Politics, Patronage and Medieval Scholarship: Henry Savile's *Rerum Anglicarum scriptores post Bedam* (1596) in Context

Thomas Roebuck

Lecturer in Renaissance Literature, School of Literature, Drama, and Creative Writing, University of East Anglia, Norwich, UK

T.Roebuck@uea.ac.uk

Abstract

Henry Savile's *Rerum Anglicarum scriptores* (1596), his collection of writings of medieval historians, was essential reading for Britain's antiquaries for generations. However, it has not generally figured largely in histories of British antiquarianism and its publication has seemed a puzzling episode in Savile's scholarly career. This article draws on newly discovered or redated print and manuscript evidence to illuminate the nexus of politics and patronage from which the book emerged. Exploring Savile's place within British antiquarianism, his practice as a medieval editor, and the volume's publication in Frankfurt, the essay argues that Savile's *Scriptores* constitutes a significant departure from earlier sixteenth-century traditions of medieval textual editing.

Keywords: Henry Savile -- William of Malmesbury -- book history -- patronage -- editing -- medieval chronicles -- antiquarianism

Introduction

In 1596, Henry Savile (1549-1622) published an edition of five medieval historians, mainly writers of the twelfth century, under the title *Rerum Anglicarum scriptores post Bedam*, the *Writers of English Affairs after Bede*, with a lavish dedication to Queen Elizabeth.[1] When the book emerged, in late October or very early November, it was immediately an object of great interest: in November 1596, Rowland Whyte bought a copy of 'Mr Saviles storie of England' for Robert Sidney (1563-1626), who liked to get new books as soon as their ink had dried.[2] A volume such as Savile's had been a *desideratum* among those interested in British history for much of the post-Reformation period. The Welsh antiquary, John Prise (1501/2-1555), had issued, in Neil Ker's words, 'what amounts to a plea for a "Rolls Series"' in his posthumously published *Historiae Brytannicae defensio*, in which he proclaimed that 'the works of William of Malmesbury, Henry of Huntingdon, Alfred, Johannes Anglicus[?], Henry [sic] of Hoveden, and of Giraldus himself' 'ought universally to be for sale'.[3] That call had already begun to be answered twenty-five years before the emergence of Savile's book by Matthew Parker (1504-1575), archbishop of Canterbury and great collector and publisher

[1] Henry Savile, ed., *Rerum Anglicarum scriptores post Bedam præcipui* (London, 1596). This article had its origins in a paper presented at a conference held at Merton College, Oxford, 1st July 2014 - 3rd July 2014, 'Scholarship, Science, and Religion in the Age of Isaac Casaubon (1559-1614) and Henry Savile (1549-1622)', co-organised by Mordechai Feingold, David Norbrook, and Thomas Roebuck. I am grateful for the comments of the audience on that paper. Since then, for conversations on the topic of this essay or for feedback on drafts, I am grateful to Sophie Butler, Mordechai Feingold, Jeffrey Miller, John-Mark Philo (who in particular gave invaluable advice on Latin translations), and two anonymous peer-reviewers for this journal. It is a particular pleasure to thank Kerry Lingwood and Kerry Murray, library managers at King's Lynn Public Library, for introducing me to their collection and for their unfailing support.

[2] Germaine Warkentin, Joseph L. Black, and William R. Bowen, eds, *The Library of the Sidneys of Penshurst Place, circa 1665* (Toronto, 2013), entry for '7v15 Anglicarum rerum post Bedam scriptores Praecipui fol.' His copy is preserved in the Centre for Reformation and Renaissance Studies (CRRS), Victoria University in the University of Toronto, bearing the signature 'Sydney 1597' (DA170.R47 1596). For bibliographical description and images see Elisa Tersigni, 'Henry Savile's Rerum Anglicarum Scriptores Post Bedam (London, 1596)', in Centre for Reformation and Renaissance Studies, Victoria College, University of Toronto: https://crrs.ca/featured-book/frb5/, accessed 17 Sept. 2020.

[3] Neil R. Ker, 'Sir John Prise', *The Library* 5th series 10 (1955), 1-24, 7. John Prise, *Historiae Brytannicae defensio* (London, 1573), 129-130: 'Atque hæc igitur, etsi non tam vniuersim venalia forent, quàm libri fortè alij, eos tamen expensis Regiæ maiestatis typis excudi conueniret. Opera inquam Willielmi Malmesburiensis, Henrici Huntingdonensis, Aluredi, Ioannis Anglici, Henrici [sic] Houedensis, ipsiusque Giraldi, qui de rebus Hibernicis & Brytannicis plurima scripsit obseruanda'.

of medieval texts.[4] Savile's work would have been hard to imagine without the precedent of Parker's. From our vantage point, though, we can see that the roots of Savile's volume run deeper still. His collection ultimately finds antecedents in manuscript compilations of British chronicles produced in the late medieval period. Indeed, Savile may have used one such volume in his own edition: a collection of Bede's *Ecclesiastical History,* William of Malmesbury's *Gesta regum* and *Historia novella*, and chronicles collected under the name 'Historia post obitum Bedae', which was made for Robert Wyvil, bishop of Salisbury (d. 1375). This volume was donated to the Bodleian by Thomas Kerry, clerk of the Privy Seal soon after the library's foundation.[5] Savile's volume was, however, a decisive turning point in this long tradition.

Savile's edition gave pride of place to three works by William of Malmesbury (b. *c.*1090, d. in or after 1142), his *Gesta regum, Historia novella,* and the first four books of *Gesta pontificum*. The first three books of William's *Gesta regum* had been published about ten years earlier by Jerome Commelin in his *Rerum Britannicarum [...] scriptores*. Commelin's manuscript of *Gesta regum* had been supplied to him by Paul Knibbe, a Flemish counsellor, but the first book was so 'damaged', having 'only survived by chance from the most lamentable desolation of the Libraries of the Low Countries', that its author could not even be identified.[6] Savile's is therefore the first substantially complete edition of William's histories in print. To them, Savile added two further major twelfth-century historical works:

[4] Essential reading on Matthew Parker as an editor of medieval texts is Madeline McMahon, 'Matthew Parker and the Practice of Church History', in *Confessionalisation and Erudition in Early Modern Europe*, eds Nicholas Hardy and Dmitri Levitin (Oxford, 2019), 116-153.

[5] This volume is Bodley MS 712. For contents and provenance see R. W. Hunt, Falconer Madan, and P. D. Record, *A Summary Catalogue of Western manuscripts in the Bodleian Library at Oxford*, 7 vols in 8 (Oxford, 1895-1953), 2/1: 453-454. For Savile's possible use see William Stubbs, *Willelmi Malmesbiriensis monachi: De gestis regum Anglorum libri quinque*, 2 vols (London, 1887), 1: xcvi.

[6] 'Huius historiæ Continuationem Anonymi, quam ex miserrima Bibliothecarum Belgicarum vastatione forte seruarat, mihi tradidit idem Knibius, sed in primo libro, vt videtur, mutilam' (Jerome Commelin, ed., *Rerum Britannicarum* [...] *scriptores vetvstiores ac præcipvi* (Heidelberg, 1587), 'Typographus Lectori', n.p.). Commelin had only moved his printing shop from Lyon to Heidelberg in 1587, and this book has both Lyon and Heidelberg imprints. Both editions have the dedication to Frederick IV, Elector Palatine (1574-1610).

