sosower, Mark L. 'Greek Manuscripts Acquired by Henry and Thomas Savile in Padua'. *Bodleian Library Record* 19:2 (2006): 157-184.
Stahl, Alan G. ed. *The Rebirth of Antiquity: Numismatics, Archaeology and Classical Studies in the Culture of the Renaissance.* Princeton University Library Chronicle, Winter, 2008.
Steggle, Matthew. *Richard Brome: Place and politics on the Caroline stage*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 2004.
Stenhouse, William. 'Georg Fabricius and inscriptions as a source of law'. *Renaissance Studies* 17 (2003): 96-107.
---, *Reading Inscriptions and Writing Ancient History: Historical Scholarship in the Late Renaissance.* London: Institute of Classical Studies, 2005.
Stern, Tiffany. '"On each Wall and Corner Poast": Playbills, Title-pages, and Advertising in Early Modern London'. *English Literary Renaissance* (2006): 57-89.
---, *Documents of Performance in Early Modern England*. Cambridge: CUP, 2009.
Stolye, Mark. *West Britons: Cornish Identities and the Early Modern British State.* Exeter: Exeter

UP, 2002.
Stone, P.W.K. *The Textual History of King Lear*. London: Scolar Press, 1980.
Strachan, Michael. *The Life and Adventures of Thomas Coryate*. London: Oxford UP, 1962.
Stretter, Robert. 'Cicero on Stage: *Damon and Pithias* and the Fate of Classical Friendship in English Renaissance Drama'. *Texas Studies in Literature and Language* 47 (2005): 345-365.
Strong, Roy. *Henry Prince of Wales and England's Lost Renaissance*. London: Thames and Hudson, 1986.
Summers, Claude J. and Ted-Larry Pebworth, eds. *Literary Circles and Cultural Communities in Renaissance England*. Columbia and London: Missouri UP, 2000.
Sweet, Rosemary. *Antiquaries: The Discovery of the Past in Eighteenth-Century Britain.* Hambledon and London, 2004.
Tatlock, J.S.P. *The Legendary History of Britain: Geoffrey of Monmouth's Historia Regum Britanniae and its Early Vernacular Versions*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: California UP, 1950.
Tavoni, M. 'Renaissance Linguistics'. *History of Linguistics, iii: Renaissance and Early Modern Linguistics*. Ed. G. Lepschy. London: Longman 1998; 4 vols. Pp.1-108.
Taylor, Charles. *A Secular Age.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP, 2007.
Thomas, Keith. 'The Life of Learning'. *Proceedings of the British Academy* 117 (2002): 201-35.
---, *The Perception of the Past in Early Modern England.* London: University of London, 1983.
Thornton Burnett, Mark and Ramona Wray, eds. *Shakespeare and Ireland: History, Politics, Culture.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1997.
Tiner, Elza. 'Patrons and Travelling Companies in Warwickshire'. *Early Theatre* 4 (2001): 35-52.
Tite, Colin. *The Early Records of Sir Robert Cotton's Library.* London: The British Library, 2003.
Timpanaro, Sebastiano. *The Genesis of Lachmann's Method* trans. Glenn W. Most. Chicago: Chicago UP, 2005.
Tittler, Robert. *Architecture and Power: The Town Hall and the English Urban Community c.1500-1640*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991.
---, *The Reformation and the Towns in England: Politics and Political Culture, c.1540-1640.* Oxford: Clarendon, 1998.
---, 'Early Modern British History, Here and There, Now and Again'. *Albion* 31 (1999): 190-206.
---, *Townspeople and Nation: English Urban Experiences, 1540-1640*. Stanford: *Stanford UP, 2001.*
G. J. Toomer. *Eastern Wisedome and Learning: The Study of Arabic in Seventeenth Century England*. Oxford: OUP, 1996.
---, 'John Selden, the Levant and the Netherlands in the History of Scholarship'. *The Republic of Letters and the Levant.* Eds Alastair Hamilton, Maurits H. van den Boogert, and Bart Westerweel. Leiden and Boston, 2005. Pp. 53-76.
---, *John Selden: A Life in Scholarship.* Oxford: OUP, 2009; 2 vols.
---, 'Selden's *Historie of Tithes*: Genesis, Publication, Aftermath'. *Huntington Library Quarterly* 65 (2002): 345-78.
