

most certainly referring to his own intended writings and the manner in which they would glorify England's past. What the *De uiris illustribus* represents in part is an account, and a detailed one, of the acts of Henry's noble progenitors and other illustrious individuals as revealed by British writers. Presented with eloquence—substance and style united—these were the fragments he shored up against the ruins of the monastic dissolutions.⁵⁷⁶

III. THE EDITIONS

A. 'Such and so confounded': *The Manuscript*

1. Physical Makeup and Mise-en-Page

Written on paper and in a modern binding, Bodl. MS Top. gen. c. 4 has been trimmed since Leland's time: it now measures, generally speaking, 185 × 280 mm. Leland made use of several stocks of paper with the following watermarks:

- a. Briquet 1255 ('shield with bird'). This was used for many of the entries in Stage I and was also employed for entries in Stage II written on formerly blank pages. It constitutes the main paper stock.
- b. Briquet 11383; Piccard XVII. V. 1618 ('hand with flower'). This paper stock was not used for entries in Stage I, but it appeared soon afterwards. A number of entries in a characteristic hand, not quite identical to Stage I (cc. 180, 218, 246 etc.), are written on this paper. It is found at the

lectanea from medieval chronicles show, Leland was himself a meticulous editor, and as a rule he did not normally silently emend but rather put his alternative reading above the line.

⁵⁷⁶ No doubt Leland did hope that the books he gathered in his study would also be printed, but there is no evidence that he saw this as a task he himself could accomplish. Bale, who was aware of the immensity of the task, suggested assembling a team to publish those medieval authors worthy of note: 'Lete one noble man therfore, nowe that the scryptures are plenteously spredde, bring fourth one noble author, and an other empreinte an other, to the conservacion of Englandes Antiquitees. In lyke case lete one ryche merchaunte brynge one worthye worke of an auncyent wryter to lyght, and an other put fourth an other, to the bewtie of our nacyon. Besides the Bryttyshe authors, whome I oft named afore, lete one bryng fourth *Bedas de gestis Anglorum*, an other Willyam of Malmesbery *de gestis Pontificum & Regum*. Lete an other brynge fourth Simeon of Durham wyth Rycharde and Johan of Haugustalde, an other Aldrede, and Wyllyam of Rievall wyth Marianus the Scott, an other Giraldus Cambrensis, an other Henry of Huntyngton, an other Alphrede of Beverlay, an other Florence of Worcestre, and an other Walter of Excestre, an other Roger Hoveden, an other Mathew Parys, on other Johan Bever, an other Radulphus Niger, an other Radulphus de Diceto, an other William Newburg of Bridlington, an other Johan of Oxforde, an other *Scala temporum*, an other *Flores historiarum*, Asserius, Observus (*sic*), Gervasius, Stephanides, and Richardus Divisiensis of Winchestre, wyth a wonderfull nombre besydes' (*Laboryouse journey*, sig. Fvi^r–Fvii^r). On his scheme see P. Schwyzer, *Literature, Nationalism, and Memory in Early Modern England and Wales* (Cambridge 2004), 63–75, who maintains that Bale did not accomplish this project because he was ultimately convinced that the 'texts dearest to his heart' did not exist: 'In short, Bale's project of national beautification in *The Laboryouse Journey* may have had less to do with the production of printed texts than with the production of nostalgia' (73).

beginning and the end of the manuscript where there are late entries and blank pages, and is the second most common stock.

- c. Piccard XVII. V. 1479* ('hand with flower'). This watermark is closely similar but not identical to Piccard XVII. V. 1479 (hence the asterisk). The stock in which it appears was not regularly used, but it was employed in what were perhaps the earliest entries, that is cc. 161 (Geoffrey of Monmouth) and 239 (William Shirwood).
- d. Briquet 12502 ('jug with cross above'). This appears rarely, but was used in Stage I.
- e. Briquet 12503* ('jug with cross above'). This watermark, closely similar to Briquet 12503, was used in Stage I.
- f. Unidentified jug with flower. This was used in Stage I.
- g. Briquet 12759* ('jug with fleur de lys above'). This appears only in very late additions.

The manuscript consists of 177 folios, numbered as 354 pages, preceded by three flyleaves and seven leaves containing a later index, and followed by six flyleaves. Leland did not normally employ quire signatures, but they do appear in a short sequence of entries and then twice later on. It is not clear why he took up or abandoned the practice.⁵⁷⁷

An autograph, the text is written in Leland's italic hand, characteristic of English humanists of his generation.⁵⁷⁸ The handwriting in Stage I is tighter, neater, and more formal than the cursive hand of Stage II. It is also much more unified in appearance than Stage II, which represents several different phases of activity, some undertaken fairly soon after the original composition.

Leland planned each chapter as a distinct Life of the author, and some of the longer ones can be seen as independent units.⁵⁷⁹ The *mise-en-page* emphasizes the separate identity of the individual chapters; if at all possible, Leland avoided carrying on a chapter to a new page, even if this meant compacting his

⁵⁷⁷ Quire signatures are found on the following pages: 168 and 169; 184 and 185; [192] and 193; 202 and 203; 212 and 213; 220 and 221; 222 and 223; 234 and 235; 250 and 251; 256 and 257; [260] and 261; 282 and 283; 304 and 305; 336 and 337. There is no signature on p. 192 because the text originally went from p. 184 to 193; likewise, p. 261 originally came after p. 245.

⁵⁷⁸ A. G. Petti, *English Literary Hands from Chaucer to Dryden* (London 1977), 71, provides a description of the specific features: 'A large, squarish, partially cursive *italic* hand, which presumably Leland learned in his Cambridge days, Cambridge being a main centre for the humanistic scripts in England. . . . The letters are well-proportioned, even if idiosyncratic and with hairline links which do not quite fulfil their function. . . . Among the distinctive letter forms are *e* made in two pen lifts, looking like a *c* intersected by an acute angle forming the lobe; *d* with a cross-stroke linking the bowl to the shaft; and *w* comprising large *v* intersected by a smaller *v*, which usually has a horizontal introductory stroke'. Concerning Leland's interest in handwriting in general see A. Fairbank and B. Wolpe, *Renaissance Handwriting. An Anthology of Italic Scripts* (London 1960), 62–3.

⁵⁷⁹ In the commentary to the *Cygneia cantio*, for example, Leland claimed to have written a Life of Sigeberht ('Sigeberti, cuius nos uitam scripsimus') (*Cygneia cantio*, ed. Hearne, 68), but it is likely that he was referring to c. 57 (Stage I). Elsewhere, as in a marginal note to c. 555 (Stage I), he describes individual units of the text as 'uitae'.

handwriting or making use of the margins. (See Plate 4.) Sometimes, too, he left a larger than normal space after he completed a chapter in order to avoid beginning a new entry in a limited area. His primary organizing principle was chronological, as we have seen, and in the early stages of his composition he was aware that there would be gaps to be filled as he continued his researches. Often, therefore, he began an entry part way down the page or used only the top half in order to accommodate possible additions; blank leaves were left as well.⁵⁸⁰

Unlike Bale, who recorded the authors and titles making up his *Index Britanniae scriptorum* in a notebook which had already been assembled, Leland put together booklets that were left loose until very late in the process. The fact, moreover, that the booklets were not bound allowed Leland to insert leaves as he discovered new information, or even new authors whose floruits necessitated their inclusion between entries which had already fully occupied the available space.⁵⁸¹

The pagination is late, and pages whose margins had been filled at the place where numbers would have been inserted, such as pp. 163, 177, 199 etc., were left unpaginated. The numbers appear to be in Leland's hand, and this suggests that he assembled the manuscript in its present form towards the end of his active life. It may also indicate that he believed the task to be nearing completion and that there would be no more major shiftings or insertions. On the other hand, there were a number of individuals whose writings he had seen and who did not find their way into the text—Robert Cowton, Gilbert Foliot, Goscelin of Canterbury, William Heytesbury, Michael Smaulfield, Roger of Salisbury, William Sudbury, and Thomas Wykes—and one must presume that he was still waiting to find the right place to insert them.

The precise make-up of the volume as it now exists provides considerable evidence about the order of composition, and in Appendix 4 I have undertaken a detailed analysis gathering by gathering. Because the manuscript was tightly rebound, however, at a later time, it is impossible to be certain about every detail, and some of my specific points must remain tentative.⁵⁸²

⁵⁸⁰ On occasion he wrote a name but added the entry later, as in c. 135 (where he also changed the original 'Elfuuardus' to 'Ealfuueardus'). A number of these names derive from Trithem. Sometimes he crossed out a previously entered heading in order to finish a chapter. For example, Henry of Huntingdon's name appears at the top of p. 161, but it was then moved to p. 162, so that the chapter on William of Malmesbury could be completed.

⁵⁸¹ This provides an explanation for some of the blank leaves that remain. For example, the chapter on Ambrosius Merlinus (c. 26) began on p. 37, but went beyond the bifolium allotted to it (pp. 37–40). Leland therefore inserted a new bifolium, comprising pp. 35–36, 41–42, and completed his entry on p. 41. He left the rest of this page blank, but provided an entry for Maugantius (c. 28) on p. 42. When he returned to the manuscript later, he inserted an entry for Merlin the Caledonian (c. 27) in the blank area on p. 41, as well as short entries for Amphibalus and Teilo (cc. 29, 30) on p. 42. He never, however, found anything to fill the first half of the inserted bifolium, that is pp. 35–36, and so these pages remained blank.

⁵⁸² The present binding is a standard library binding of the first half of the nineteenth century.

2. Later Hands

There are comparatively few annotations by subsequent users and these can be classified as follows.

- a. The title-page, table of contents, and marginal notes on pp. 70, 184, 189, 258, 273, 323, 327, 333, 336, 340, 341, and 354, are written by William Burton (who acquired it in 1612), as comparison with his handwriting in Bodl. MS Bodley 470 (*SC* 2490) shows.
- b. More or less contemporary with Burton's, another hand makes some interlinear additions to the table of contents as well as providing in the margins of the text a few miscellaneous annotations (on pp. 81, 94, and 121) and a number of cross-references in the form 'Vide p. 000'. It is a mixed hand characterized by a vertically compressed aspect combined with separation of the characters.
- c. Earlier than the other two, this hand, clearly italic, makes use of flourishes such as elongated ascenders and exaggerated loops, and is written with very fine strokes. It briefly notes points of interest in the margin on pp. 11, 70, 83, 84, 110, 141, 171, and 300. There are, in addition, notes in differing hands in the margins of pp. 15, 37 and 49 which are not by this hand but which share affinities with it.
- d. This hand, possibly that of its eighteenth-century editor Anthony Hall, is responsible for notes concerning the arrangement of material in the manuscript on pp. 259, 262, 263, and 264.⁵⁸³
- e. An inserted leaf contains a note about the author Richardus Anglicus in what looks like an early eighteenth-century hand that does not occur elsewhere in the manuscript.

B. '*Maye hys worke come ones to lyght*': John Bale's *Epitome*

The letter sent to Bale in 1547 concerning Leland's mental state and the unlikelihood that he would bring any of his intended works to fruition, including *De uiris illustribus*, quite possibly precipitated Bale's decision to prepare the *Summarium* for print. In mid-1536, when Bale wrote the preface to the *Anglorum Heliades*, he believed that the *De uiris illustribus* was nearing completion and would soon be issued forth: 'Plurimum uere glorie tum tibi tum uniuerse nostre nationi pariet historia illa quam pre manibus habes, quam spero ad omnium utilitatem in breui e tuis officinis in publicum prodituram' (Truly that history which you now hold in your hands will bring great glory to yourself and to all our nation. I hope that it will soon come forth from your study into the public for the use of all).⁵⁸⁴ In 1547 more than a decade had passed, and not only was the *De uiris illustribus* still in manuscript, it now seemed

⁵⁸³ For examples of Hall's hand see Bodl. MS Ballard 18 (*SC* 10804), fols. 41–46.