Historia Anglorum of Henry, archdeacon of Huntingdon (*c*.1088-*c*.1157) and *Chronica* of the Yorkshire historian, Roger of Hoveden (d.1201/2). These are all writers of 'affairs after Bede'.[7] William of Malmesbury says exactly this in the Prologue of the very first work contained in Savile's volume: 'The history of the English, from their arrival in Britain to his own time, has been told with straightforward charm by Bede, most learned and least proud of men'; William continues that story.[8] The last two works printed in Savile's volume, however, are of a slightly different character, and both are focussed on Anglo-Saxon history. One is the remarkable Latin version of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle by Æthelweard (d.998), which tells Anglo-Saxon history from its beginnings down to the reign of King Edgar (959-975). As the unique manuscript of Æthelweard was destroyed in the Cotton Library fire of 1731, Savile's edition is its only surviving witness.[9] The final work is a portion of the forged chronicle attributed to Ingulf (*c*.1045-1109), abbot of Crowland Abbey, which covers the history of this Benedictine abbey (in south Lincolnshire) from its foundation in 716 down to the reign of Edward the Confessor (where Savile's manuscript must have broken off), along with a short fragment of Peter of Blois's continuation of the work. Despite its being a forgery, pseudo-Ingulf is recognised today as a complex, hybrid work, which remains of great interest and importance.[10] The whole volume, which was reprinted in Frankfurt in 1601, is completed by the 'Fasti Regum et Episcoporum Angliæ, Usque ad Willielmum Seniorem', a table, first of all, of Roman consuls, emperors, and popes, with corresponding events in Britain, which

[7] For an important recent discussion of Savile's publishing of historians who attempted to fill the 'post-Bedan gap' see George Garnett, *The Norman Conquest in English History: Volume 1: A Broken Chain?* (Oxford, 2021), 362-365, which argues that Savile's 'arrangement of his selected texts therefore served to emphasize that the Conquest had been the major event in English history' (365). I am extremely grateful to Professor Garnett for sharing his work with me in advance of publication.
[8] William of Malmesbury, *Gesta regum Anglorum = The History of the English Kings*, eds and trans R. A. B. Mynors, R. M. Thomson, and M. Winterbottom, 2 vols (Oxford, 1998), i.1.1.
[9] Alistair Campbell, ed. and trans., *The Chronicle of Æthelweard* (London, 1962).
[10] D. Roffe, 'The Historia Croylandensis: A Plea for Reassessment', *The English Historical Review* 110 (1995), 93-108.

gives way to lists of Anglo-Saxon kings and bishops. Taken together, these works constituted a dramatic expansion of the availability of medieval historical texts in print.

That this book is a hugely significant one for the history of the study of medieval Britain is undeniable. It remained the only edition of several vitally important British Latin historians until the nineteenth century. Between the end of the sixteenth century and 1840 -- a 240-year period -- if William of Malmesbury's *Gesta regum*, for instance, was read in print, it was read in Savile's edition. The geographical breadth of provenance and historical layers of annotations on surviving copies testify to its endurance. To give just one example: a copy of the Frankfurt edition of the book now in the National Library of Scotland, with a seventeenth-century binding, was still part of the library of the Scots Monastery in Regensburg, Bavaria, in 1788, and features notes pasted into the book in a mid-to-late-eighteenth-century hand.[11] Yet Savile's *Scriptores* has not figured as largely as it might have in accounts of British antiquarianism. Graham Parry's overview of antiquarianism, for instance, which remains invaluable, only mentions in passing Savile's work as an editor of medieval historians.[12] The reasons for this neglect are easy to understand. Early modern scholars have focussed on *Britannia* by the greatest antiquary of the era, William Camden (1551-1623), for instance, because there is a great deal of Camden's own writing and historical analysis to be found there. It is far more difficult to locate the presence of an editor in an early modern edition, unless he provides copious commentary -- which Savile did not. The blankness of Savile's edition can seemingly make it hard to interpret.

Moreover, this book appears, in many ways, a surprising one for Savile to have published. As his first Latin book, it was an important milestone in Savile's career. However,

[11] National Library of Scotland, SBA.715. The book's boards are covered with (probably) pig-skin, blind tooled with two triple fillet borders, four floral cornerpieces, and one (quite small) floral centrepiece. The ownership inscription on the title page reads: 'Ex Libris Mon*aster*ii S Jacobi Scot. Ratisb. sub Abb. Benedicto 1788'. Handwritten notes from Lodovico Antonio Muratori's *Annali d'Italia* (1744-1749) are pasted at 891. I am very grateful to Jordan Knowles for kindly sharing his photographs of this volume with me.

[12] Graham Parry, *Trophies of Time: English Antiquarians of the Seventeenth Century* (Oxford, 1995), 42.

while his earlier work on the history of ancient science and mathematics is well documented among his surviving papers, almost no manuscript material of Savile's own relating to *Scriptores* -- no notebooks or drafts -- is known to survive. At first glance, too, Savile's own situation in Oxford places him on the margins of British antiquarianism. Although there were Oxford antiquaries, such as Thomas Allen (1540?-1632), the Gloucester Hall mathematician and antiquarian (who published nothing, but energetically pursued the study of medieval manuscripts), antiquarianism was not a phenomenon primarily associated with the university at this time. Earlier exponents had been connected more with Cambridge than with Oxford, and more with the Church than either, and the leading antiquaries of Savile's generation lived in London, and their associations were often with the Inns of Court, sites of record keeping (the Tower of London or the Heralds' Office), or the Society of Antiquaries itself.[13] The first question that this article will address, then, is how far Savile ought to be situated among the antiquaries of his own age. Drawing on both newly discovered and previously known but freshly-dated archival evidence of the book's development and publication, the article then illuminates Savile's motivations in producing the work, and in doing so demonstrates that the book needs to be situated at the centre of Elizabethan politics and patronage in the 1590s.

Savile's contemporaries knew how to situate his edition. It was seen as a contribution to the tradition of medieval textual editing established by Matthew Parker. This is apparent from William Camden's preface to his own edition of British historical chronicles, which tells of the editorial work of 'the highest cultivator of venerable antiquity', Matthew Parker, before turning to 'the most famous Henry Savile, a man of the most exquisite erudition and

[13] Linda van Norden, 'The Elizabethan College of Antiquaries' (Ph.D. Diss., University of California at Los Angeles, 1946), 269: 'In striking contrast to the donnish character of the English antiquarianism of one hundred years later is the total detachment of the College of Antiquaries both from the universities and from the Church'. More recently on British antiquarianism see Angus Vine, *In Defiance of Time: Antiquarian Writing in Early Modern England* (Oxford, 2010).

121 solid judgment' and his edition of medieval chronicles.[14] Camden implicitly presents himself
122 as next in this tradition of English medieval editors. Continuities between Savile's work and
123 Parker's are clear. That Parker had published several chronicles of the thirteenth century, for
124 instance, must have helped to shape Savile's decision to focus on the historians of the twelfth
125 century: he was filling the gap between Bede (widely printed already) and those thirteenth-
126 century chroniclers available in Parkerian editions.[15] But, as I will argue, Savile's edition
127 constituted a departure from Parker's approach to medieval textual editing, too. Despite all
128 the caveats one might offer, it is not too crude a generalisation to say that several of Parker's
129 most celebrated editions (or the editions produced by the 'circle' of antiquaries around
130 Parker) were 'confessional editions', in the sense that they quite explicitly sought to draw on
131 the resources of Britain's medieval archives to answer questions posed by confessional
132 controversies. Early modern editions of medieval texts could not but be enmeshed within the
133 matrix of politics, confession, and patronage, which shaped Protestant scholars' encounters
134 with the contentious centuries in which the power and corruption of the Catholic church was
135 perceived to be at its height. Savile's historians offered plenty of opportunities to address
136 these issues: in the case of Anselm's struggles with the Norman kings as told in William of
137 Malmesbury's *Gesta pontificum*, for instance, or Thomas Becket's with Henry II in Roger of
138 Hoveden's *Chronica*. Yet, even when Savile very occasionally feels moved to point the
139 reader towards potentially controversial passages, it is done in a dry and neutral way quite
140 uncharacteristic of Parker's framing of his editions.[16] When in his 'Fasti Regum et
141 Episcoporum Angliæ', appended to *Scriptores*, Savile chronicles the bishoprics of the Anglo-

[14] 'summus venerandæ antiquitatis cultor Matthæus Parkerus [...] Deinde Clarissimus Henricus Sauilius vir exquisitissima eruditione & solidissimo iudicio' (William Camden, *Anglica, Normannica, Hibernica, Cambrica, a veteribus scripta* (Frankfurt, 1603), ***2v).
[15] On the printing history of Bede see Bertram Colgrave and R. A. B. Mynors, eds, *Bede's Ecclesiastical History of the English People* (Oxford, 1969), lxx-lxxiii.
[16] e.g. Savile, ed., *Scriptores*, 284v: 'Edictum Henrici regis contra Papam', in the margin of Roger of Hoveden's account of the disputes around Thomas Becket's Archbishopric.

Saxon church, the era of ecclesiastical history which had been instrumentalized more than any other by the Parker circle to demonstrate the antiquity of the true Protestant church, Savile chooses not to offer comment on the bishoprics' incumbents, even in passing. By examining Savile's practice as a textual editor (drawing gratefully on the work of medievalists who have attempted to solve the knotty problems of exactly which manuscripts Savile drew upon) and the ways in which he framed his edition of medieval historians, I wish to show that Savile's religio-political priorities were distinct from those of Parker. Savile's departures from the tradition established by Parker are thus as consequential as his continuities with that tradition. An episode in the book's reception explored in the conclusion will help, it is hoped, to underline the complexity and significance of Savile's approach to editing medieval texts in this landmark volume -- a work which every antiquary owned and relied upon for more than a century.