Townsend, Freda L. 'Ben Jonson's 'Censure' of Rutter's *Shepheards Holy-Day*'. *Modern Philology* 44 (1947): 238-247.
Trevor-Roper, Hugh. 'James Ussher'. *Catholics, Anglicans, and Puritans: Seventeenth Century Essays.* London: Secker & Warburg, 1987.
---, 'The Church of England and the Greek Church in the Time of Charles I'. *From Counter-Reformation to Glorious Revolution.* London: Secker and Warburg, 1992.

Tribble, Evelyn. *Margins and Marginality: The Printed Page in Early Modern England*. Charlottesville: Virginia UP, 1993.
Tuck, Richard. '"The Ancient Law of Freedom": John Selden and the Civil War'. *Reactions to the English Civil War 1642-1649*. Ed. John Morrill. New York, 1983.
Tucker, George Hugo. *The poet's odyssey : Joachim Du Bellay and the 'Antiquitez de Rome'.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990.
Tudeau-Clayton, Margaret. *Jonson, Shakespeare and early modern Virgil*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1998.
Turner, Henry S. *The English Renaissance Stage: Geometry, Poetics and the Practical Spatial Arts 1580-1630*. Oxford: OUP, 2006.
Tylus, Jane. 'Jacobean Poetry and Lyric Disappointment'. *Soliciting Interpretation*. Eds. Elizabeth D. Harvey and Katharine Eisaman Maus. Chicago: Chicago UP, 1990.
Ultee, Maarten. 'The Republic of Letters: Learned Correspondence, 1680-1720'. *The Seventeenth Century* 2 (1987): 95-112.
Underdown, David. *A Freeborn people: Politics and the Nation in Seventeenth-Century England*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.
Wadmore, J.F. 'Some Account of the History and Antiquities of The Worshipful Company of Skinners, London'. *Transactions of the London and Middlesex Archaeological Society* 5 (1876-80): 92-182.
Wall, Wendy. *Staging Domesticity: Household Work and English Identity in Early Modern Drama*. Cambridge: CUP, 2002.
Wallace, David. *Premodern Places*. Oxford: OUP, 2004.
Wallraff, Martin and Rudolf Brändle, eds. *Chrysostomosbilder in 1600 Jahren: Facetten der Wirkungsgeschichte eines* Kirchenvaters. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2008.
Walker, Greg. *The Politics of Performance in early Renaissance drama*. Cambridge: CUP, 1998.
Waquet, Françoise. 'Qu'est-ce que la République des Lettres? Essai de sémantique historique'. *Bibliothèque de l'École des chartes* 147 (1989): 473-502.
---, , ed. *Mapping the World of Learning: the Polyhistor of Daniel Georg Morhof.* Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2000.
Wagner, Sir Anthony. *Heralds of England: A History of the Office and College of Arms.* London, 1967.
Ward, Joseph P. *Metropolitan Communities: Trade Guilds, Identity, and Change in Early Modern London*. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1997.
Watkins, John. *Representing Elizabeth in Stuart England: Literature, History, Sovereignty*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2002.
Wayne, Don. *Penshurst: The Semiotics of Place and the Poetics of History*. London: Methuen, 1984.
Webster, Tom. *Godly Clergy in Early Stuart England: The Caroline Puritan Movement, c.1620-1643.* Cambridge: CUP, 1997.
Weil Baker, David. '"Dealt with at his owne weapon": Anti-Antiquarianism in Milton's Prelacy Tracts'. *Studies in Philology* 106:4 (2009): 207-234.
Weinberg, Joanna. 'Azariah de' Rossi and the Forgeries of Annius of Viterbo'. *Essential Papers on Jewish Culture in Renaissance and Baroque Italy*. Ed. David B. Ruderman. New York: New York University Press, 1992. Pp.252-79.
---, ed. and trans. *The Light of the Eyes.* New Haven and London: Yale UP, 2001.
---, 'Where Three Civilizations Meet'. *History and Theory* 30 (1991): 13-26.
Weiss, Roberto. *The Renaissance Discovery of Classical Antiquity.* Oxford: Blackwell, 1969.