⁵⁸⁴ Harley 3838, fol. 1r.

unlikely that it would ever appear. Bale therefore brought out his own account of British writers, even though it was written in exile, with its author denied access to many of the primary documents that would have filled it out.⁵⁸⁵ Bale also realized, however, that the *Summarium* was an interim measure and he claimed that it would be supplanted when the ‘richer [labours] issue forth’ from his quondam mentor’s ‘more cultivated pen’. His tribute to Leland in the preface to the *Summarium*, nevertheless, testifies both to his ostensible admiration and to an increasing impatience: ‘Caeterum Ioannes Lelandus, uir absolute eruditus & eloquens, Britannicaeque antiquitatis studiosissimus, non impigre his manum apposuit, cuius ornatissimos labores sitientibus desyderiis in dies expectamus’ (John Leland, a man deeply learned and eloquent, most studious of British antiquity, put his hand to these same matters, but not energetically, and we await daily with thirsty desire his most distinguished labours).⁵⁸⁶

On his return to England *ca* 1548 Bale was appalled by what he saw around him, describing his countrymen in sad understatement as ‘muche geuen to the destruccyon of thynges memorable’.⁵⁸⁷ Nevertheless, he set about augmenting the *Summarium* from the evidence of surviving manuscripts, and by 1549 he had planned a much extended sequel:

Sumwhat more is it than a yere past, sens I put fourth a worke of the same argument, entytled *de scriptoribus Britannicis*, conteynyng .v. bokes wyth serten addycyons whych I gathered togyther beyng out of the realme. Sens I returned agayne therunto, by the serche of dyverse most ruynouslye spoyled, broaken up, and dyspersed lybraryes, I have collected by no small labour & dyligence, so muche as wyll make so many bokes more, besydes the necessarye recognycyon and frutefull augmentacyon of the seyd first worke. Thys lattre worke intende I to set fourth also, to the commodyte of my contrey, as it is ones fynysshed, yf povertie withstande me not, as it is my most doubt.⁵⁸⁸

He wished to make clear that this new project, which would be published in 1557–9 as the *Scriptorum illustrium maioris Brytanniae . . . catalogus*, would not necessarily supplant Leland’s efforts, and he hastened to add: ‘Yet wolde I have

⁵⁸⁵ By this time, of course, Bale had the example of Gesner’s *Bibliotheca uniuersalis* before him.

⁵⁸⁶ Bale, *Summarium*, fol. iv. The precise meaning of this statement depends on how one translates ‘non impigre’ and I am very grateful to David Howlett, editor of the *Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources*, for guidance on this matter: ‘As for “non impigre”, my colleagues and I think that you could infer either that Bale used “im-” in intensive, as distinct from privative, sense, otherwise unrecorded in our archive, or infer that Bale wrote (nastily) what he meant, or infer that he wrote the opposite of what he meant, leaving you to write “non (*sic*) impigre”’. I have taken the statement to be a qualifying one since the work had been promised imminently for many years.

⁵⁸⁷ *Laboryouse journey*, sig. Diii^v.

⁵⁸⁸ *ibid.* sig. Di^v–Dii^r.

no man to judge my rude labours, to Leylandes fyne workemanshpy in any poynt equal but at all tymes to geve place unto it'.⁵⁸⁹ With Leland now incapacitated, his text cried out for an editor: 'Blessed be that man, whyche shall set that worthy worke abroade'.⁵⁹⁰ And who better than himself? In 1549, then, Bale's scheme was twofold: he would both produce a revised and expanded edition of the *Summarium* and publish Leland's *De uiris illustribus* separately. They would be 'parallel lives', complementary indeed, but they would not be merged into one. It was an odd decision and a difficult assignment.⁵⁹¹

Cambridge, Trinity College, MS R. 7. 15 (753), hereafter T, contains Bale's 'personalized transcript' of *De uiris illustribus*, compiled after he was formally nominated bishop of Ossory in October 1552, six months after Leland's death.⁵⁹² Presumably, however, there was an earlier copy, since Bale had borrowed Leland's original from Cheke soon after his return to England, and he would have given it back before he left for Ireland.⁵⁹³ Like later commentators, he found the state of Leland's autograph manuscript daunting, describing it as a 'mutilum, uagum, ac undique indigestum opus' (defective, diffuse, and altogether unrevised work), but he did point out in Leland's defence that it was a first draft ('nam primum eius collectaneum erat'; T, fol. 2r). He himself had time only to excerpt ('deflorabam') chapter by chapter before having to return the manuscript to Cheke. Bale's version appears, nevertheless, to have been destined for the printer, and there is a formal title 'Opus Ioannis Lelandi de illustribus uiris Anglice nationis a Ioanne Balyo apud Hibernos episcopo epitomatum ac plerisque in locis emendatum et auctum' (John Leland's work on the illustrious men of the English nation, excerpted by John Bale, bishop to the Irish, emended and augmented by him in many places).⁵⁹⁴

⁵⁸⁹ *ibid.* sig. Diif.

⁵⁹⁰ *ibid.* sig. C.viii'. On Bale's association of print with Protestantism and 'exclusive' private manuscript culture with Catholicism see E. Gerhardt, "No quyeckar merchaundyce than lybrary bokes": John Bale's commodification of manuscript culture', *Renaissance Quarterly* 60 (2007), 408–33, at 416–18.

⁵⁹¹ On the various stages that led to the final entries in the *Catalogus*—materials deriving from Bale's own earlier works as well as Leland's unpublished writings—see Copsey, *Hermits from Mount Carmel*, 297–300.

⁵⁹² The term 'personalized transcript' is Sharpe's: see 'English bibliographical tradition', III. On fol. 1r Bale characterized himself as 'Ossoriensi apud Hibernos episcopo'. For a description of the manuscript see Fairfield, *John Bale*, 163–4. After his own preface Bale copied four poems from the now lost manuscript of Leland's 'epigrammata': *Carmen* 137 ('Instauratio Britannicae antiquitatis'), *Carmen* 95 ('Posteritatis amor dubius'), *Carmen* 6 ('Commigratio bonarum literarum in Britanniam'), and *Carmen* 21 ('Commigratio musarum ad Cantabrigiam'), as well as 'Antiquitas eiusdem academiae' (commentary to *Cygnæa cantio*, ed. Hearne, 68). Bern, Burgerbibliothek, MS B. 39 contains a copy of T written by several scribes. It lacks the poems following the preface and does not have the conclusion in Leland's name (see below, cxlii–cxliv). There are marks in the margin to indicate where words have been omitted and need to be inserted.

⁵⁹³ In his preface (T, fol. 2r), he stated that he found Leland's text at the house of an especial friend ('amicum non uulgarem'), i.e. Cheke.

⁵⁹⁴ See also *Index*, 180—'Ioannes Balæus citra reditum ex Germania, scripsit . . . Epitome scrip-

As we have seen, *De uiris illustribus* was meant to be organized into four books. By choosing to follow Johann Trithem and organize his text chronologically rather than alphabetically Leland created inevitable structural problems. What was he to do when—as so often occurred—there was no indication of an author's floruit? In a number of cases he speculated on likely dates based on what the individual wrote or the idiosyncrasies of his prose style. When this did not provide clues he placed authors together who had written works on the same topic, who belonged to the same order, or whose writings were found in the same libraries. At times he relied on similarity of names, as in the case of Simon and Peter Stock ('sicut fabula fabulam trudit'; c. 277) or the five Serlos (c. 121); sometimes he employed even more general association of ideas. Organizing chapters on the basis of authors meant as well that anonymous works were not included, except when Leland made an attempt to speculate about their authorship.

Precise chronology was, it should be emphasized, an organizational peg for Leland: it was not essential to the meaning of his text. Ultimately his aim was to witness to the literary excellence of his nation from beginning to end by showing just how many learned individuals Britain had produced: 'there is no kinde of liberale science, or any feate concerning lerning, yn the which they have not shewen certeine argumentes of greate felicitie of wytte'.⁵⁹⁵ His conception of history was a laicized one, comprehensive rather than apocalyptic, the voice of the 'civic and literary humanist'.⁵⁹⁶

For Bale, on the other hand, chronology came to be—certainly by the time he composed the *Catalogus*—an essential part of his interpretation of the past; indeed, it was an epistemological necessity.⁵⁹⁷ In his view there was a

torum Lelandi li i. "Post diuturnas atque assiduas"—which is indeed the incipit to Bale's preface. In a letter to Bale dated to July 1554 Matthias Flacius Illyricus offered to have *De uiris illustribus* (as well as the *Summarium*) printed at Wittenberg or Leipzig. This is not surprising since Bale had a considerable reputation on the continent, especially among Protestants, and his scholarship was much respected: see N. L. Jones, 'Matthew Parker, John Bale, and the Magdeburg centuriators', *Sixteenth Century Journal* 12/3 (1981), 35–49, at 36. The letter was copied by Bale into BL MS Cotton Titus D. x, fols. 180v–181r. (I thank Tom Freeman for this reference.)

⁵⁹⁵ Bodl. MS Top. gen. c. 3, p. 284.

⁵⁹⁶ See Simpson, *Reform and Cultural Revolution*, 20.

⁵⁹⁷ Like Leland, Bale used Trithem's *Liber de scriptoribus ecclesiasticis* as a model (on which see Fairfield, *John Bale*, 98), and he owned a copy: 'Ioannes Tritemius cum meis additionibus, & aliis eiusdem tituli' (McCusker, no. 91). He provided a list of his authorities on the title page to the first volume of the *Catalogus*: 'ex Beroso, Gennadio, Beda, Honorio, Bostono Buriensi, Frumentario, Capgrauo, Bostio, Burello, Trissa, Tritemio, Gesnero, Ioanne Lelando, atque aliis authoribus collectus'. Unlike Leland, as the list shows, he had access to 'Boston of Bury', i.e. Henry of Kirkestede's *Catalogus de libris autenticis et apocryphis*: see A. Hudson, 'Visio Baleii: An early literary historian', in *The Long Fifteenth Century*, ed. H. Cooper and S. Mapstone (Oxford 1997), 313–29, at 315–17. In *The History of the Worthies of England*, ed. P. A. Nuttall, 3 vols (London 1840), 2. 289, Thomas Fuller claimed, inaccurately, that Leland was also indebted to 'Boston of Bury': 'John Leland oweth as much to this John Boston, as John Bale doth to him, and John Pits to them both'. Pits is, of course, John Pits (1560–1616), the author of *De illustribus Angliae scriptoribus* (Paris 1619).