Henry Savile Among the Antiquaries?

How far, then, are we able to place Savile, the mathematician, classical scholar, and patristic editor, among the British antiquaries? Although he was never a member of the Society of Antiquaries, and would not have been a figure to whom the term 'antiquary' was immediately applied in the 1590s, Savile did have connections with individual antiquaries, perhaps most importantly within his own family. He was distantly related to the manuscript collector, Henry Savile of Banke (1568-1617).[17] Much more significantly, however, his brothers, the younger Thomas (d.1593) and the elder John Savile (1546-1607), can be shown to have deep connections to antiquarian circles. From 1579, Thomas Savile was a regular correspondent of

[17] 'He matriculated from Merton College, Oxford, in 1588, during the wardenship of his distant cousin and namesake, Sir Henry Savile, the translator of Tacitus and editor of Chrysostom': F. J. Levy, 'Savile, Henry, of Banke', *ODNB*, online edn.

William Camden, when the latter was drafting *Britannia*. Indeed, it seems to have been Thomas Savile's correspondence with Camden that indirectly led his brother Henry to publish Ingulph. Ingulph does not seem to have been a prominent author among the generation of antiquaries connected with Parker; although he was cited by John Caius in his account of the history of Cambridge, he does not feature in John Bale's indices of medieval British authors.[18] It was Camden's use of him in the description of Lincolnshire in *Britannia* that brought him to prominence. Thomas Savile seems to have drawn Camden's attention to Ingulph. 'I have about me', Thomas wrote to Camden in September 1580, 'transcripts of Ingulph, abbot of Croyland, and they are yours too, if you wish'.[19] Camden then seems to have made notes on late Anglo-Saxon history from Ingulph, before drawing on him in *Britannia*.[20] Thomas Savile died in 1593, but perhaps he had already been encouraging his brother to edit Ingulph; if not, there would doubtless have been encouragement from Camden, whose advice Savile certainly sought when he published Thomas Bradwardine's *De causa Dei*, though Savile seems likely already to have known Camden by the 1590s.[21]

Medieval authors were not, however, the centre of Thomas Savile and Camden's correspondence. Their focus was on ancient Roman Britain and the elucidation of the Antonine Itinerary, with a recurring topic of conversation particularly being the problem of identifying Britain's ancient Roman tribes or the places mentioned in the Itinerary.[22] These were debates with which Henry Savile was also clearly conversant and which leave their mark on his *Scriptores* in the chronology of British kings and bishops that Savile appended to

[18] John Caius, *De antiquitate Cantabrigiensis academiæ libri duo* (London, 1568), 300.
[19] Thomas Savile to William Camden, 10 Sept. 1580: '*Ingulphi Abbatis Croylandensis* ex V[eteri] L[ibro] exscripta apud me sunt, quin si vis, apud Te', in *V. Cl. Gulielmi Camdeni et illustrium virorum ad G. Camdenum epistolae*, ed. Thomas Smith (London, 1691), 3.
[20] B[ritish] L[ibrary] Cotton MS Cleopatra A.iv, fol. 110v.
[21] See Scott Mandelbrote, 'Calculators in Divinity: Henry Savile and Thomas Bradwardine', *Erudition and the Republic of Letters* 6 (2021), 114-135, 116.
[22] The classic essay is F. J. Levy, 'The Making of Camden's *Britannia*', *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance* 26 (1964), 70-97, although I am preparing a fuller study of the manuscript drafts of Camden's *Britannia*.

that work ('Fasti Regum et Episcoporum Angliæ'), in which he attempted to date key events in Romano-British history such as the Battle of Camulodonum.[23] They surface earlier in Savile's career too, in his marginal commentary to Tacitus's *Agricola*, a project that raised many questions about Britain's Roman history and formed a prelude to the historical periods treated in Savile's *Scriptores*. One marginal note, for instance, incisively glosses 'Brigantes' as 'Yorkshire, Lancashire, Westmerland, Cumberland, & the Byshoppricke of Durham'.[24] The identification of the Brigantes is closely related to difficult questions of Roman geography that Thomas Savile and Camden had been discussing in the early 1580s. Nevertheless, what must still be noted is the extent to which Savile's *Agricola* commentary does not focus on these issues, rather than to which it does. He was aware that there were questions about how ancient Roman sources might map onto modern British geography, but the intricacies and problems of this antiquarian exercise do not seem to have been central concerns for him, at least by 1591.

Another influence on Henry Savile's antiquarian pursuits is likely to have come from his brother, John Savile. He was a lawyer, perhaps the profession that, more than any other, helped to nurture antiquarianism in the sixteenth century. His autobiography shows that he was already engrossed in reading the works of medieval law before he joined the Inns of Court in 1564: 'he read through, once and again, *Littleton's Tenures, Ancient and Modern*, the *Statutes*, both *Magna Charta* and *Rastall's Abbreviamenta*, and the Year Books of Richard III, Henry VII and Henry VIII'.[25] By the 1570s, he was directly connected to some of the leading antiquarian circles of the period. In 1571 he was presented with a gift copy of John Foxe's edition of the Gospels in Anglo-Saxon from Matthew Parker himself, a book

[23] Savile, ed., *Scriptores*, *3v (this work has separate page signatures to the rest of the book).
[24] Henry Savile, *The Ende of Nero and Beginning of Galba. Fower Bookes of the Histories of Cornelius Tacitus. The Life of Agricola* (Oxford, 1591), 248.
[25] J. W. Clay and John Lister, 'Autobiography of Sir John Savile, of Methley, Knight, Baron of the Exchequer, 1546-1607', *Yorkshire Archaeological Journal* 15 (1900), 420-427, 423.

which was sold in the 1861 auction of the Savile family's books and manuscripts.[26] This gift places the young John Savile in the direct ambit of the kind of antiquarian scholarship that Henry Savile would take up in his *Scriptores*. A little later, in or around 1580, John Savile was clearly in touch with William Lambarde (1536-1601), the Kentish historian and lawyer who received tutoring in Anglo-Saxon at the Inns of Court from the pioneering scholar of that language, Laurence Nowell (c.1516-1576).[27] Lambarde was a member of Parker's antiquarian circle, so it may have been via these contacts or through the Inns of Court that John Savile became acquainted with him.[28] Lambarde gave him a manuscript copy of what would eventually be published, a century and a half later, as his *Alphabetical Description of the Chief Places in England and Wales*.[29] This manuscript remained in the Savile family until the nineteenth century.[30]

Alongside these London antiquarian associations, John Savile also maintained close links to Yorkshire and to the north of England more generally for his whole life. Those links enabled him to make interesting antiquarian discoveries, one of which Thomas Savile reported to Camden. 'There is belonging to the Bishop of Durham', he wrote (perhaps

[26] *Catalogue of a Selection of Singularly Curious & Rare Books, from the Libraries of those Eminent Scholars Sir Henry Savile, and Sir John Savile, who lived in the time of James the First.* (London, 1860), lot 178: 'The present copy will to all time have a special interest from the following memorandum written on the title: "Liber Joannis Savile, socii Medii Templi, ex dono reverendiss. pris Matthæi (Parkeri) Archieps. Cantuar, 16 die Augusti, 1571, in præsentia W. Fletewodd, Recordatoris civ. London."'. For more on the Savile book and manuscript sale see John-Mark Philo, 'The Printer's Copy of Henry Savile's Tacitus', *Erudition and the Republic of Letters* 6 (2021), 1-30, 6.

[27] Anthony Wood, *Athenæ Oxonienses*, 2 vols (Oxford, 1691-92), 1: 147. On Lambarde and Anglo-Saxon studies in this period more generally see Rebecca Brackmann, *The Elizabethan invention of Anglo-Saxon England: Laurence Nowell, William Lambarde, and the study of Old English* (Cambridge, 2012).

[28] On Parker and Lambarde see Madeline McMahon, 'Licking the "beare whelpe": William Lambarde and Matthew Parker Revise the *Perambulation of Kent*', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 81 (2018), 154-171.

[29] William Lambarde, *Dictionarium Angliæ topographicum & historicum* (London, 1730). Thomas Savile reports to Camden that 'I have seen in my brother's possession' the 'commentary collected by William Lambarde about modern true Saxon, British and Latin modern names of cities, rivers etc'. Although Thomas does not specify, the dating of this letter (10 Sept. 1580) meant that he must be referring to John Savile, as Henry was abroad on his continental tour at the time. See Smith, ed., *Camdeni* [...] *epistolae*, 3: 'Commentarium à *G. Lambardo* collectum de nominibus modernis, ut loquitur, veris & sincerè Saxonicis, Latinis, & Britannicis civitatum, fluminum, &c. apud fratrem meum vidi'.