Wesselius, W. 'Johannes Drusius the Younger's Last Journey to England and his Hebrew letter-book'. *Lias* 16 (1989): 159-176.

Westfall, Suzanne R. *Patrons and Performance: Early Tudor Household Revels*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990.
Wheeler, G.A. ed. *Letters Addressed to Thomas James, First Keeper of Bodley's Library*. Oxford: OUP, 1933.
Wheeler, G.W. ed. *Letters of Sir Thomas Bodley to Thomas James, first Keeper of the Bodleian Library.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1926.
White, Paul Whitfield. 'Patronage, Protestantism and Stage Propaganda in Early Elizabethan England'. *Yearbook of English Studies* 21 (1991): 39-52.
---, *Theatre and Reformation: Protestantism, Patronage, and Playing in Tudor England*. Cambridge: CUP, 1993.
---, and Suzanne R. Westfall, eds. *Shakespeare and Theatrical Patronage in Early Modern England*. Cambridge: CUP, 2002.
Whitfield, Christopher. *Robert Dover and the Cotswold Games*. London: Henry Sotheran Ltd, 1962.
Williams, Franklin B. 'Commendatory Verses: The Rise of the Art of Puffing'. *Studies in Bibliography* 19 (1966): 1-14.
Williams, Penry. 'The Crown and the Counties'. *The Reign of Elizabeth I.* Ed. Christopher Haigh. Houndmills: Macmillan, 1984.
Williamson, Elia and John McGavin. 'Crossing the Border: The Provincial Records of Southeast Scotland'. Eds. Audrey Douglas and Sally-Beth Maclean. *REED in Review: Essays in Celebration of the First Twenty-Five Years*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2006. Pp.157-177.
Wilson, J. 'The First Historian of Cumberland'. *The Scottish Historical Review* 8 (1910-11): 5-21.
Wilson, Luke. *Theatres of Intention: Drama and Law in Early Modern England*. Stanford: Stanford UP, 2000.
Wiseman, Susan. *Drama and Politics in the English Civil War*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1998
---, '"The Eccho of Uncertaintie": Jonson, Classical Drama, and the English Civil War'. *Refashioning Ben Jonson: Gender, Politics and the Jonsonian Canon*. Eds. Julie Sanders, Kate Chedgzoy and Susan Wiseman. Houndmills: Macmillan Press, 1998. Pp.208-229.
Withington, Eleanor. 'Nicholas Briot and Jonson's Commendation of Joseph Rutter'. *Notes and Queries* 198 (1953): 152-53.
Withington, Philip. 'Two Renaissances: Urban Political Culture in Post-Reformation England Reconsidered'. *The Historical Journal* 44 (2001): 239-267.
---, *The Politics of Commonwealth: Citizens and Freemen in Early Modern England*. Cambridge: CUP, 2005.
Woolf, Daniel. *The Idea of History in Early Stuart England: Erudition, Ideology, and 'The Light of Truth' from the Accession of James I to the Civil War.* Toronto: Toronto UP, 1990.
---, *Reading History in Early Modern England.* Cambridge: CUP, 2000.
---, *The Social Circulation of the Past: English Historical Culture, 1500-1730.* Oxford: OUP, 2003.
Wolf, F.A. *Prolegomena to Homer* trans. Anthony Grafton, Glenn W. Most and James E.G. Zetzel. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1985.
Wollman, Richard B. '"Speak that I may see thee": Aurality in Ben Jonson's Print Poetry'. *Ben Jonson Journal* 3 (1996): 21-37.
Womack, Peter. 'Imagining Communities: Theatres and the English Nation in the Sixteenth Century'. *Culture and History 1350-1600: Essays on English Communities, Identities and Writing*. Ed. David Aers. New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1992. Pp.91-145.

Womersley, David. 'Against the Teleology of Technique'. *Huntington Library Quarterly* 68 (2005): 95-108.
Wood, D. ed. *Martyrs and Martyrologies*. Oxford: Studies in Church History 30, 1993.
Wormald, Jenny. 'Oh Brave New World? The Union of Scotland and England in 1603'. T.C. Smout, ed. *Anglo-Scottish Relations from 1603-1900*. *Proceedings of the British Academy* 127 (2005): 13-35.