'correspondence', as John N. King has observed, 'between the development of English literature and the pattern of the seven historical ages expounded in [Bale's own *Image of both Churches*, printed in 1545]'.⁵⁹⁸ Essentially, Bale set out to show the periodization of church history and to demonstrate how Revelation could be used to account for the manner in which the past had unrolled itself.⁵⁹⁹ The job of the bio-bibliographer, by Bale's reckoning, was to seek out and highlight those beacons whose lives and writings warned of the evils of the Roman church and heralded the new evangelical age that was dawning under Henry VIII's reformation: 'In all ages have there bene some godly writers in Englande, which have both smelled out, & also by theyr writynges detected the blasphemouse fraudes of thys Antichrist [i.e. the pope]'.⁶⁰⁰ Although Bale did grant that 'Dyverse, of those christen workes ded Leylande fynde' (which in turn aided him in the composition of the *Antiphilarchia*), one of his chief concerns was to reorganize Leland's text into a sequence which revealed its underlying eschatological meaning.⁶⁰¹

Self-avowedly less eloquent and less concerned about *bonae literae* than Leland, Bale had no time for Leland's increasingly complex rendering of place and personal names into acceptable classical forms: when he did include Leland's version he often clarified, as in the case of Leland's 'Alanus abba Theoci curiae' (c. 191), where he added 'seu Teukesberi', or 'Auoniae borealis seu Northampto-

⁵⁹⁸ J. N. King, *English Reformation Literature. The Tudor Origins of the Protestant Tradition* (Princeton, NJ, 1982), 66–7.

⁵⁹⁹ On periodic thinking in Leland and Bale see Simpson, *Reform and Cultural Revolution*, 7–33. Concerning Bale he observes: 'his periodic schema is itself explicit. Interwoven with his *Catalogus* is another work by Bale, his *Acta Romanorum Pontificum*; in this work he narrates the history of the Papacy, particularly in relation to England, through the lens of apocalyptic history, in which the popes play the role of Antichrist. So Bale's history of "letters", for want of a better term, is conditioned by the explicit apocalyptic and polemical frame within which it is set. It is this historical frame that generates the focus and sympathies of Bale's discussion' (27). T supports this interpretation of Bale's thought: fols. i^v–iv^r contain an account of 'the history of the papacy, which Bale later interpolated into the *Catalogus* (and published separately as *Acta Romanorum Pontificum*), and it looks as though he used these leaves for jottings as he organized his thoughts' (Fairfield, *John Bale*, 164). See also the comments of Avihu Zakai on Bale's 'reconstruction of ecclesiastical history based upon an apocalyptic mode of historical thought' ('Reformation, history, and eschatology in English Protestantism', *History and Theory* 26 [1987], 300–318, at 307–309).

⁶⁰⁰ *Laboryouse journey*, sig. Cvi^r.

⁶⁰¹ His own researches suggested that Leland's dating was often wrong and his own arrangement of authors was significantly different from Leland's. For the manner in which the *Catalogus* made even more clear than the *Summarium* 'the relationship between the authors [Bale] listed and the six-age chronology of Church history' see Fairfield, *John Bale*, 99–120. Also, A. MacColl, 'The construction of England as a protestant 'British' nation in the sixteenth century', *Renaissance Studies* 18 (2004), 582–608, at 591, argues: 'What Bale is doing is applying traditional methods of interpretation to the composite historical discourse formed from his own account of British writers and his history of the popes. Like other Reformation Protestant authors, he abandons the explicitness and systematization of medieval exposition, adopting instead a more fluid movement between literal, moral and figurative levels. The result is an apocalyptic version of history that exercised a profound influence on Elizabethan thinking about church and nation'.

niae'. Only rarely did he emulate this practice himself: for example, in his entry for 'Rogerus Twiforde' (not known to Leland) he has added after Twiforde 'alias Good Lucke seu bona fortuna' (T, fol. 121r).⁶⁰²

Leland felt considerable frustration at the names by which medieval monks called themselves and the bibliographical complications this caused. 'But at this point'—he observes in his chapter on William Shirwood (c. 239)—'the reader must be warned that the writers of that time were negligent about the surnames of illustrious men to such an extreme degree that they would stick in some other name, none too apt, often derived from the subject's birthplace or not infrequently from his rank, suppressing his true name'.⁶⁰³ Nevertheless, he was often reduced to the same practice himself, and Bale attempted to elucidate based on his own research: for instance, Leland's nebulous John, treasurer of York (c. 175), becoming John de Belmeis; Nigel, monk of Canterbury (c. 202), revealed as Nigel Wireker [*recte* Witeker]; and Thomas the Franciscan (c. 282) identified as 'of Eccleston'.

On occasion Bale listed individuals, such as John Bever (T, fol. 83r), to whom Leland had made allusion in the *Collectanea* or in his published writings, but who had not found their way into the *De uiris illustribus*.⁶⁰⁴ He also included the results of his own research, noting in the margin beside the entry for Walter Map (T, fol. 55v) that 'Ex duobus unus facit Lelandus'.⁶⁰⁵ He usually, but not always, separated his own additions from Leland's original text by means of the heading 'Ioannes Balaeus' and the use of red ink. For the most part this added material consisted of further titles, and Bale was invariably less cautious in his attributions than Leland: under Alberic of London's works, for example, he included the 'uirtutes antiquorum' (as he had done in the *Summarium*), which was actually written by the thirteenth-century Franciscan theologian John Waleys.⁶⁰⁶ There are some individuals in T—usually listed under Bale's own name or in red ink—who did not appear in *De uiris illustribus*, but who

⁶⁰² On this example see also Bale, *Index*, 390, where he provides the alternative, and correct, first name Robert.

⁶⁰³ Below, 443.

⁶⁰⁴ See *Catalogus*, 1. 361: 'Fulcit sermonis mei ueritatem Lelandus, Brytannicarum antiquitatum assiduus indagator, qui eius auctoritatem non nihili facit, tam in Assertione regis Arthuri, quam etiam in Cygnae cantionis commentario' (Leland, the assiduous investigator of the antiquities of Britain, supports the truth of my statement. He does not account the authority of [Bever] for nothing either in his *Assertio regis Arthuri* or in the commentary to his *Cygnae cantio*).

⁶⁰⁵ When he made further corrections concerning Map in the *Catalogus* (1. 253) Bale did not, however, name Leland: 'Sunt qui hunc ex Sarisburiensi canonico, sunt etiam qui ex Lincolniensi praecentore, Oxoniensem archidiaconum, anno Domini 1197, fuisse factum affirmant' (There are those who affirm that from a canon of Salisbury or even a precentor of Lincoln he was made archdeacon of Oxford in AD 1197); for Map see below, c. 157.

⁶⁰⁶ See Sharpe, 'English bibliographical tradition', 110; for further elaborations to Leland's entry on this author see 111–12. For Bale's general practices see A. G. Rigg, 'Antiquaries and authors: The supposed works of Robert Baston, O. Carm.', in *Medieval Scribes, Manuscripts, and Libraries. Essays Presented to N. R. Ker*, ed. M. B. Parkes and A. G. Watson (London 1978), 317–31.

would later be cited on Leland's authority in the *Catalogus*.⁶⁰⁷ According to the *Catalogus*, i. 307, it was on information that 'Lelandus colligit' that Bale learned about Henry de Hanna: although this author appears in the epitome (T, fol. 68r), he is not found in *De uiris illustribus*. John Bampton is cited in T, fol. 92v after Luke Bosden, and the entry in the *Catalogus*, 2. 46 is alleged to have come 'Ex Lelando'. Adam Saxlingham (T, fol. 99r; *Catalogus*, 2. 52) provides a similar case, as do Richard Deepdale (T, fol. 115r; *Catalogus*, 2. 48), William Sternfield (T, fol. 121r; *Catalogus*, 2. 82), William Harsick (T, fol. 133v; *Catalogus*, 2. 88), John Ovinhell (T, fol. 143v; *Catalogus*, 2. 158), John Bury (T, fol. 146r; *Catalogus*, i. 595), Denys Holkham (T, fol. 149r; *Catalogus*, 2. 98), and others. Bale stated in the *Catalogus* that John Colley 'tam accurate a nostro Lelando, maximo Scriptorum celebratore, laudatus est, ut aliorum laudationibus non indigeat' (was so accurately praised by our Leland, the greatest eulogizer of writers, that he does not stand in need of the praises of others; *Catalogus*, 2. 91). Although Bale provided a brief entry, no praise included, in the epitome (T, fol. 144r), Leland himself made no reference to Colley. When Bale composed the *Catalogus* he was a Marian exile and had lost many of his books.⁶⁰⁸ He must, therefore, have used the epitome rather than Bodl. MS Top. gen. c. 4 as a guide, and this would account for at least some of the confluences. Leland's name, moreover, had become one to be conjured with as early as the mid 1550s. By attaching individuals to Leland's authority Bale increased the credibility of the *Catalogus*.

Bale's most successful political drama was *King Johan*, and in the revised text, put together after Henry VIII's death, Verity addresses herself to Leland:

I assure ye, fryndes, lete men wryte what they wyll,
Kynge Johan was a man both valeaunt and godlye.
What though Polydorus reporteth hym very yll

. . .

Yes! Therfor, Leylonde, out of thy slumbre awake,
And wytnesse a trewth for thyne owne contrayes sake.⁶⁰⁹

⁶⁰⁷ Others, such as John Godwick, John Wilton, Thomas Radclif, William Flete, John Soley, Thomas Ashborne, William Green, John Ergome, Robert Bale, John Sowle, and William Galyon are included both in T and in the *Catalogus*, but without reference to Leland in the latter. Bale normally takes the brief entry from the epitome and expands it considerably in the *Catalogus*, as in the case of Thomas Boarstall, where the epitome has 'Thomas Borstale Augustinianus, doctor Parisiensis ac publicus praelector apud suos fratres, scripsit lecturam Sententiarum li. iiii, distinctiones ordinarias li. i, quodlibeta quoque li. i. Claruit anno domini 1290' (T, fol. 80r). The *Catalogus* (i. 345), on the other hand, provides a full narrative including the information that his books were written 'sophistice . . . iuxta eius aetatis naturam'.

⁶⁰⁸ On this exile and the composition of the *Catalogus* see Peter Happé, *John Bale* (New York 1996), 20–22.

⁶⁰⁹ *John Bale's King Johan*, ed. B. B. Adams (San Marino, CA, 1969), 2193–9. On the dating of the B text, which was composed over a period of time after his first exile, see Happé, *John Bale*, 90–92. The reference here to Leland's 'slumbre' indicates that these lines were written after 1547 and before

Unable himself to speak, Leland is evoked in support of historical truth—that is, Bale’s apocalyptic vision of the past—even in cases where Leland might have disagreed, and it often took considerable manipulation to make his writings read as Bale wished them to do.⁶¹⁰ The ‘slumbering’ Leland is also called up in the epitome, where there is an added conclusion to the text written by Bale, but put forth in Leland’s voice under the heading ‘Ioannes Lelandus. Conclusio totius operis’:

Ecce, quae tibi, pie lector, sum pollicitus, prestiti, nempe selectionum quorundam Britannorum atque Anglorum, ab initio ad hanc aetatem usque, et acta et scripta, eaque tanto accuratius prestiti quanto Tritemius eorum causam remissius egit, Balaeus uero clarius, lucidius, uigilantius. Diuerterat quidem amicus ille in meam gratiam Ventam Icenorum atque aliorum, excussurus ibidem Bibliothecas bonis libris refertas, hoc nomine, ut mihi tandem uenturo, labor in eadem parte et expeditior et gravior esset. Multos ille autores a me non ante aut uisos aut lectos exquisiuit. Inter quos sunt Nennius, rerum Britannicarum antiquissimus scriptor, Albritius de origine deorum, Athelardus de rerum naturis, Lechbertus theologus, Alexander Essebius, Rogerus Houedenus, Thomas Wiccius, Radulphus Marham, et alii plerique consimiles. Hic ille Ioannes Baleus Couensis est, homo Anglus in Sudouolgia natus, qui collectaneum quoddam de eruditis scriptoribus, sed tumultuaria opera, aetate hac nostra fecit, quo illustria Carmelitarum et Augustinianorum facta abunde depredicat, aliaque multa aedidit.⁶¹¹

(Look, I have provided what I promised you, pious reader, that is, the deeds and writings of the more select British and English writers from the beginning to our own times, and I have provided these as accurately as

1552. Following his edition of the New Year’s Gift in *A discoverie of certaine errors published in print in the much commended Britannia* (London 1599), Ralph Brooke included his own evocation of ‘Leylands Supposed Ghost’ against defamers and plagiarists, Polydore Vergil and William Camden in particular.