[30] *Catalogue of some of the most valuable and important early manuscripts, chiefly on vellum, collected [...] by Sir John Savile the Elder [...], Sir Henry Savile, Provost of Eton, and Sir John Savile the Younger* (London, 1861), lot 45.

meaning in the Cathedral Library), 'a foundation charter, as I have heard from my brother John'.[31] John Savile's role as JP for County Durham may have enabled him to make this kind of antiquarian discovery: social status frequently facilitated access to rare documents. He also collected manuscripts, one of which is probably the *Life of St John of Beverley* by the eleventh-century monk, Folcard (d. after 1085), which is now in the British Library, a book that belonged to the Collegiate Church of St John at Beverley before passing to a William Wraye of Ripon, in North Yorkshire.[32] This northern provenance suggests that John Savile was the manuscript's collector, rather than Henry. John Savile's antiquarian knowledge, however, was not restricted to one county or region, as the detailed list of corrections and additions to *Britannia* that he sent to Camden in 1589 shows. His critique encompassed ecclesiastical, legal and political history, as well as geographical details, from throughout *Britannia* and throughout Britain.[33] Perhaps Henry Savile may have sought John's advice in preparing *Scriptores*. Like John, Henry Savile remained fiercely proud of his Yorkshire connections and seems to have prepared a splendidly presented manuscript of historical documents relating to the family's part of West Yorkshire.[34] It is unlikely, given Roger of Hoveden's reticence in providing autobiographical details in *Chronica*, but not impossible, that Savile guessed he was publishing one of Yorkshire's leading historians in his *Scriptores* volume.[35]

[31] Smith, ed., *Camdeni* [...] *epistolae*, 9: 'Est apud Episcopum Dunelmensem, ut à Joanne fratre meo accepi, charta donationis'. The charter contains mention of 'Camulodunum', which leads Savile to conjecture that Camulodunum may have been the nearby town which is now called Northallerton.
[32] BL Add. MS 61901. See *Catalogue of some of the most valuable and important early manuscripts*, lot 61. For description of the manuscript and provenance see *Catalogue of Additions to the Manuscripts. New Series 1981-1985* (London, 1994).
[33] Smith, ed., *Camdeni* [...] *epistolae*, 36-39: John Savile to Camden, 25 Dec. 1589.
[34] *Catalogue of some of the most valuable and important early manuscripts*, lot 62: 'Manuscript on vellum, in the autograph of Sir Henry Savile, in the original oak boards Saec. xvi-xvii. A most valuable Manuscript for the local historian, as containing every information that could be collected by H. Savile respecting lands held by himself and ancestors'. I do not know the current whereabouts of this manuscript. Sotheby's auctioneers were quick to attribute manuscripts to Henry Savile, rather than his brother John, but in this case the specificity provided makes it plausible that Henry Savile was at least involved in compiling this manuscript.
[35] For identification of the historian as Roger, parson of Howden, see Frank Barlow, 'Roger of Howden', *English Historical Review* 65 (1950), 352-60.

Henry Savile himself was also something of a manuscript collector. In 1620, Savile donated several manuscripts to the Bodleian. Some of these were related to his work on Chrysostom, and some to humanistic studies more generally. There were also some British medieval manuscripts, including a thirteenth-century manuscript of Geoffrey of Monmouth and an early-twelfth-century manuscript of Bede's metrical life of St Cuthbert.[36] Tellingly, these were not, however, the centrepiece of his bequest. We also need to be cautious when it comes to the manuscripts in the Savile Sotheby's sale of 1861. I have already conjectured that one of these, namely the *Life of St John of Beverley* (BL Add. MS 61901), seems most likely to have been acquired by John Savile. The same might be said of a twelfth-century manuscript of saints' lives that derives from the Convent of Austin Friars in Newcastle-upon-Tyne.[37] Some of the medieval British manuscripts in the Sotheby's sale, though, did surely belong to Henry Savile. One of these is a manuscript of Henry of Huntingdon's *Historia Anglorum*, which is now among the Egerton manuscripts in the British Library.[38] According to Diana Greenway, Henry of Huntingdon's modern editor, this manuscript was almost certainly one which Savile used in his edition.[39] The manuscript belonged to the Carmelite Friars of London in the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, where it was catalogued by John Leland.[40] Its later sixteenth-century provenance connects it strongly with Henry Savile in particular. Ker argues that its distinctive binding, with a blind-tooled oval centrepiece, was

[36] MS Bodl. 622 (Geoffrey of Monmouth) and MS Bodl. 109 (Bede's metrical life of St Cuthbert). Both of these manuscripts have been rebound in the seventeenth century in calf leather with the same blind-tooled floral design on each board, running parallel to the spine.
[37] *Catalogue of some of the most valuable and important early manuscripts*, lot 59. The manuscript is now BL Add. MS 35110. See Bodleian Library, Medieval Libraries of Great Britain, http://mlgb3.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/mlgb/book/4028/?search_term=35110&page_size=500, accessed 17 Sept. 2020. None of the annotations in the manuscript are in Savile's hand.
[38] BL Egerton MS 3668. *Catalogue of some of the most valuable and important early manuscripts*, lot 10. The original sticker, indicating this was lot 10 in that sale, is still to be found on the manuscript's upper board.
[39] Diana Greenway, ed., *Henry, Archdeacon of Huntingdon:* Historia Anglorum*: The History of the English People* (Oxford, 1996), cxxix-cxxx.
[40] ibid., cxxx.

in use in Oxford from the mid-1560s to 1573.[41] It seems plausible that either Savile had the manuscript rebound in Oxford (he arrived there in 1561, albeit when he was twelve) or that he acquired it in Oxford when it had already been rebound. Either way, its Oxford provenance -- as well as the fact that he used the manuscript in his edition -- suggests Henry Savile's ownership.

At least one other medieval manuscript that Savile owned seems to have passed through the hands of the London chorographer John Stow (1524/5-1605): a late fourteenth-century compilation of historical chronicles, taking material from Henry of Huntingdon and Simeon of Durham. It was among the manuscripts Savile donated to the Bodleian in 1620. This Kentish manuscript came from St Augustine's Abbey at Canterbury, and bears Stow's signatures. It is heavily annotated throughout in the hand of John Joscelyn (1529-1603), perhaps the leading antiquarian scholar in Parker's household.[42] Joscelyn draws minute attention to comparisons between this composite chronicle and passages in Henry of Huntingdon, Roger of Hoveden, and Simeon of Durham.[43] This manuscript seems not to have been used by Savile in his edition of Henry of Huntingdon, but in view of its composite nature, it would probably have been difficult to do so. Savile also owned another manuscript of Henry of Huntingdon (with continuations until 1203), one that stayed in his family until the 1861 Sotheby's sale, after which it was acquired by the British Library.[44] The first folio

[41] Neil Ker, *Fragments of Medieval Manuscripts used as Pastedowns in Oxford Bindings with a Survey of Oxford Binding c.1515-1620*, eds Scott Mandelbrote and David Rundle (Oxford, 2004), centrepiece xiii (on its dating see 217). The connection between BL Egerton MS 3668's and Ker's centrepiece xiii is made in the British Library, Explore Archives and Manuscripts, http://searcharchives.bl.uk/primo_library/libweb/action/display.do?tabs=detailsTab&ct=display&fn=search&doc=IAMS032-001985961&indx=2&recIds=IAMS032-001985961&recIdxs=1&elementId=1&renderMode=poppedOut&displayMode=full&frbrVersion=&dscnt=0&frbg=&scp.scps=scope%3A%28BL%29&tab=local&dstmp=1580727778043&srt=rank&mode=Basic&&dum=true&vl(freeText0)=egerton%203668&vid=IAMS_VU2, accessed 17 Sept. 2020.

[42] Bodl. MS Bodley 521. Stow's signature is most clearly visible at the top of fol. 108r. For more on this manuscript, including the identification of John Joscelyn as annotator, see Bodleian Library, Medieval Libraries of Great Britain, http://mlgb3.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/mlgb/book/1582/, accessed 17 Sept. 2020. For an extensive sample of Joscelyn's hand see BL Cotton MS Vitellius D.vii.

[43] e.g. Bodl. MS Bodley 521, fol. 54r, fol. 80v, 87r (Henry of Huntingdon), fol. 77v (Hoveden), fol. 95v (Simeon of Durham).