C.E. Wright. 'Sir Edward Dering: A Seventeenth-Century Antiquary and his "Saxon" Charters'. *The Early Cultures of North-West Europe.* Eds Cyril Fox and Bruce Dickens. Cambridge: CUP, 1950.
Woolf, Daniel R. *The Idea of History in Early Stuart England: Erudition, Ideology, and 'The Light of Truth' from the Accession of James I to the Civil War*. Toronto: Toronto UP, 1990.
---, *Reading History in Early Modern England*. Cambridge: CUP, 2000.;
---, *The Social Circulation of the Past: English Historical Culture, 1500-1730*. Oxford: OUP, 2003.
Woolland, Brian, ed. *Jonsonians: Living Traditions*. Burlington: Ashgate Publishing, 2003.
Worden, Blair. 'Ben Jonson among the Historians'. *Culture and Politics in Early Stuart England*. Eds. Kevin Sharpe and Peter Lake. Houndmills: The Macmillan Press, 1994. Pp.67-89.
---, 'Historians and Poets'. *Huntington Library Quarterly* 68 (2005): 71-93.
Woudhuysen, Henry R. 'Leicester's Literary Patronage: A Study of the English Court, 1578-1582'. DPhil thesis. University of Oxford, 1981.
Wright, Christopher John. *Sir Robert Cotton as Collector: Essays on an early Stuart courtier and his legacy*. London: British Library, 1997. Pp. 105-28.
Wrightson, Keith. 'The Politics of the Parish in Early Modern England'. Eds. Paul Griffiths, Adam Fox and Steve Hindle. *The Experience of Authority in Early Modern England*. Houndmills: Macmillan, 1996. Pp.10-46.
---, *Earthly Necessities: Economic Lives in Early Modern Britain*. New Haven and London: Yale UP, 2000.
Vagenheim, Ginette. 'L'épigraphie: Un aspect méconnu de l'histoire de la philologie classique au XVIIe siècle'. *Les cahiers de l'humanisme* 1 (2000): 89-115.
van der Meer, Jitse M. and Mandelbrote, Scott eds. *Nature and Scripture in the Abrahamic Religions: Up to 1700*. Leiden: Brill, 2008; 2 vols.
Van Es, Bart. *Spenser's Forms of History.* Oxford: OUP, 2002.
van Norden, Linda. 'Peiresc and the English Scholars'. *Huntington Library Quarterly* 12 (1949): 369-389.
---, 'Sir Henry Spelman on the Chronology of the Elizabethan College of Antiquaries'. *Huntington Library Quarterly* 13:2 (1950): 131-160.
---, 'The Elizabethan College of Antiquaries'. Ph.D. thesis, University of California at Los Angeles, 1946.
---, 'Celtic Antiquarianism in the "Curious Discourses"', *Essays Critical and Historical, Dedicated to Lily B. Campbell*. Berkley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1950. Pp.65-70.
van Rooden, Peter T. *Theology, Biblical Scholarship and Rabbinical Studies in the Seventeenth Century: Constantijn L'Empereur (1591-1648), Professor of Hebrew and Theology at Leiden.* Leiden: Brill, 1989.
Verbogen, Jan. 'Martinus Smetius et Angelo Colocci. Une collection romaine d'inscriptions antiques au XVIe siècle'. *Humanistica Lovaniensia* 34 (1985): 255-272.
Vine, Angus. 'Etymology, Names and the Search for Origins: Deriving the Past in Early Modern England'. *The Seventeenth Century* 21 (2006): 1-21.

---, *In Defiance of Time* . Oxford: OUP, 2010.
Vinogradoff, Paul. *Roman Law in Medieval Europe.* Oxford, 1929.
Yoch, James J. 'The Renaissance Dramatization of Temperance: The Italian Revival of Tragicomedy and *The Faithful Shepherdess*'. *Renaissance Tragicomedy: Explorations in Genre and Politics*. Ed. Nancy Klein Maguire. New York: AMS Press, 1987. Pp.115-38.
Youings, J. 'Some early topographers of Devon and Cornwall'. *Topographical Writers in South-west England.* Ed. M. Brayshay. Exeter: Exeter UP, 1996. Pp.50-61.
Zagorin, Perez. *The Court and Country: the Beginning of the English Revolution*. London: Routledge, 1969.