⁶¹⁰ On Bale’s attempts ‘to regulate and contain the interpretations of his readers’ C. Shrank, ‘John Bale and reconfiguring the “medieval” in reformation England’, in *Reading the Medieval in Early Modern England*, ed. McMullan and Matthews, 179–92, at 191, observes: ‘He is consequently an intrusive presence, breaking into his own texts through paratext just as he habitually intervenes in, and interprets, the texts of others: be they the examinations of Askew, initially recorded in her own hand and words, or the scholarly meditations of Leland’s *A Nene yeares gyfte*, published with Bale’s extensive interjections as *The laborious Journey of Johan Leylande*. Bale’s on-stage persona in his extant plays—“Baleus Prolocutor”, “Bale, the spokesman, one who speaks for others”—is thus symptomatic of the author’s recurrent attempt to retain interpretative responsibility for the actions or ideas he recounts’.

⁶¹¹ T, fol. 159v. This passage has been printed, translated, and discussed by Sharpe in ‘English bibliographical tradition’, 112. I have used my own transcription and have adapted Sharpe’s translation. As Sharpe has observed, there is a second version of this conclusion, slightly longer and more flowery, on fol. 160r–v. On other examples, not quite so blatant, of the manner in which Bale ‘was not averse to rewriting another’s text *if necessary*’ see O. Wort, ‘The double life of Anne: John Bale’s *Examinations* and *Diue Anne vitam* (sic)’, *Review of English Studies* 58 (2007), 633–56, at 648–56.

Tritheim negligently pleaded their case. Bale, however, has done it better, more clearly, and more carefully. Indeed that dear friend made a detour to Norwich and elsewhere to search through the libraries there, crammed with good books. He did this so that, when I came some time later, my own work on the same material would be rendered quicker and more pleasant. He sought out many authors I had not previously seen or read, among whom are Nennius, the most ancient writer of British matters, Alberic's *On the Origins of the Gods*, Adelard's *On the Natures of Things*, Lethbert the theologian, Alexander of Ashby, Roger of Howden, Thomas Wykes, Ralph Marham, and very many others of similar kind. This is that John Bale of Covehithe, an Englishman born in Suffolk, who in this our time has put together a compilation on learned writers, working in haste, in which he makes known abundantly the deeds of the Carmelites and Austins, and has published many other things.)

The chief aim here is to show Leland's indebtedness to Bale, and the ventriloquized voice is strikingly different in tone from that of the supplicating dedicatory letter of the *Anglorum Heliades*, written in Bale's own voice a decade and a half earlier. Sewn together ('consuto' is the term Leland used to describe the *Anglorum Heliades*) from scraps of Leland's prose, the *Conclusio* is roughly based on two brief passages from *De uiris illustribus*, both of which must have irritated Bale when he read them. The first is drawn from Leland's chapter on Alberic (c. 289), into which, when Bale quoted it in the epitome (T, fol. 6rv), he inserted his name to clarify the diminutive 'amiculus'.⁶¹² In the *Conclusio* Bale modified and amplified Leland's original passage for strong rhetorical effect. First, he identified some of those 'multos autores' for the knowledge of whom Leland was beholden to him.⁶¹³ He also changed the meaning significantly with what appears to be a minor addition, 'atque aliorum' (and elsewhere): it was not just at Norwich, according to the new account, that Bale helped

⁶¹² 'Diuertat amicus quidem in meam gratiam, Ventam Icenorum, excussurus bibliothecas ibidem bonis libris refertas: hoc nomine ut mihi, eo paulo post uenturo, labor in eadem parte tum expeditur tum gravior esset. Multos ille autores a me non ante aut uisos aut lectos exquisiuit, inter quos et Albricius de origine eorum comparuit' (below, 506).

⁶¹³ Bale certainly did not introduce Leland to 'Nennius', whose writings Leland had come across by 1534 at the latest, nor Howden, whose chronicle Leland first saw at Winchester in 1533. It was Bale, however, who directed him to the Carmelite priory in Norwich in 1534, where copies of the cited works of Alberic and Adelard were to be found. Although Leland did not, as we have seen, have an entry for Thomas Wykes in the *De uiris illustribus*, he did refer to him in the commentary to the *Cyanea cantio*. According to the *Summarium* Bale found a copy of Wykes's chronicle at the Austin house of Gorleston in Norfolk, and it is quite possible that he alerted Leland to Wykes, whose history survives in one manuscript only, probably owned by Bale (McCusker, no. 39). Although he quoted his *Liber festiualis*, Leland makes no reference to Alexander of Ashby's *Comprehensio historiarum ueteris ac noui testamenti*, whose prologue was addressed to a certain Letardus; but Bale himself had made a copy of the first book in the 1520s, and may well have been Leland's source for his knowledge of Ashby. According to his list the *Liber festiualis* was in his Irish library: 'Alexander Essebiensis, de sacris diebus, carmine' (McCusker, no. 44).

Leland out. Likewise, the substitution of ‘tandem’ (some time later) for ‘paulo post’ (soon afterwards) emphasizes the length as well as thoroughness of his preliminary investigations. The *Conclusio* also provides the place in which to expand on the accomplishments of Bale as inspirer of Leland’s efforts, and this is done in language borrowed from another passage in *De uiris illustribus*, Leland’s disparaging phrase turned on itself. As his authority for the floruit of William of Coventry (c. 366; Stage I), Leland cited Bale: ‘ut Ioannes Baleus Conensis (*sic*), homo Anglus, refert in quodam collectaneo de Carmelitis tumultuaria opera consuto’. In its new context it is a ‘collectaneum quoddam de eruditis scriptoribus’ rather than ‘quodam collectaneo’, and it is thorough (‘abunde’),⁶¹⁴ even if composed in haste.⁶¹⁵ Bale has thus redeployed Leland’s prose to celebrate his own central role in Leland’s enterprise.

Leland often wrote with charm and wit. He was proud of his eloquence, as we have seen, and tried to engage his reader directly, conveying the excitement of the chase and the allure of the physical manuscript as well as of the written word it contained. In turn, he assumed his reader was a learned scholar familiar with the ancient languages, an antiquary like himself, fascinated with the English past, and he invariably addressed him in good classical manner as ‘candide lector’ (gentle, that is, well-disposed reader). The intended reader of Bale’s ventriloquized text was quite a different one, addressed as ‘pie lector’. Here Bale is using ‘pius’ in a specifically religious context, and is appealing to the company of evangelical Christian believers. It is the same audience for whom the commentary portion of *The laboryouse journey* was written, ‘men godly mynded’, and very different from Leland’s ideal reader.

Although certainly intended for publication Bale’s epitome never found its way into print. What happened? One could argue that circumstances were to blame, since soon after the putative first copy was completed Edward VI died, Mary came to the throne, and Bale was forced to flee from Ireland in haste, leaving books and papers—although not his copy of Leland—behind.⁶¹⁶ However, there were other factors apart from personal disruptions that prevented the publication of the epitome. Ultimately Leland’s text remained intractable in spite of all Bale’s creative editing.

Unlike Bale, Leland retained a qualified respect for the religious world with which he had grown up. This permeates *De uiris illustribus*. Although he did adopt a fashionable anti-papal stance after the mid 1530s Leland remained a conservative in religion throughout his life. If he had survived into Mary’s reign he would no doubt—like Henry Parker, Lord Morley, who wrote a tract in defence of the eucharist *ca* 1555—have wholeheartedly supported a return to

⁶¹⁴ In the alternative version of the *Conclusio* Bale has ‘abunde, lucide, deserteque’.

⁶¹⁵ After ‘edidit’ Bale has added ‘quibus nomen immortalitati consecrauit et posteritati reliquit’ in the alternative version.

⁶¹⁶ After hair-raising adventures Bale fetched up first in Strasbourg, then Frankfurt, and finally Basel, where both John Foxe and he worked for the printer Johann Oporinus.

the old order. On the other hand, Bale, who never looked back, wanted to have the whole system overthrown, and he showed himself disappointed by Leland's inclusiveness, as well as his unwillingness to condemn papistical writers.⁶¹⁷ For example, Leland described with admiration the learned account of the miracles of St Swithun by Lantfred, the tenth-century monk of Winchester (c. 139). He considered this work 'worthy of the ears of the learned and of all good people'.⁶¹⁸ Bale, who had long since rejected the cult of saints, could not let this pass, and after paraphrasing Leland's text he added snidely: 'Portents from the dead along with necromantic practices were held in value in those days. I am amazed by Leland's judgement in this instance'.⁶¹⁹ According to the *Catalogus* the Northampton Carmelite William Beaufeu was the author of a Latin translation of the Anglo-Norman version of Edmund of Abingdon's *Speculum religiosorum*. Bale gave Leland credit for the basic information on William ('sic habet Lelandus'), although it actually comes from Bale's additions to Leland in the epitome (T, fol. 124v). Immediately after his summary of 'Leland' ('Tantum ille'), however, Bale added his own interpretation of what went before: 'Nevertheless he was one of those masters of lies, who trampled under foot the eternal Gospel of Christ with frivolous sophistry and the fictions of impious men, so they might erect a most horrible idol with their deceptive and false justification of flesh'.⁶²⁰ What happens in this case, then, is that Bale takes issue with comments by a Leland who appears, in fact, to be his own fabrication.

There are many examples of this sort of brief commentary and/or minor change, and these could have been dealt with relatively easily in a bowdlerized edition of Leland's work, but the central problem lay with Bale's 'morning star in the midst of the darkness',⁶²¹ John Wyclif, to whom Leland was deeply antagonistic. Leland was emphatic in his defence of transubstantiation, and it was this aspect of Wyclif's teaching that disturbed him so profoundly, 'that venerable assurance of the Lord's Body being undermined by men of bad faith who followed the insane doctrine of Wyclif (rightly, in this respect, to be

⁶¹⁷ On this topic see Fairfield, *John Bale*, 116–17.

⁶¹⁸ Below, 283. It was the language in particular that he admired, as the allusion to the 'ears of the learned' indicates, and Lantfred was, indeed, one of the writers of the so-called hermeneutic Latin style, who have been rehabilitated by Michael Lapidge and others.

⁶¹⁹ 'Mortuorum portenta cum necromantis practis in pretio hac aetate habentur. Admiror hoc loco Lelandi iudicium' (T, fol. 37r). Although the criticisms of Lantfred remain in the *Catalogus*, Leland's name has been omitted, Bale declaring that Lantfred 'eruditus & pius a quibusdam scriptoribus iudicatur: a nobis uero superstitiosus atque impius fuisse probatur' (is judged by certain writers as learned and pious, but I consider him to have been superstitious and impious) (*Catalogus*, 1. 139). He then quotes Leland more or less directly ('Eruditionis . . . secutus'), but instead of naming him has 'inquiet'.

⁶²⁰ 'Veruntamen ex illis mendaciorum magistris erat, qui friuolis sophismatibus atque hominum impiorum figmentis, aeternum Christi testamentum conculcabant, ut ex ficta falsaue carnis iustificatione foedissimum idolum erigerent' (*Catalogus*, 1. 517).