[44] *Catalogue of some of the most valuable and important early manuscripts*, lot 36.

of the manuscript bears a marginal annotation that also seems to be in Joscelyn's hand, noting that 'the addition of this book extends up to the year 1200, which was the first year of King John; the author of which addition seems to be someone other than Henry of Huntingdon'.[45] This manuscript is likely to have been used by Savile in his edition.[46]

The principles according to which Savile valued manuscripts are hinted at in a remarkable letter from Savile to Robert Cotton (dated 1611), with which Savile returned three manuscript books: John Philoponus's sixth-century CE commentary on Aristotle's *De Anima*, the celebrated Cotton Genesis manuscript (an early manuscript version of the Book of Genesis), and a third text that he does not name, but describes as 'fitter to bee flung away then kept'.[47] Strikingly (for our purposes), given Cotton's vast and specialised collection of British medieval manuscripts, the two manuscripts which Savile names here are Greek ones. Even more intriguing is his comment on the manuscript of Philoponus's commentary, which he notes was 'long ago printed'. This book, Savile writes, 'is good for nothing else but to bee kept in an old Library for a manuscript'. Cotton, he says, ought to donate it and the Cotton Genesis to Sir Thomas Bodley for his library in Oxford, 'being things not worth the keeping for any great learning, that can be picked out of them'.[48] To Savile, there are manuscripts that might be useful for the 'learning, that can be picked out of them' because their content has not yet been printed. Then there are those that have been printed, and therefore their content is no longer useful for learning; nevertheless, they ought to be preserved for preservation's sake. They are fit 'to be kept in an old Library for a manuscript': for no other reason than *to be a manuscript*. Then there is a final category of the third unnamed work, which is 'fitter to

[45] BL Add. MS 24061, fol. 1r: 'additio <libri> extendit vsq*ue* Ann*um* 1200 qui fuit Annus primus Regis Iohannis?./ cuius additio*n*is alius videt*ur* esse aucthoris qu*am* Henricus Huntinton'.
[46] Greenway, ed., *Henry, Archdeacon of Huntingdon*, clx.
[47] BL Cotton Julius C. III, fol. 333: addressed from Eton, 18 Dec. 1611. I have had to rely on the transcription of this letter produced by Thomas Smith (1638-1710), Cotton Librarian in the 1690s: Bodl. MS Smith 71, p.75. Smith's transcriptions are generally faithful, although he introduces his own spellings (e.g. 'bee' for 'be').
[48] Savile was clearly attempting to help Bodley to acquire manuscripts from Cotton in the early days of the foundation of his library, as can be seen from the letter of Savile to Cotton (dated only 'St Peters Day'), transcribed in Bodl. MS Smith 71, p. 33.

be flung away then kept': it is of no value at all. All told, Savile's focus thus seems to have been on the value of manuscripts' written *contents*, although he does acknowledge that those where useful content has been extracted and printed ought still to be preserved in a library. On show here is certainly an antiquary's impulse to preserve manuscripts, but there is also a fairly unsentimental, utilitarian emphasis on manuscripts' texts at the expense of other ways of interpreting their meaning or other motives for valuing them. According to the logic of this letter, in bringing the medieval historians into print, Savile would render their manuscripts 'not worth the keeping for any great learning, that can be picked out of them'. The qualifications with which the letter is written seem to bespeak a less than complete endorsement of antiquarian manuscript preservation. He knew antiquaries and did some antiquarianism, but Savile could not straightforwardly be described as 'an antiquary'.

The Publication of Henry Savile's *Rerum Anglicarum scriptores* (1596)

If Savile's links to the antiquarian community, then, were rather more partial than might have been expected for the editor of such a major contribution to British antiquarianism, how can we understand the immediate, local context from which the book emerged? Savile's book was published by three of the leading stationers of the period: George Bishop (b. in or before 1538, d.1610/11), Ralph Newbery (b. in or before 1536, d. 1603/4), and Robert Barker (c.1568-1646). Barker was the son of the royal printer, Christopher Barker, and already had a share in the royal privilege from 1593, three years before the emergence of the *Scriptores* volume.[49] Bishop and Newbery were junior partners with Barker in the royal printing house, and they were key figures in the learned book trade in London.[50] In the late 1560s, Bishop

[49] On Barker see Graham Rees and Maria Wakely, *Publishing, Politics, and Culture: The King's Printers in the Reign of James I and VI* (Oxford, 2009).
[50] Anders Ingram, 'Bishop, George' (b. in or before 1538, d. 1611)', *ODNB*, online edn.

was importing books from the great Antwerp publisher, Christophe Plantin (1520-1589).[51] Newbery had been the first publisher of Camden's *Britannia*, in 1586. Savile's volume announced on its title page that it was printed by the 'Deputies of the Royal Printer' (*Typographi Regij Deputati*): the ideal imprint for a volume which, as we shall see, had precise and personal royal connections. Its dedication to the 'Most Serene and Powerful Prince, Elizabeth Queen of England, France, and Ireland' is a well-known part of the book, prominently placed before the engraved title pages which introduce the individual historians.[52]

The dedication's flattering rhetoric could easily be dismissed as little more than a tissue of conventions. However, the extent to which this really *was* a court-centric volume, intimately bound up with very personal royal patronage, is revealed by an extraordinary copy of parts of Savile's book that survives in King's Lynn Public Library (Norfolk, UK). It is bound in two volumes.[53] The first volume contains William of Malmesbury's *Gesta regum* and *Historia novella*; the second, Henry of Huntingdon's *Historia* and William's *Gesta pontificum*. The volumes have the same pagination and lists of errata as the 1596 edition. There are also the distinctive title pages for each historian -- one for William of Malmesbury at the start of the first volume and one for Henry of Huntingdon at the start of the second. These title pages are dated 1596, just as in a standard copy of the book. The most obvious unusual feature is that it is incomplete -- there is no Roger of Hoveden, Ingulph, Æthelweard, or 'Fasti' -- and *Gesta pontificum* is bound in the wrong place (after Henry of Huntingdon). Both volumes are bound in fashionable limp vellum, stamped with outer and inner single-

[51] Julian Roberts, 'The Latin Trade', in *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain: Volume 4: 1557-1695*, eds John Barnard and D. F. McKenzie (Cambridge, 2002), 141-173, 156-157.
[52] Savile, *Scriptores*, ¶ij^{r}: 'Serenissimæ Potentissimæque Principi Elizabethæ, Angliæ, Franciæ, & Hiberniæ Reginæ, &c.'. Savile's preface has always been treated as a key text in understanding both Savile's attitude toward British historical writing and those of this period more broadly. It was discussed, for instance, at some length, in *Biographia Britannica: or, The Lives of the Most Eminent Persons*, 7 vols (London, 1747-1766), 5: 3599. It was reprinted in J.-P. Migne's 1855 edition of William of Malmesbury in his *Patrologia Latina*.
[53] Shelfmarks: DL-A4-8 and DL-A4-14. There is no published catalogue of King's Lynn's early modern book collections, but a card catalogue is available in the library itself.

fillet gold borders; traces of silk ties are visible.[54] The centrepiece of each volume is an heraldic stamp: a quartered shield, with two pairs of three fleur de lys and two pairs of three lions. It is surrounded by the motto of the Order of the Garter: 'Honi Soit qui Mal y Pense'. This is the royal armorial shield of Elizabeth I. The binding of each volume is not quite identical: the first volume features small gold-stamped floral decorations at the corners of the inner border, while the second volume has small acorns for its inner border's cornerpieces (see Figure 1 for this volume's binding). The distance between the inner and outer gold-fillet border is greater on the first volume than the second. The overall impression, however, is one of similarity and that these volumes were a pair. They are the same size, and the margins of the pages in both have been ruled with red ink borders. They have been in King's Lynn since at least the mid seventeenth century, when they were donated to the library of St Margaret's Church in King's Lynn, which had been established in 1631. The donation of the volumes was made by Hamon Le Strange (1583-1654), a member of the Norfolk gentry and MP and an enthusiastic book collector, who was also father of Roger Le Strange (1616-1704), the Restoration censor of the press.[55] Hamon Le Strange put his name on each volume and noted their price: 20 shillings, one of his pricier books, but certainly not his most expensive.[56] His donation of the volumes (probably made in the years following 1644) is recorded in St Margaret's Library's handsome vellum donors' book, which had been begun by John Arrowsmith (1602-1659) when he was a minister in King's Lynn and before he became master of St John's College, Cambridge, in 1644.[57]

[54] On these limp vellum bindings, which 'became popular in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries', see David Pearson, *English Bookbinding Styles, 1450-1800: A Handbook* (London, 2005), 64-65.
[55] On Sir Hamon Le Strange's book collecting see Jane Whittle and Elizabeth Griffiths, *Consumption and Gender in the Early Seventeenth-Century Household: The World of Alice Le Strange* (Oxford, 2012), 196-199; Clive Wilkins-Jones, '"My Rude and Imperfect Manuscript": Sir Hamon L'Estrange's "Observations" on Thomas Browne's *Pseudodoxia Epidemica*', *Studies in Philology* 114 (2017), 768-851, esp. 778.
[56] On the prices of Hamon Le Strange's books see Whittle and Griffiths, *World of Alice Le Strange*, 198-199.
[57] The first volume is listed as 'Gulielmus Malmesburiensis de gestis Regum Anglorum' and the second as 'Henerici Huntindoni*en*sis historiae' in the St Margaret's Library Donors' Book (no shelfmark), p. 24.

[Insert Figure 1. Caption: Binding of the second volume of Henry Savile's *Rerum Anglicarum scriptores*, King's Lynn Public Library. Photo: Andi Sapey]

That each of these volumes bears a royal armorial shield is tantalising, although it should be stressed that such royal armorials stamped on bindings do not, by themselves, necessarily indicate royal provenance.[58] However, what makes these volumes truly essential sources for understanding Savile's work in his *Scriptores* is that each contains its own individual printed dedication to Elizabeth. I know of no other copies which contain these dedications, although the fact that these were *printed*, as opposed to manuscript, dedications, suggests that more copies may well have been produced and are likely to survive. Each dedication features the same red ruling found in the rest of the volume, but that ruling does not exactly match the layout of the other pages. The leaves of the dedications are also slightly smaller than those of the rest of the book. Each dedication is bound after the title page that opens each volume, and these dedications were clearly products of the same printers who produced the rest of the book. The first dedication opens with a decorated initial 'S' which is used elsewhere in *Scriptores* itself, and the second opens with a pictorial initial 'Q', which is used in another book printed by Barker, Bishop and Newbery: a 1593 Bible.[59] The second dedication features a headpiece that bears Elizabeth's coat of arms, echoing the gold-stamped shield centrepiece of the binding (see Figure 2 for this dedication). Each dedication has been corrected by hand, adding small accent markings and a letter here or there (in italic script). These dedications contain some wording that appears in the final dedication which was printed in the 1596 edition, but each is also an individually coherent argument and contains substantive new material that hints at the volume's genesis. Given the importance of each of

[58] David Pearson, *Provenance Research in Book History: A Handbook* (London, 1994), 109.

[59] *Testamenti veteris Biblia sacra* (London, 1593); for the pictorial initial 'Q' see ¶2v. Like Savile's *Scriptores*, this book has multiple title pages. Some of those title pages introduce sections of the book which were printed at Eliot's Court Press (e.g. *Libri Apocryphi*, the title page of which is dated 1592). However, the storied initial 'Q' appears only in parts of the book which were *not* printed at Eliot's Court (on which see Henry R. Plomer, 'The Eliot's Court Printing House, 1584-1674', *The Library* 4th series 2 (1922), 175-184).

the two dedications for Savile and their wider significance for the history of patronage and the book-trade, it is worth spending time carefully describing the contents of both, before comparing them to the final printed dedication. Full Latin texts of the two dedications found in the King's Lynn volumes appear in the appendix to this article.

[Insert Figure 2. Caption: Dedication of second volume of Henry Savile's *Rerum Anglicarum scriptores* to Elizabeth I, King's Lynn Public Library. Photo: Andi Sapey.]

The first volume's dedication begins with a lament for the lack of historians to tell of Elizabeth's ancestors, leaving England without 'our own famous domestic examples of good deeds'.[60] In telling our history, we must 'leave aside fables', which 'in the judgment of prudent men have greatly detracted from the truth'.[61] In reality, Julius Caesar is the first man to have 'set forth our Britain in his own commentaries like a painting, to be examined', and to have 'sketched out in outline the nature of the sky and the land, the customs and impulses of the inhabitants, the form of the state, its laws, its religion itself'.[62] Rome's Emperors -- Claudius, Domitian, Severus, Constantine -- followed him, extending the borders of the empire into Britain and with it their knowledge of Britain's affairs.[63] However, with the collapse of Rome's power, the English came to Britain, giving rise to erudite men who 'transmitted the memory of their own ages to future generations (as the Poet wrote)', with Savile's 'seris nepotibus' (to future generations) alluding to Virgil's *Georgics*.[64] 'Of whom [*sc.* these 'erudite' early English historians]', he explains, 'I do not hesitate to say that the

[60] In the footnotes, I will refer to the first volume (DL-A4-8) as *Scriptores A* and the second (DL-A4-14) as *Scriptores B* -- the letters A and B were added by a seventeenth-century hand (perhaps Hamon Le Strange's) to each respective volume's title pages. *Scriptores A*: 'ijsque domesticis bene agendi exemplis careamus'.
[61] *Scriptores A*: 'si à fabulis abeamus, (quae [...] prudentium iudicio etiam vera detraxerunt)'.
[62] *Scriptores A*: 'Primus enim ... Julius Cæsar Britanniam nostram [...] in commentarijs suis, tanquam in tabellâ, spectandam proposuit: primus cœli solique naturam, incolarum mores & motus, reip. formam, leges, religionem ipsam si minus accurate descripsit, at certe leuiter adumbrauit'.
[63] *Scriptores A*: 'Quem deinceps Claudius, Domitianus, Seuerus, Constantius, alij complures consequuti, quo longius in Britanniam imperij sui terminos propagarunt, eo plus lucis & notitiæ rebus nostris attulerunt'.
[64] *Scriptores A*: 'quod homines (vt illa secula ferebant) nacti eruditos, seris (vt Poeta loquitur) nepotibus suorum temporum memoriam transmiserunt'. See Virgil, *Georgics*, 2.57-58: 'Jam, quae seminibus jactis se sustulit arbos, / Tarda venit, seris factura nepotibus umbram': 'Now, the tree which arose from scattered seeds, / Grew slowly, making shade for following generations'.

prince, because of the faith of his narration and maturity of his judgment, is William of Malmesbury, a learned man, who has woven the history of more or less seven hundred years with such fidelity and diligence that he may seem almost the only one from among our people who fulfils the office of Historian'.[65] Savile states that William was 'greatly desired by many who had a thirst after our Antiquities', and so motivated 'partly by zeal for public utility and partly by the encouragement of famous men', he brought William 'out of the shadows' and 'took care that he be inscribed to your most August name', in order that 'he who once cast off obscurity from former ages by the light of his own intellect, now revived again may borrow light and splendour from your most serene Majesty'.[66] In this dedication, William of Malmesbury is the only historian to whom Savile refers -- and William is the only historian whose works are contained in this volume.

Savile then turns to thanking Elizabeth for her patronage. Her 'kindness toward me witnessed so many times' encouraged Savile to make this dedication, in hope that 'these rays of your royal kindness, which have shone constantly on our former labours however slight, would by no means be absent from these monuments of your ancestors'.[67] He then expands upon why Elizabeth is the ideal dedicatee of this book. 'And truly, if we think rightly', Savile explains, 'to whom rather ought the deeds of the Britains, Saxons and Normans be offered, than to your Majesty, you who have not only taken up as a whole by hereditary law those individual sovereignties which they obtained separately, but you who have embraced all the

[65] *Scriptores A*: 'Quorum ego sanè principem tum narrationis fide, tum iudicij maturitate Gulielmum Malmesburiensem dicere non dubitarim, hominem literatè doctum, qui septingentorum plus minus annorum res tanta fide & diligentia pertexuit, vt è nostris prope solus historici munus explesse videatur'.
[66] *Scriptores A*: 'Quem cum magnopere à plurimis Antiquitatum nostrarum sitientibus desiderari intelligerem, partim publicæ vtilitatis studio, partim clarissimorum virorum hortatu, è tenebris eruendum, tuoq*ue* Augustissimo nomini inscribendu*m* curaui'.
[67] *Scriptores A*: 'Sed me recreat tua mihi toties spectata ma*n*suetudo, nec vereri patitur, quin illi Regiæ benignitatis tuæ radii, qui nostris antea qua*n*tuliscunq*ue* laboribus perpetuò affulserunt, nequaqua*m* his maiorum tuoru*m* monumen*t*is sint defuturi'.