⁶²¹ *Catalogus*, 1. 450, quoting from Ecclesiasticus 50: 6.

detested by all good people').⁶²² Even though he was willing to grant that the fourteenth-century church needed reform, Leland concluded his entry on Wyclif (c. 427; Stage I) with the observation that, 'I have nothing further to write of his books, just as I cannot say whether they are fit to be read by true followers of the Christian religion'.⁶²³ Immediately before Wyclif, Leland had an entry for his opponent William Woodford, stating that Archbishop Thomas Arundel called the church fathers to a council in London to condemn Wyclif's heresy, and that Woodford was chosen to refute the *Trialogus*. In the epitome (T, fol. 123r) Bale conflated Woodford with William [?Ufford] the Carmelite (c. 531) and attached Leland's entry for the latter to the chapter on Woodford, including Leland's statement in *De uiris illustribus* that he got his information from Bale.⁶²⁴ When he came to compose his entry for Woodford in the *Catalogus* (I. 510–11) Bale quoted *De uiris illustribus* with acknowledgement ('Lelando teste'), adding considerably, as was his standard practice, to Leland's list of four titles. He made, however, two significant changes in his quotation: for Leland's term 'haeresis' to describe Wyclif's teachings he substituted 'doctrina'; for 'ecclesiasticos patres' he gave 'rabbinos'. He replaced Leland's claim that Woodford was able to 'pierce, lay low, and finally dispatch the enemy', with his own conclusion that 'Thus like the traitor Judas, hired by the papistical clergy he took arms against the truth of God for the kingdom of Antichrist'.⁶²⁵ To Leland's observation that there was not much to choose between Wyclif's arguments and those of his adversary William Binham (c. 428)—'the one was more superstitious than is proper, the other was more learned than virtuous'⁶²⁶—Bale added in the epitome: 'Posthac uidebis Lelandum inter utrumque claudicantem, magis tamen papisticis negotiis haerentem' (Here you see Leland wavering between the two, but rather more adhering to the opinions of the papists; T, fol. 112v). When he came to describe Binham in the *Catalogus*, however, he revised this slightly, stating that Leland was neither warm nor cold in these matters ('qui in his neque calidus neque frigidus erat'; *Catalogus*, I. 458), not that he seemed to be sympathizing with the papists.

In the case of the anti-Wycliffite John Sharpe (c. 443; Stage I) Bale reacted violently to *De uiris illustribus*:

Weigh carefully the preposterous judgement of Leland here. He says that the most barbarous sophist is a famous theologian. Pious doctors he calls hydras. And he says that the most frigid—actually the most iniquitous—

⁶²² Below, 675.

⁶²³ Below, 637.

⁶²⁴ Following Leland's 'Gulielmus quidam fraterculus' Bale adds 'idem Wodefordus est'.

⁶²⁵ 'Cum Iuda ergo traditore a Papistico clero conductus, pro Antichristi regno aduersus Dei ueritatem arma suscepit'.

⁶²⁶ Below, 641.

glosses of the papists are the sword of the Gospel. Observe, however, what sort of people Sharpe and his peers were from their writings.⁶²⁷

So strongly did Bale feel about Sharpe that he continued his debate with Leland even in print, in the *Catalogus* itself (1. 505–506), expanding on the comments from the epitome. The basic information for Bale's entry on Sharpe is quoted from Leland, but the parenthetical comments and extended summary are Bale's, based in part on T:

According to old libraries (as Leland would have it), John Sharpe was highly regarded among the philosophers and theologians of his time (who were the most virulent papists). The great dispute he had (so Leland says) with the Wycliffites added something to the renown (disgrace and infamy) of his name. For he struck fiercely with the sword of the Gospel (sophistical fictions) against those loathsome hydras (such he calls pious theologians) who were rearing on high the new heads of virulent discourses over the sacrament of the Eucharist (the idol of bread). What else he did is unknown. That is all Leland has to say. Such things, pious reader, are the comments of the papists, who judge good to be evil, light to be darkness.⁶²⁸

Bale then added a greatly expanded list of Sharpe's writings, introducing it with a modified version of Leland's statement that 'of the books by which he commended himself to posterity, I have seen only' etc. Bale inserted 'inutiliter' before 'commendavit' and has 'Quorum nos sequentes uidimus' for 'ego tantum uidi'. After the list of titles he concludes: 'a most barbarous sophist, he produced still other papistical dregs of this sort'.⁶²⁹ Suitably, from his perspective, he rounded off his discussion with a quotation from Revelation 6: 12: '[Talibus doctrinis] sol factus est niger tanquam saccus cilicinus'.⁶³⁰

These sorts of revision indicate why Bale ultimately rejected his old mentor, and why it was inevitable that the *Catalogus* would in the end swallow up and replace the *De uiris illustribus* even in its epitomized form.⁶³¹ When Bale

⁶²⁷ 'Perpende praeposterum Lelandi iudicium hoc loco. Barbarissimum sophistam theologum illustrem uocat, pios doctores lernas, et papistarum commenta frigidissima, immo iniquissima, gladium Euangelicum. Tu interim qualis hic atque sui similes fuerint ex scriptis nosce' (T, fol. 122r). See Fairfield, *John Bale*, 117, for this passage apart from the last sentence.

⁶²⁸ 'Ioannes Sharpe, ut ueteres testantur bibliothecae (sic habet Lelandus) inter philosophos & theologos sui seculi (qui uirulentissimi Papistae fuerunt) illustris habitus est. Sed & controuersia (inquit) quae illi magna fuit cum Vuicleuanis, aliquid ad splendorem (pudorem & infamiam) nominis attulit. Nam Lernas teterrimas quidem illas (sic uocat pios doctores) noua uirulentarum dissertationum, de eucharistiae sacramento (panis idolo) capita alte exerentes, gladio Euangelico (figmentis sophisticis) acerrime insectatus est. Caetera quae fecit, in obscuro sunt. Haec ille. Talia (pie lector) sunt Papistarum commenta, qui iudicant bonum malum, & lucem tenebras'. Bale invoked here the same pious readers to whom the ventriloquized Leland addressed the conclusion of the epitome.

⁶²⁹ 'Et eius generis alias adhuc emisit Papisticas faeces, barbarissimus sophista'.

⁶³⁰ '[By such doctrines] the sun became black as sackcloth of hair'.

⁶³¹ Fairfield observes that 'Bale changed his mind about [publishing] this manuscript, however,

concurred with the judgement of his friend that 'if he [Leland] had so fynyshed them [his works] and set them fourth accordynge as he than intended and wolde have done, Truly I suppose no lesse, but it wolde have byn a wondre (yea, a myracle to the worlde) to have redde them',⁶³² he was able to do so precisely because these works had not been set forth.⁶³³

In a preface addressed to Queen Elizabeth in the reissued version of the *Catalogus* Bale defined clearly the function of the antiquarian enterprise as he understood it: those writers to be 'brought into light and public knowledge, who in any way will be capable of shaping and guiding the state with good laws or of forwarding the cause of the evangelical faith'.⁶³⁴ There is an implicit censorship here which is at odds with Leland's inclusivity. To Leland's rhetorical question 'For what book was ever so ineptly written that one could not hope to learn something of value from reading it?' Bale could provide a stern response.⁶³⁵

Bale's epitome is not a transcription as such of the surviving manuscript of *De uiris illustribus* and Bale did not have access, so far as can be ascertained, to lost writings relating to Leland's text. From a strictly editorial point of view, therefore, the epitome is of little use in reconstructing and elucidating the *De uiris illustribus*, although it does provide some readings in the case of difficult passages. What it does show, however, is the manner in which Bale tried to reconcile his own researches—quite apart from his own theological position—with Leland's. He too had spent much of his lifetime examining manuscripts and gathering titles, and his *Summarium* had much to offer that Leland had missed. After he returned to England from abroad soon after Leland's insanity

either because he found himself putting too much of Leland's data into the *Catalogus*, or because he finally decided that Leland's conservative theology was too dangerous to his readers' spiritual health. So the epitome stayed in manuscript' (*John Bale*, 116).

⁶³² See above, xxxv.

⁶³³ In the *De illustribus Angliae scriptoribus* Pits observed that Bale obscured Leland's work in the process of editing it: see Happé, *John Bale*, 138.

⁶³⁴ 'ut in lucem publicumque proferantur, qui ullo modo uel rempublicam bonis legibus instituere & conformare, uel religionis Euangelicae negotium promouere poterunt' (sig. a 3r).

⁶³⁵ For the quotation see below, 121. This does not mean that Bale did not include papistical authors in his bio-bibliographical surveys: see the comments by Hudson in '*Visio Baleii*', 329. She concludes her discussion with a quotation from the *Catalogus* that emphasizes the wide sweep of Bale's bibliographical exercise as well as the loss for which it was trying to compensate: 'ingens ille librorum thesaurus, quem collegi, et hoc in opere coaceruau, in Bibliothecis ac coenobiis nostris aliquando delituit: quos nunc partim obliuio deleuit et obliterauit, partim iniuria ac iniquitas exulceratissimorum temporum obscurauit et extinxit' (the enormous treasure of books which I gathered up and collected in this work lay hidden away at one time in our libraries and monasteries. Now oblivion has destroyed and obliterated some of them, some the violence and iniquity of the festering times has obscured and destroyed). See also T. S. Freeman, 'John Bale's Book of Martyrs? The account of King John in *Acts and Monuments*', *Reformation* 3 (1998), 175–223, at 212: 'Around the middle of the sixteenth century, certain Protestant scholars, most notably Matthias Flacius and John Bale, drew on the research of earlier antiquarians, Protestant and non-Protestant, and brought together the sources, often hitherto neglected or ignored, which were necessary to create an alternative interpretation of the past'.

set in, he 'perused' many libraries in Cambridge, Oxford, London, Norwich, and 'certain other places of Northfolke and Southfolke' for names of authors and titles, reporting that:

Among the stacyoners & bokebynders, I found many notable Antiquitees, of whom I wrote out the tytles, tymes, and begynnynghes, that we myghte at the leaste shewe the names of them, though we have not as now, their whole workes to shewe.⁶³⁶

He hoped too that other scholars would engage in the same activities in different parts of the country.

Leland himself added to *De uiris illustribus*, emended entries, inserted titles, right to the end of his working life. Although Bale tried to separate his own findings from Leland's, the epitome bears witness to the way in which this elaboration and emendation was, by nature, an on-going process. As Bale's efforts show—and as Thomas Tanner's would a century and a half later—even had God lent Leland 'lyfe and healthe conveyent' he would no doubt never have brought *De uiris illustribus* to a satisfactory conclusion. It was not in his magpie-like nature.⁶³⁷

C. *Commentarii de scriptoribus Britannicis*, ed. Anthony Hall (Oxford 1709)

Although the *De uiris illustribus* was less widely copied than Leland's other prose remains, in part because Bale's bibliographical efforts appeared to replace it in the eyes of many individuals, antiquaries did continue to consult it.⁶³⁸ There was also talk of publication and *A proposal tending to the advancement of learning by an unburdensome and practicable encouragement of the Press, at the Theater in Oxford* (ESTC R182168; London 1676) advertised 'Lelandi uitae

⁶³⁶ *Laboryouse journey*, sig. Gii^v–Giii^r. Note, however, that he condoned the destruction of 'the byshop of Romes lawes, decrees, decretals, extravagantes, clementines and other suche dregges of the devyll, yea yf Heytesburyes sophismes, Porphyryes universals, Aristotles olde logyckes and Dunses dyvynyte, wyth such other lowsy legerdemaynes', consigning them to the bookbinders to be used as 'coverynghes for bokes'. On this passage see above, xlv.