virtues of these men together in your heroic spirit?'.[68] After further praise of Elizabeth's reign he breaks off: 'I will not give occasion to seem to you impertinent by enumerating your praises in front of you: these are for a greater work, of a greater leisure [*otium*]' (a word which recurs frequently in these dedications, as Savile explores the proper and improper uses of *otium*).[69] He concludes by reaffirming that he is sending 'this writer to you, a most truthful witness of former times, a sign of my most dedicated obedience to you'. 'If perhaps', he goes on, 'howsoever often you wish to take respite from the most grave cares of your reign, you will spend your most honourable *otium*' in reading William of Malmesbury, 'I shall take pains that the remains of other historic writers (a veritable heap) may join him'.[70]

The second volume's dedication follows fairly directly from the argument of the first. Two reasons, Savile reminds the queen, have 'recently led me (most serene Queen) to bring William of Malmesbury, the prince of our historians, from the shadows and to dedicate him to you, prince of all women and of all memory': these were 'zeal for the public good, and desire of bearing witness to my singular reverence toward you'. 'These same reasons', he announces, 'have prevailed upon me without difficulty, so that now I have added Henry of Huntingdon as a companion to William'.[71] In a crucial turn in the argument, he once again invokes the question of how *otium* should be spent: 'we think we ought no less to give an account of our leisure (*otium*) than of our business time (*negotium*)' (alluding to Cicero's

[68] *Scriptores A*: 'Et verò, si recte ratiocinamur, cui potius Britannoru*m*, Saxonum, Normannorum res gestas offerre debui, quàm Maiestati tuæ, quæ non modo quas singuli singulas ditiones obtinuerunt, has vna vniuersas hæreditario iure adiisti, verum etiam omnes istorum omnium virtutes animo planè heroico es complexa?'.
[69] *Scriptores A*: 'Verùm enimuerò non committam vt tuis apud te laudibus recensendis tibi quoq*ue* ipsi videar ineptus: maioris sunt illæ operis, maioris otii'.
[70] *Scriptores A*: 'hunc ad te scriptorem, verissimum superiorum temporum indicem, meique addictissimi erga te obsequii testem mitto: quo si forte, quoties a grauioribus regni tui curis respirare voles, honoratissimum otium tuum oblectabis, dabo operam vt propediem cæterorum quoque historicorum reliquiæ veluti cumulus accedant'.
[71] *Scriptores B*: 'Qvæ me causæ (Serenissima Regina) non ita pridem adduxerunt, vt Malmesburiensem nostratium historicorum principem e tenebris eruerem, tibiq*ue* omnium omnis memoriæ fœminarum Principi dicarem; altera, publicæ vtilitatis studium; altera, singularis meæ in te obseruantiæ testificandæ desideriu*m*; eædem profecto, vt in hoc tempore Hutindoniensem illi quasi comitem adiungerem, non difficulter obtinuerunt.'

description of the opening of Marcus Cato's *Origines*).[72] Savile declares he has devoted his *otium* to studies which are useful for the commonwealth, and to British history specifically, 'that part of letters which has long lain neglected, even ignored, by most of our people, and has therefore been traced by foreigners'. Those 'foreigners' (presumably he is thinking of Polydore Vergil among others) have recounted what they found in the ancient historians 'far more eloquently than truly'; by contrast, the ancient historians of Britain themselves are 'perhaps not the most eloquent, but nonetheless faithful and dutiful narrators of history'. [73] Savile continues to develop this distinction between the faithfulness of the ancient historians that he is publishing and the faithlessness of other, modern historians. He has turned to the ancient British historians so that he would not have to rely on Polydore Vergil's ('and his followers'') accounts of the 'famous families of Brutuses, Androgeuses, and Arthurs', which are likely to have been 'born out of the wit of Geoffrey of Monmouth, as several have suspected'.[74] These 'more recent' historians, however, have tried to 'surpass rough antiquity with an artifice of language', and in doing so seem 'not so much to have added the light of rhetoric than to have taken away the fidelity of history'.[75] Just as the farther one travels from the source of the river, he explains, in a familiar metaphor, the more it is contaminated with 'filth and dirt', so the farther histories are 'from the times of the affairs which they narrate, as if distant from the river's source, so are they the more polluted by so much filth (as I call it)

[72] *Scriptores B*: 'nec minorem nobis otij quam negotij rationem reddendam putemus'. Compare Cicero, *Pro Plancio*, 66: 'etenim M. Catonis illud quod in principio scripsit Originum suarum semper magnificum et praeclarum putavi, "Clarorum virorum atque magnorum non minus oti quam negoti rationem exstare oportere".'
[73] *Scriptores B*: 'tum ex literis eam præcipue partem, quæ hactenus a nostris plærisque partim neglecta, partim ignorata, ab exteris sic tractata est, vt quæ a veteribus non eloquentissimis fortasse, fidelibus tamen & religiosis rerum gestarum narratioribus accepissent, disertius multo quam verius nobis tradiderint'.
[74] *Scriptores B*: 'Etenim ne illas ex vltima antiquitate Brutorum, Androgiorum, Arturorum familias ex Monumetensis, vt nonnulli suspicantur, ingenio natas, a Polydoro, ac cæteris deinceps illustratas repetere necesse habeam'.
[75] *Scriptores B*: 'quibus recentiores isti [...] rudemque vetustatem dicendi artificio antecellere conantur, no*n* tam orationis lucem addidisse, quam historiæ fidem detraxisse merito videantur?'.

of fables'.[76] By making these British historians available in print, it is now possible to sift through what recent historians have drawn from 'the ancient monuments of annals' and what they have 'invented out of their own imaginations'.[77] At this point he turns back to Elizabeth, explaining the depth of his gratitude to her for everything she has given to him by drawing a complicated distinction between the obligations imposed by gifts and by debts. 'Therefore', he concludes, 'I thought this other one [i.e., this second volume] ought to be offered (with me a supplicant) like a votive tablet'. 'If you are willing to embrace it with your royalty and kindness and guard it with your authority, you will excite extraordinarily the courage in me to bring to maturity this greater work, which now for a long time already in gratitude to you I am desirous to bring forth'.[78] Like the first dedication, which ends with the promise of more historians to accompany William, the second seems to point to the completing of the whole *Scriptores* (the length of which would be swollen by the addition of Roger of Hoveden).

The final, published, dedication begins with a far more forthright attack on Polydore Vergil. While in the first dedication Savile alludes to a generalised mistrust of foreign historians and, in the second, he wishes to escape reliance on Polydore, he opens the final dedication by condemning outright this 'Italian man' who as a 'guest in our affairs and not versed in the realm, nor of any great judgment or wit' 'took falsity for truth' and 'left our history mendacious'. Whereas Savile had acknowledged that international historians had attempted to tell English history eloquently, in the final dedication he notes that Polydore has

[76] *Scriptores B*: 'Nimirum ceu flumina quanto maiore a suis fontibus interuallo feruntur, tanto plus cœni & sordium vnà secum ferunt; sic historiæ, quo longius a rerum quæ narrantur temporibus quasi a capite absunt, eo certe pluribus fabularum, vt ita dicam, sordibus inquinantur'.

[77] *Scriptores B*: 'quibus facile quid neoterici vel ex vetustissimis annalium monumentis hauserint, vel de suo, vt argutius dicere viderentur, adfinxerint, intelligamus.'

[78] *Scriptores B*: 'Quamobrem hanc alteram quasi votiuam tabulam, mediocrem illam fateor, sed tamen nostræ non mediocris erga Maiestatem tuam obseruantiæ indicem supplicissimè offerendam censui; quam si regiâ tua & benignitate complecti, & autoritate tueri voles, mihi certe animum ad maiora illa maturanda, quæ iam diu in tui gratiam parturio, incredibiliter excitabis.'

left English history 'written quite thinly and tritely'.[79] 'Our own historians (from the dregs of the people)' are little better, having 'contaminated' English history 'with inept trash'.[80] This is again a more strongly-worded version of Savile's criticism of 'more recent historians' in the second King's Lynn volume's dedication: presumably he is thinking of the authors of works such as Holinshed's *Chronicles* (1577-1587). Savile then notes (in language that closely echoes the opening of the first King's Lynn volume's dedication) that the deeds of Elizabeth's ancestors 'lie unknown and hidden' for the lack of learned historians.[81] Reworking language from the second dedication, he says that he 'sought medicine for that ill': that the whole British historical tradition was polluted with fables and lies.[82] Whereas the implication in the second King's Lynn volume's dedication is that the 'medicine' for these ills would be the printing of medieval historians themselves, in the final dedication to the *Scriptores* this 'medicine' appears to be framed as Savile's own prospective telling of English history: but 'although I was not lacking in spirit' to write this, he was not 'supported by these helps or tools (as it were) for the writing of history, that would allow me to build an enduring work from the foundations that would transmit the memory of these times to subsequent generations'.[83] He has, however, done what he could toward this goal of creating an accurate account of British history by sending 'into the light the most ancient authors of our affairs', 'men not indeed fluent speakers, but faithful interpreters of our story', echoing his apology in the second King's Lynn volume's dedication for the medieval historians' lack of eloquence.[84]