⁶³⁷ On the 'magpie complex' from which Leland may well have suffered see my entry in *Dictionary of Literary Biography: Sixteenth-Century British Nondramatic Writers, Second Series*, ed. D. A. Richardson (Detroit, MI, 1994), 224–9, at 227.

⁶³⁸ Apart from Bale's copies, Harris lists selective extracts by William Burton, now contained in Bodl. MS Gough gen. Top. 2 (SC 17596), pp. 221–222 ('Early custodial history', 484). He does not, however, include later copies: Cambridge, Trinity College, MS O. 10. 6–7, on which see below; extracts by Sir James Ware, dated 25 November 1644 in Bodl. MS Rawlinson B. 479 (SC 11826), fols. 1r–22v; Bodl. MS Ballard 70 (SC 10855), fols. 1–15, containing Anthony Wood's extracts from all of the *Collectanea*, as well as *De uiris illustribus*, dated 17 June 1660. According to Hearne's preface to his edition of the *Itinerary*, James Wright of the Inner Temple (1643–1713) had owned a copy made during Queen Elizabeth's time and before the original had been damaged, but this was destroyed in a fire in the Middle Temple in 1678/9.

Scriptorium Anglicanorum' at the end of 'Books ready, or preparing for the Press', but nothing more was heard of this putative edition.⁶³⁹

In 1693 the London booksellers and stationers John and Awnsham Churchill put forward with Abel Swalle a proposal for an expanded edition in English of William Camden's *Britannia* (the first edition of which had appeared in 1586).⁶⁴⁰ When the intended editor died in the same year, Arthur Charlett, master of University College, recommended Edmund Gibson as a replacement, and Gibson agreed to take over the position.⁶⁴¹ Meanwhile, Thomas Gale (1635/6–1702), high master of St Paul's School and formerly a fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, had acquired between 1685 and 1689 from the heirs of Sir Roger Twysden a medieval copy from Bury St Edmunds of the *Catalogus de libris autenticis et apocrifis* of Henry de Kirkestede (attributed to Boston of Bury), previously owned by Bale and then by James Ussher (1581–1656).⁶⁴² He also possessed a transcript of the *De uiris illustribus*, probably written by professional amanuenses, now Cambridge, Trinity College, MS O. 10. 6–7 (1458–9).⁶⁴³ According to Anthony Hall (1679–1723), Gale had intended to publish an edition of Leland's text supplemented by additions from 'Boston of Bury', but when he was appointed dean of York in 1697 he was forced to abandon the project (as well as London, which he greatly missed).⁶⁴⁴ If Gale made a separate transcript of 'Boston of Bury' it has not survived, and his original manuscript had migrated, presumably through sale, to the Churchill brothers by early 1694.⁶⁴⁵ As Gibson related to his friend Thomas Tanner (1674–1735) on 30 January 1694, Awnsham Churchill had

⁶³⁹ I thank Richard Sharpe for the reference to this single sheet anonymous tract. The list, as he informs me, was almost certainly drawn up by Dr John Fell, dean of Christ Church.

⁶⁴⁰ See J. M. Levine, *The Battle of the Books: History and Literature in the Augustan Age* (Ithaca, NY, 1991), 327–8.

⁶⁴¹ *ibid.* 330–36. The edition of the *Britannia* appeared in 1695: *Camden's Britannia, newly translated into English, with large additions and improvements* . . . (London: for A. Swalle & A. & J. Churchill, 1695).

⁶⁴² See Henry of Kirkestede, *Catalogus de libris autenticis et apocrifis*, ed. R. H. Rouse and M. A. Rouse, CBMLC II (London 2004), clxxxi–cxcv.

⁶⁴³ It was presented to the College by his son Roger (1672–1744) in 1738. The text was interleaved with blank leaves for annotations, of which there are a number, presumably in Gale's hand, taken from a variety of sources including manuscripts in the Cotton library, and made over a number of years. There are also cross-references to Bale's copy. The indices are in different hands. (Oliver Harris kindly undertook a preliminary examination of this manuscript for me and I am grateful for his comments.) Gale owned a transcript of portions of the *Itinerary*, now Cambridge, Trinity College, MS O. 5. 25 (1306), which was used by Hearne in his edition: see *Leland's Itinerary*, ed. Toulmin Smith, 1. xxix. Both manuscripts appear in the catalogue of Gale's library found in [Edward Bernard], *Catalogi librorum manuscriptorum Angliae et Hiberniae in unum collecti*, 2 vols (Oxford 1697), 2/1. nos. 6084–5.

⁶⁴⁴ Unpaginated 'Praefatio' to *Commentarii de scriptoribus Britannicis*. Writing to Charlett in March 1694 Gibson stated that if Gale were to undertake an edition of Leland 'it would be 7 years work': quoted in W. T. Davies, 'Thomas Tanner and his "Bibliotheca"', *Times Literary Supplement*, 14 December 1935, 856, from Bodl. MS Ballard 5 (SC 10791), fol. 23v.

⁶⁴⁵ See *Catalogus de libris autenticis et apocrifis*, ed. Rouse and Rouse, cxcvii. Nevertheless, it does

decided by this date to undertake a combined edition of Leland and 'Boston of Bury'—it would complement Camden's *Britannia*—and Gibson suggested to Tanner, who had completed a draft of his *Notitia monastica*, that he undertake the transcription.⁶⁴⁶ Tanner was enthusiastic, and in mid May 1694 Churchill came to Oxford with his copy of 'Boston of Bury', which he lent to Tanner when they entered into an agreement.⁶⁴⁷

Churchill also brought with him to Oxford a copy of the *De uiris illustribus*, along with other of Leland's writings, which he had borrowed from Captain Charles Hatton.⁶⁴⁸ These transcripts were made by Hatton's father, Christopher, first Baron Hatton (1605–1670), an antiquary and one of the original members of the Royal Society.⁶⁴⁹ Tanner was, however, granted access to 'Boston of Bury' and the copy of *De uiris illustribus* for a limited time only, Churchill writing to him on 26 May that:

Pray let Boston be transcribed as soon as may be and should be glad to have you make what use you can of y^e Collectanea out of hand y^t I may restore y^m. I fear Leland must be new transcribed. if so I must gratify you for itt. For Capt. Hatton desires his MMS. as intire as may be.⁶⁵⁰

He began work immediately and by mid July had finished the transcription of

seem very uncharacteristic for Gale, an avid collector, to have willingly given up this rare and valuable text.

⁶⁴⁶ 'Now here's a gentleman (I mean a bookseller) designs to publish Leland's *De uiris illustribus* and *Boston of Bury* along with it. The latter is Sir Roger Twisden's book, and perhaps the onely one in the world; and while your book is printing, if you could be well pay'd for transcribing that, and contrive to get money both ways, I am of opinion you could not employ your time better'. Printed by R. W. Hunt in 'Tanner's *Bibliotheca Britannico-Hibernica*', *Bodleian Library Record* 2/28 (1941–9), 249–58, at 250. The history of Tanner's involvement in this project is discussed fully by R. Sharpe in 'Thomas Tanner (1674–1735), the 1697 Catalogue, and *Bibliotheca Britannica*', *The Library*, 7th ser. 6 (2005), 381–421, at 388–9. The *Notitia monastica*, subtitled *A short history of the religious houses in England and Wales*, was published in 1695 by the Churchills.

⁶⁴⁷ In 1695 Churchill assured Tanner that Gale had stolen 'Boston of Bury' from Sir William Twysden (eldest son and heir of Sir Roger): see *Catalogus de libris authenticis et apocryphis*, ed. Rouse and Rouse, cxciv–cxcv.

⁶⁴⁸ On 10 May Hatton wrote to Charlett: 'Mr. Churchill (y^e Bearer hereof) having acquainted me S^t that he designs to publish Leland's Workes, and y^t you had been pleased to recommend to him a person who wou'd undertake to fit for y^e Press Leland's most valuable worke, y^t de scriptoribus Angliae I was soe fully convinc'd, y^t any person recommended by you is assuredly very well qualified for y^e Taske he undertakes, y^t I very readily complied wth Mr. Churchill's desire to me, to lend him my Manuscript copies of Leland his Collectanea in 3 voll^s, his Itinerary in one, and de scriptoribus in two other vol^s in fol^o' (quoted in Hunt, 'Tanner's *Bibliotheca Britannico-Hibernica*', 250). As a note on the flyleaf of his copy indicates, Gale had seen Hatton's transcription. He also referred to it in his entries for Ceolfrith (TCC MS O. 10. 6, fol. 57r; c. 82) and William of Newburgh (ibid. fol. 105v; c. 173).

⁶⁴⁹ See Harris, 'Early custodial history', 477. On Christopher Hatton's fears in the early 1640s about the destruction that would be wrought by 'the Presbyterian contagion' and the need for 'preservation-by-recording' see Harris, 'Reformation and the antiquarian resistance', 241.

⁶⁵⁰ Printed in Hunt, 'Tanner's *Bibliotheca Britannico-Hibernica*', 252.

'Boston of Bury', returning the original to Churchill in October.⁶⁵¹ By 1696 the original scheme had expanded considerably and a prospectus announced that:

Leland's entire book de Scriptoribus Britanniae (wch was never yet printed) will be interwoven thro' the whole work (in a different Character); nothing in Bale or Pits (but their ill language) will be omitted; and some Hundreds of Authors will be inserted which are not to be found in any of those three. . . . The authors will be digested according of time under the several Centuries. . . . At the end will be printed entire Boston monk of Bury his Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Writers.⁶⁵²

The work moved forward slowly, however, and when Hall brought out his edition in 1709 he proclaimed that 'Nemo adhuc repertus est, qui Lelandum Lelando restitueret'.⁶⁵³ Charlett sent a copy of Hall's edition to Tanner as soon as it was published, and Tanner wrote back on 4 February:

I am obliged to you for another very kind letter since, and for the printed Leland, wch I just now received by the London Waggon. I have not had time to run it over but it seems to be hansomly and, I believe, correctly printed, and I must acknowledge the respectfull mention of my self, tho' I neither feared nor expected any ill words from this editor, as having deserved no bad usage at his or any of his encouragers hand. During the whole dependance of this undertaking, you, to whom I have writ my thoughts freely, know that I have shew'd as little resentment as any body so nearly concern'd possibly could, always thinking it my duty to sacrifice my own private sentiments and interest to what in the better judgment of my superiors would so much advance the public state of learning. My design was last year and is still, as much as it was 13 years since, to print Leland entirely, by interweaving

⁶⁵¹ *ibid.* On its subsequent history and loss, Tanner seeming to be 'the latest person one can demonstrate to have laid eyes on the manuscript', see *Catalogus de libris authenticis et apocrifis*, ed. Rouse and Rouse, ccii–cciv. To what degree if any Tanner made use of the lost Hatton transcript of *De uiris illustribus* is not clear, but there may be one slight hint that both he and Hall consulted it. In the *Commentarii de scriptoribus Britannicis* Hall omitted the concluding sentence to c. 338 (Nicolas de Gorran) and Tanner's entry for Gorran has the same omission. At the end of the entry Tanner has added a note quoting the missing sentence, and alleging as his source Bale's epitome, which he had in his possession during part of his time at Norwich: 'His addit Ms. Lel. Trin'. It is virtually impossible that both editors would have independently made this same omission, and it is equally unlikely that Tanner would have copied Hall's printed edition: he would long since have completed his own transcription by 1709. The only remaining scenario is that they both consulted another copy that had this gap: Hatton's seems the likely candidate. Nevertheless, as Sharpe observes, 'No one has established exactly the textual foundations of Tanner's text of Leland or even its completeness, but it clearly relied chiefly on Leland's autograph' ('Thomas Tanner', 390).

⁶⁵² Quoted in Sharpe, 'Thomas Tanner', 390.

⁶⁵³ 'Praefatio' to *Commentarii de scriptoribus Britannicis*. Hall had long known about Tanner's forthcoming edition—on which see Sharpe, 'Thomas Tanner', 392–3—and in the preface he observed that 'Tredecim, aut eo amplius, abhinc annis idem negotium suscepit uir eruditus Thomas Tannerus'.

his Writers with my own, as they shall happen in order of time or Alphabetically, making his words the Text, but finding that he had entirely omitted above 2000 British writers, and that of those he does mention, he had given a very imperfect account of their writings, I could not satisfy myself that the bare edition of Leland's book (wch undoubtedly exceeded everything in the kind before his time) without the addition of such new Authors and Writings as later searches of Libraries have discovered, would answer the expectation of the world or turn to the Booksellers account. Mr Harrington, you also know, intended great improvements. If it had pleased God to have afforded him Life and Leisure, his happy pen would have done Leland more honor and the world more service than Mr H[all] or I can pretend to.⁶⁵⁴

Guardedly polite about what Hall had accomplished—'hansomly and, I believe, correctly printed'—Tanner had not given up on his own project. His position was that Leland's 'bare' text might have been admirable for its time, but that it could no longer stand on its own: it would not 'answer the expectation of the world or turn to the Booksellers account'.

On 22 January 1709 Thomas Hearne described Tanner as 'continually drudging at it, no one day escaping without some Improvements',⁶⁵⁵ but there is little sign of sustained effort in the succeeding years.⁶⁵⁶ Tanner's situation was not unlike Leland's own had been more than a century and a half earlier, and there was no doubt a similarity in the despair both may have felt in the possibility of bringing such a mammoth project, new materials constantly turning up, to an end.⁶⁵⁷ Edited and completed by David Wilkins (1685–1745), Tanner's text was at last published by William Bowyer in 1748, some thirteen years after his death, with the title of *Bibliotheca Britannico-Hibernica: sive, De scriptoribus, qui in Anglia, Scotia, et Hibernia ad saeculi XVII initium floruerunt, literarum ordine juxta familiarum nomina dispositis commentarius*. It continues to be, as Sharpe has shown, an enormously important book, a major source of information about authors of the English middle ages and early modern period, 'a magnificent bibliographical achievement that helped to ensure that even quite

⁶⁵⁴ Quoted in Sharpe, 'Thomas Tanner', 397. Mr Harrington was no doubt the lawyer James Harrington (1664–1693), who owned an interleaved copy of 'quarto Baleus': see *The Life and Times of Anthony Wood*, ed. A. Clark, 5 vols (Oxford 1891–1900), 2. 498. Hall's edition would have come as no surprise to Tanner, and Charlett had written to him about it as early as December 1704: see Sharpe, 'Thomas Tanner', 391–2.

⁶⁵⁵ Hearne, *Remarks and Collections*, 2. 164.

⁶⁵⁶ Tanner himself would later confess that the appearance of Hall's edition had 'caused him to "cool a little"': see Davies, 'Thomas Tanner and his "Bibliotheca"'.

⁶⁵⁷ In 'Thomas Tanner and his "Bibliotheca"', Davies refers to 'Tanner's vague and procrastinating ambition as a scholar and undistinguished success as a Churchman': a cynic might apply the same description to Leland.

minor British writers from the period before 1600 were catalogued and in some sense knowable through succeeding centuries'.⁶⁵⁸

Published by Oxford University Press, the *Commentarii de scriptoribus Britannicis* was Anthony Hall's first antiquarian undertaking: he had originally been directed to the project by the Anglo-Saxon and Greek scholar Edward Thwaites and other fellows of Queen's College, where he had been an undergraduate and where he would be elected a fellow in 1706.⁶⁵⁹ It was announced in the *History of the works of the learned. Or, An impartial account of books lately printed in all parts of Europe* in August 1705 (7. 8, 511): Thwaites at first denied but then subsequently confirmed this report.⁶⁶⁰ According to an entry in Hearne's diary of 21 October 1705 Charlett told Hearne that Hall would not pursue his scheme 'upon Assurance that Mr. Tanner prosecutes it'.⁶⁶¹ On 15 February 1708 Hearne wrote to Thomas Smith, Sir Robert Cotton's librarian and compiler of the *Catalogus librorum manuscriptorum bibliothecae Cottonianae* (1696), stating that 'Mr. Hall is resolved to publish Leland *de Scriptoribus*, which is a pity if Mr. Tanner really intends to put it into the press speedily'.⁶⁶² Hearne, who described Hall as 'a Man of no Industry, it being common with him to lye abed 'till very near dinner time, and to drink very freely of the strongest liquors',⁶⁶³ dismissed the edition as soon as it appeared:

Last Night [i.e. 5 March 1709] was publish'd in Oxford Dr. Smith's Accurate Edition of St. Ignatius's Epistles in 4^{to}, & Leland's Book *de Scriptoribus* in 8^{vo}, the last by one Mr. Hall, A.M. and Fellow of Queen's College, in which he has committed most gross Errors as I find by comparing only the first Sheet with the MS^t, which neither himself nor the Persons he imploy'd could read. 'Tis also full of Typographical Errors.⁶⁶⁴

⁶⁵⁸ Sharpe, 'Thomas Tanner', 381.

⁶⁵⁹ In an entry of his diary for 22 January 1709 Hearne stated that Hall 'was put upon it by Mr. Thwaites, and was assisted by divers of the College besides' (*Remarks and Collections*, 2. 164). Gibson and Tanner were also graduates of Queen's.

⁶⁶⁰ See Hearne's diary entries for 14 and 21 September 1705: *Remarks and Collections*, 1. 44, 47.

⁶⁶¹ *ibid.* 1. 58.

⁶⁶² *ibid.* 2. 94. On 4 October 1707 Smith had informed Hearne of his wish that Hall or somebody else would anticipate Tanner in bringing out Leland (*ibid.* 2. 58). In a letter to the patristic scholar William Cave, dated 15 November 1708, Hall stated that he had been willing 'to make what enquiries I could at Cambridge after Boston or Bury; but these proving fruitless I must, at present, be content with Leland alone. And I am the more inclined to be so because you were pleased to inform me that Boston seems not to signify much' (printed in Huddesford, *Lives of those Eminent Antiquaries*, 1. 104).

⁶⁶³ Hearne, *Remarks and Collections*, 2. 171.

⁶⁶⁴ *ibid.* 2. 174. Hearne himself had considered an edition, and the publication of the *Commentarii de scriptoribus Britannicis* was a catalyst for his own editions of Leland's other writings. A copy of Hall's edition with Hearne's corrections is found as Bodl. MS 8° Rawlinson 57. These are detailed up to p. 135 but, as a note on this page indicates, Hearne was barred from the library at this point. As a result 'the corrections that come after are only some that I did now and then before my eject-

Writing to Smith on 27 February, Hearne related that at a dinner at Queen's College:

Mr Thwaites at the same time condemn'd the latter Part of his [Hall's] Edition of Leland, as being negligently done, which he said might have been done much better if he would have condescended to have let him look over the Sheets, as he did of the first Part, which he said was very well corrected, and accurately perform'd, tho' I knew the quite contrary, notwithstanding I said nothing.⁶⁶⁵

In another letter to Smith, dated 13 February 1709, he sent a detailed list of criticisms.⁶⁶⁶ After Hall announced his edition of Nicholas Trevet's *Annales*, Hearne observed (in his diary entry for 18 March 1717) that 'it is most certain that no great matter is to be expected from Hall, if we may conclude anything from his Edition of Leland's Book de Scriptoribus, most pitifully put out by him, there being strange Omissions of very material Passages, & a vast number of very considerable Faults in it.'⁶⁶⁷

Hearne, himself an extraordinarily meticulous editor, was no doubt overly severe: Hall's transcription is relatively accurate in general. The standardization of orthography, however, appears arbitrary and is sometimes misleading. Showing no interest in the various stages of production, Hall ignored all deletions and other similar changes over time. On occasion he inserted words or phrases which did not exist in the original. Elsewhere he omitted material from the text or left out Leland's marginal additions. Nevertheless, by his own account, 'Autographum igitur diligenter exscribi, &, quanta potui cura, emendae excudi curavi', and Theodor Harmsen, who wrote the entry on Hall for the *ODNB*, is probably nearer the mark than Hearne when he characterizes it as 'a valuable edition of average quality compared to other historical editions produced at the time'.

D. 'So much studyng at al houres': *The Present Edition*

I. The Title

After describing in the New Year's Gift the structure of his comprehensive

ment'. See also his letter to Thomas Rawlinson of 27 July 1719: 'a Book full of the grossest Errors, as well as large Omissions. . . . I have noted down some of them in the Copy I have, & had went through the whole, had not I been most wickedly and unjustly ejected from the Bodlejan Library' (*Remarks and Collections*, 7. 33).

⁶⁶⁵ *ibid.* 2. 171–2.

⁶⁶⁶ *ibid.* 2. 168–9.

⁶⁶⁷ *ibid.* 6. 156. Hearne wrote to Richard Rawlinson on 8 November 1718 pointing out that 'the utmost of his Abilities appears in Leland's Book de Scriptoribus, so horribly printed that I was quite ashamed of it, when I began to compare it with the MS. . . . To tell you the truth, I know the Editor of Rivet [i.e. Trevet] to be so very ignorant in MSS. that he could not read Leland, . . . much less can he read MSS. that are older'; *ibid.* 6. 249.

history of writers of 'this realme [of England]', Leland stated that he had 'addid this title, *De uiris illustribus*, folowing the profitable exemple of Hieronyme, Gennadie, Cassiodore, Severiane, and Trittemie a late writer'.⁶⁶⁸ Commenting on this passage Bale pointed out that: 'Of many ydell wytted braggers, whych judge them selves lerned and are nothyng lesse, is the tytle of thys worke, *de uiris illustribus*, contempned and ill spoken of. But what wyse men do thynte of them that so frantycklye on their ale benches do prattle, it is easy to conjecture'.⁶⁶⁹ Bale did not identify to whom he was darkly referring or what the complaints might have been, but the allusion may have been to Polydore Vergil, who no doubt judged himself learned, or perhaps to the individual 'notioris loquentiae, quam eloquentiae' (more notorious for loquacity than for eloquence) whom Leland took to task for correcting him on the number of arches to London Bridge.⁶⁷⁰ Whatever else, Bale's comments do show that this was the name by which the work was known to Leland's contemporaries as well as the one Leland intended. It is therefore the title used in this edition.

2. Editorial Procedures

The present edition is based on Leland's autograph, Bodl. MS Top. gen. c. 4. Although T derives from it and has no independent value, it has been cited in

⁶⁶⁸ Bodl. MS Top. gen. c. 3, p. 283. In the marginal gloss he expanded the title slightly to 'Libri quatuor de uiris illustribus siue de scriptoribus Britanicis'. In the *Cygneae cantio* (ed. Hearne, 81) he called the work *De uiris illustribus*, or more expansively 'lib[er] de origine & incremento bonarum in Britannia literarum'. In c. 339, he described it as 'Catalogus illustrium uirorum'. Jerome's catalogue was compiled around AD 392 and Gennadius added his continuation approximately a hundred years later. In his allusion to Cassiodorus' 'De uiris illustribus', Leland was probably thinking of Bk 1 of the *De institutionibus diuinarum scripturarum*: see L. W. Jones, 'Further notes concerning Cassiodorus' influence on mediaeval culture', *Speculum* 22 (1947), 254-6, at 254. Tritheim's *Liber de scriptoribus ecclesiasticis* was, as has been noted, published in 1494. 'Severiane' may possibly be identified as Sulpicius Severus, who composed a Life of St Martin of Tours. (Bale identified Bishop Severianus, father of Agricola, as Sulpicius Severus.) On fol. ii^v of Bodl. MS Bodley 354 (SC 2432) Leland has written: 'Vitae illustrium uirorum autoribus Sulpitio Seuero, Alcuino, Gregorio Turonensi, Ioanne Diacono, Mellito, Fausto [= *Carmen* 39].

Carmen Ioannis Leylandi Londinensis
Plutarchus uitas scripsit, uitasque Seuerus,
Et pulchre officio functus uterque suo est
Quanto Plutarchus lingua praestantior, alter
Materia tanto clarior, atque fide.'

(Plutarch wrote lives, as did Severus, and both did a fine job in their work. To the same degree that Plutarch is superior in his use of language, so too the other is more polished in his subject-matter and in his faith.) On the tradition of *uiri illustres* in general see Sharpe, 'English bibliographical tradition'.

⁶⁶⁹ *Laboryouse journey*, sig Di^rv. In T Bale also called the work *De uiris illustribus*. On a flyleaf prefacing his transcript Thomas Gale observed 'Titulus huius operis ex Balaeo—De Viris illustribus Libb. IV'.

⁶⁷⁰ *Cygneae cantio*, ed. Hearne, 92. Leland (correctly) gave the number as nineteen (as did Vergil) rather than twenty (as did his detractor). Leland concluded his comments with a reference to his detractor's pot companions ('compotores').

the case of difficult readings, textual gaps, and, on occasion, inaccurate information. I have followed Leland's orthography throughout, but paragraphing and punctuation are my own. I have transcribed *e*-caudata as *ae* or *oe* and have retained Leland's own *ae* even in cases where it is manifestly inappropriate.⁶⁷¹ For words in Old English I have rendered *æ* as a single letter but have left two for the Latin *ae*. Upper case 'V' or lower case 'u' represent both the vowel and consonant in the Latin text and 'j' is not employed. In English quotations, including those in printed books where contemporary usage was inconsistent, I have rendered the consonants as 'v' and 'j'. Ordinals are normally written out as words even when Leland himself used a number. I have given all dates in arabic in my translation and roman in the Latin text, even though Leland himself had no clear policy. I have used the conventional Latin abbreviations for reckonings of time in spite of Leland's inconsistency in this regard. I have signalled marginal notes and pointing fingers, both by Leland and later commentators. Leland normally underlined quotations and I have put these in quotation marks. He also underlined for emphasis, and sometimes for reasons I cannot fathom, but I have not noted these. In the Latin text I have italicized words left in the vernacular—normally place-names—and in the English I have done likewise with Latin forms.

Although Leland intended the finished work to be divided into four books, the chronological span for each book given in the New Year's Gift is too imprecise to permit reconstruction and no attempt has been made to divide the present edition into books. The numbered chapter headings are editorial and are taken from Hall with the exception of cc. 156–179, where Hall's numbers are noted parenthetically. Some chapters were not included by Hall because they were redundant, and I have printed these without adding new numbers, although they have been set off from the preceding chapter by an explanatory headnote and double spacing. Sometimes, as in c. 186, I have divided what was a single chapter by Hall's reckoning into two but I do not normally signal subsidiary authors within chapters, since Leland himself did not set these off from the primary entry and Hall did not include them in his headings. Like Hall, I have heeded Leland's general instructions on placement, such as 'redige'. Hall's pagination appears in the left-hand margin of the Latin text.

As has been shown above, Leland's text is the product of two distinct phases of composition, one *ca* 1535–6 (Stage I), and one *ca* 1543–6 (Stage II): these are signalled at the beginning of each chapter in the form SI or SII.⁶⁷² In

⁶⁷¹ Sometimes it is difficult to be certain whether or not Leland meant to emend *ae* to *e*: in these cases I have followed standard usage. Elsewhere, as in the case where he gives *benae* for *bene*, I have silently emended.

⁶⁷² Leland added a small number of entries soon after the completion of his original text and I have normally treated these as additions. There are, however, several instances written on paper with the watermark Briquet 11383 which are very early additions, and I have included them as part of the original stage of activity. C. 147 is an unusual case: if Leland saw Eadmer's history at Haughmond

his first phase of composition, Leland seems to have been copying out draft entries: see, for example, c. 154, where his eye skipped from 'designato' to 'amicitiae' and he later had to add 'amicus innotuit' above the line. The later entries were more rushed, and in some cases Leland appears to have composed on to the page. This is not a diplomatic edition, however, and I have not noted purely mechanical corrections, removal of repetitions and other stylistic improvements, or slight reorganizations of word order that occurred over the years.⁶⁷³

I silently emend trivial errors on Leland's part when these are obviously the result of carelessness.⁶⁷⁴ I do not point out generic changes in orthography, such as 'achademia' to 'academia', or in the Latin rendering of English place- and personal names.⁶⁷⁵ When a particular individual's name has been changed throughout a single chapter, I signal only the first instance as a revision—the variant may be significant—but the reader can assume that all further occurrences of the second form are revisions on Leland's part. I do not note more general changes, such as the substitution of 'Isidis ad uadum' for 'Oxonia' or 'Ealmerus' for 'Elmerus'. If a chapter in Stage I is printed with the later form, then the reader will know that this was an addition. Leland did not, however, correct every example as he worked his way through the earlier text, and I have let uncorrected forms stand rather than standardizing them. The only additions or substitutions which I signal as such are those in which Leland returned to the text to add new information to an original entry or to make substantial changes to his earlier draft, as in the cases when he changed 'nunc' to 'nuper' in his references to monastic houses.⁶⁷⁶ On occasion, what might appear to be an addition because of its position in the margin is in fact a result of the constraints of space, and I do not draw attention to it. Passages that Leland later deleted are retained, but printed in a smaller type size.

For the most part Leland described texts rather than giving titles as such. In the Latin transcription I have left these descriptions unitalicized and uncapitalized unless Leland has used the specific term 'titulus', in which case I have provided a capital. In the English translation, however, I have normally treated the Latin descriptions as titles, both because that is how they would be regarded in English and because by so doing the reader is able to see more easily where they occur in the text. As in the manuscript itself, lists of works

when he visited Wales in 1538, this chapter cannot have been written earlier; nevertheless, he has retained his unrevised orthography.

⁶⁷³ In c. 161, for example, he added 'avidus' after 'inuissebat' and then took out 'semper avidus' after 'maxime'. There are many instances of this sort of tinkering. Likewise he almost always wrote 'ob ouo' when he meant 'ab ouo', but this has been treated as an unconscious *lapsus calami*, and is not recorded.

⁶⁷⁴ I have not, however, consistently emended when subject and verb do not agree.

⁶⁷⁵ See Appendix 3 for a detailed list of Leland's orthographic revisions.

⁶⁷⁶ Leland normally made use of *signes de renvoi* when he added material in the margin, but I have not noted the actual signals. Sometimes there is no text corresponding to the *signe de renvoi*.

are indented.⁶⁷⁷ Sometimes Leland rendered the titles in lists in the accusative case and sometimes in the nominative: I have followed his usage when it is apparent—even when he is inconsistent in a single entry—and have used the accusative case when there is no other indication.

De uiris illustribus was still in draft form when insanity overtook Leland, and he never fully revised it. Hall's tendency was to emend silently, but I have tried generally to reproduce the text in the form in which Leland left it, even though this does entail some inconsistencies in my own edition. Leland's text was, it must be emphasized, a work in progress, and my editorial method is designed to highlight this.

3. The Translation

Leland was an accomplished Latinist whose verse has been characterized by J. W. Binns as standing 'to the Latin poetry of sixteenth-century England as Wyatt and Surrey do to the English. His poetry . . . is an expression of the emerging humanistic culture of his day'.⁶⁷⁸ His prose style was no less learned and attests to his training at St Paul's School and at Cambridge. Much of the *De uiris illustribus* is written in a flourished Latin style, the flavour of which would be difficult to capture in English.⁶⁷⁹ Other sections, nevertheless, show signs of haste, and this too is virtually impossible to indicate in translation.

Almost everything in the text has been translated, including the titles and *incipits* of Latin works, except when there is no acceptable English equivalent or where a short repetitive phrase, such as 'Haec ille', would appear awkward in English.⁶⁸⁰ Normally, substantial deletions are translated, but short ones, especially those which lack grammatical coherence or do not make sense as such, are ignored. A literal translation of expressions popular with the humanists—*bonae literae*, *bonae artes*, and the like—often does not capture the resonances

⁶⁷⁷ In 'English bibliographical tradition', 100, Sharpe observes that 'like Trithemius and Alberti, he often tabulates the list of an author's works, using two columns where he was able to add their incipits'.

⁶⁷⁸ Binns, *Intellectual Culture in Elizabethan and Jacobean England*, 19.

⁶⁷⁹ Leland was particularly fond of synonyms; he made great use of doublets and even triplets. It was a practice in which his friend and collaborator Nicholas Udall also indulged when he provided translations into English of Terence: for 'Impotenti est animo', for example, he gave ' . . . he can not mayster, subdue, refreynne, withdrawe, or rule the passions of his mynde' (*Floures for Latine spekyng selected and gathered oute of Terence* [London 1533 (1534)], 30).

⁶⁸⁰ I have normally given personal names in the form in which they are found in Richard Sharpe's *Latin Writers*. In some cases, especially for the Anglo-Saxon period, I have translated Leland's version of a name rather than the more generally accepted one since it is possible that his text represents a now-lost manuscript form. Leland enjoyed finding recondite ways of putting English names into Latin—Eure as Aquarius in c. 593, for example—and my translation does not always reproduce his verve and wit. English equivalents for Latin descriptive titles are not always easy to find, since the standardized formal title as such came into being only with printed books and the use of the title page. On medieval *tituli* in general see R. Sharpe, *Titulus: Identifying Medieval Latin Texts. An Evidence-Based Approach* (Turnhout 2003).

behind them and I have on occasion been relatively loose in my translation. Likewise, Leland's complicated circumlocutions when discussing university degrees have been abbreviated or recast.

Although Leland himself translated Greek epigrams into Latin, he never articulated a theory of translation in general. Udall, on the other hand, did explain what he thought were the responsibilities of a translator and how he should set about his business:

I have laboured to discharge the duetie of a translatour, that is, kepyng and folowyng the sense of my booke, to interprete and turne the Latine into Englyshe with as much grace of our vulgare tounge, as in my slendre power and knowelage hath lyen.⁶⁸¹

Whether or not the result measures up to Udall's efforts, my aims have been the same.

⁶⁸¹ Erasmus, *Apophthegmes*, trans. Nicholas Udall ([London] 1542), sig. *ii^v.

SIGLA

H	page of Hall's edition
p.	page of Leland's autograph: Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Top. gen. c. 4
T	John Bale's epitome: Cambridge, Trinity College, MS R. 7. 15 (753)
SI	Stage I
SII	Stage II

TRANSCRIPTION SYMBOLS

[]	editorial conjecture where text is illegible or damaged
< >	text supplied editorially
⸮ ⸮	Leland's additions to the text
⸮ ⸮	addition within addition
⸮ ⸮	text deleted by Leland (smaller type)
***	lacuna in text
{ }	letters in manuscript but deemed superfluous
	end of page in manuscript