[79] Savile, *Scriptores*, ¶ijr: 'Nam Polydorus, vt homo Italus, & in rebus nostris hospes, & (quod caput est) neque in rep. versatus, nec magni alioqui vel iudicij vel ingenij [...] historiam nobis reliquit cùm cætera mendosam, tum exiliter sanè & ieiunè conscriptam'.
[80] Savile, *Scriptores*, ¶ijr: 'Nostri ex fæce plebis historici [...] putidissimis ineptijs contaminârunt'.
[81] Savile, *Scriptores*, ¶ijr: 'iaceant ignoti, & delitescant'.
[82] Savile, *Scriptores*, ¶ijr: 'Cui malo dum medicinam quærerem'. *Scriptores B*: 'Quocirca, vt aliquam huic malo medecinam facerem...'
[83] Savile, *Scriptores*, ¶ijr: 'neque ita essem vel animo vacuus, vel ab illis subsidijs & quasi instrumentis historiæ scribendæ instructus, vt opus à fundamentis extruerem victurum, serísque nepotibus temporum illorum memoriam transmissurum'.
[84] Savile, *Scriptores*, ¶ijr: '& in lucem primus emitterem vetustissimos rerum nostrarum authores, non illos quidem facundos, sed fidos rerum gestarum interpretes'.

In the final version of the dedication, the responsibility to produce a complete account of English history based upon the chronicles that Savile has published is cast squarely onto 'other men, who abound in leisure (*otium*) and wit'.[85] Their chief tool would be the writings of William of Malmesbury, and here Savile restates his praise of William verbatim from the first King's Lynn volume's dedication, with only the telling change that he is now described as learned 'as the times went'.[86]

Rather than treating Henry of Huntingdon as a single 'companion' to William, as Savile does at the outset of the second King's Lynn volume's dedication, the final dedication of *Scriptores* groups Henry of Huntingdon and Roger of Hoveden together, two 'particularly good and diligent authors, most true witnesses of former times', who are 'next to William, but next perhaps by a long distance'. And to them Savile has 'added' Ingulph, who is 'greatly desired by many who are eager for our antiquities' (recycling the language that had been applied to William in the first dedication), and Æthelweard, whose inclusion is justified 'for the sake of his nobility no less than his antiquity' (he was a descendant of Æthelred I).[87] Savile then refashions a lengthy passage of praise for Elizabeth, bringing together the second dedication's playful ruminations on the difference between debts and gifts with the first dedication's account of Elizabeth as the unifier of all her ancestor's kingdoms and virtues. He concludes in the manner of both previous dedications by looking toward the future: his praises of Elizabeth are things 'for another work, for another time'.[88] Finally, he turns back to the present book, in the hope that 'the things which you have thus far been willing to honour with your most ample favours' 'you may deem worthy to embrace with your kindness and

[85] Savile, *Scriptores*, ¶ijr: 'eo consilio, vt alij, qui & otio abundarent & ingenio, hos quasi ad manum haberent rerum nostrarum commentarios, vnde sumerent, quæ ad tanti operis exædificationem pertinerent'.
[86] Savile, *Scriptores*, ¶ijr: 'homo, vt erant illa tempora, literatè doctus'.
[87] Savile, *Scriptores*, ¶ijv: 'Huic proximi, sed longo forsan interuallo proximi Hvntindoniensis, & Hovedenus, authores cum primis boni & diligentes, verissimique superiorum temporum indices: quibus Ingvlphvm à plurimis antiquitatum nostrarum sitientibus magnopere desideratum adiecimus, &, qui maiores tuos propinquo affinitatis gradu contingit, nobilitatis non minùs quàm antiquitatis causa Elwardvm'.
[88] Savile, *Scriptores*, ¶ijv: 'Sed alterius sunt hæc operis, alterius temporis'.

guard with your authority', repeating this last phrase from the second dedication, but with the added thanks to Elizabeth that she had *already* bestowed her favour on these historical works 'thus far' (hactenus).[89]

What should already be clear is that these three dedications follow one another in sequence: from the first to the second King's Lynn dedications, then to the final, published dedication. The first King's Lynn dedication refers only to William of Malmesbury -- and that volume contains William alone. That dedication ends by promising that if this volume met with Elizabeth's approval there would be further 'remains of historic writers' to follow. The second dedication begins by noting that Savile 'recently' (*non ita pridem*) presented William to Elizabeth, and now adds Henry of Huntingdon 'as a companion' (*quasi comitem*) to William. This dedication ends by promising once again that if Elizabeth approves of the volume, Savile will bring this work 'to maturity' (*ad maiora illa maturanda*). The third dedication then follows through on this promise, presenting the whole volume to the queen, with the addition of Roger of Hoveden, Ingulph, and Aethelweard. The sequence of dedications, however, ought not to be read too literally, as though to suggest that Savile was actually waiting on Elizabeth's approval of each historian before embarking on work on the next. Given that the King's Lynn volumes' title pages both bear the date 1596, these dedications presumably cannot date from any earlier than the last months of 1595, when it would have been plausible that the date 1596 might have been printed proleptically. Given that, as we saw, Robert Sidney had already obtained a copy of the finished book in November 1596, there is a relatively short window in which the dedications could have been printed. The work of editing each historian in *Scriptores*, certainly other than perhaps the shorter works of Ingulph and Ethelweard, must already have been substantially complete even when

[89] Savile, *Scriptores*, ¶ijv: 'Interim verò serenissimam Maiest. tuam supplicissimè rogatam volo, vt quem hactenus beneficijs tuis quàm amplissimis ornatum esse voluisti, eum deinceps regia tua & benignitate complecti, & authoritate tueri digneris.'

the first volume was printed. Given that the foliation and even the errata are the same in the King's Lynn copy as in a regular copy of the book, the printing of the whole volume must surely already have been in process when these individual dedications were printed. Savile's language implies that the second volume followed fairly soon after the first -- he had presented William of Malmesbury to Elizabeth 'non ita pridem' (recently) -- but in saying so it also suggests that the two volumes were not presented at the same time (and if this were the actual dedicatory copy, the small differences in the binding of the two volumes may also reflect that they were not bound at precisely the same moment).

Savile seems most likely to have been working closely with the royal printers during the lengthy printing process of such a substantial volume. The most plausible scenario here is that once the printers had completed work on *Gesta regum* and *Historia novella*, a dedication to William alone was printed in order to secure preliminary approval for the book from Elizabeth at court. Then when Henry of Huntingdon was printed, another similar dedication was prepared. In this respect alone, the King's Lynn volumes grant rare, invaluable insight into the process of smoothing the way toward Elizabeth's patronage. That Savile must have been presenting these volumes to Elizabeth during the course of 1596 reveals the extent to which his *Scriptores* was inextricably bound up with his campaign to secure the Eton College provostship, which was underway at exactly the same time. Savile was writing to Sir Robert Cecil in April 1595 to ask for his and his father's support in nominating him for the provostship, and in February of 1596 Savile was writing to Elizabeth, Lady Russell, Burghley's sister-in-law 'at the Conclusion' of his 'Suit' to secure the provostship, asking her to encourage Cecil to make a decisive intervention on his behalf.[90] He was finally appointed in May 1596.[91] If Elizabeth simply received Savile's completed *Scriptores* in October or

[90] Cecil Papers 32/1, Savile to Robert Cecil, 28 April 1595. Savile to Lady Russell, 4 Feb. 1595/96, printed in John Strype, *Annals of the Reformation and Establishment of Religion*, 4 vols in 7 (Oxford, 1824), 4: 319.
[91] R. D. Goulding, 'Savile, Sir Henry (1549-1622)', *ODNB.*

November 1596, when the book was published, it would suggest the work was purely a gift of thanks for the provostship. However, these dedications suggest that the volume was presented piecemeal as the printing went along. If the first volume of *Scriptores* (containing only William of Malmesbury) was presented to the queen in May 1596, after she had granted him the Eton provostship, then it may indeed still be purely a gift of thanks. However, if individual volumes of William of Malmesbury and Henry of Huntingdon were presented *before* this -- a distinct possibility -- it may be that they were *part* of Savile's campaign to secure the provostship, with each volume an indication of the kind of public-minded scholarship he might produce were the queen to advance his career further. Whichever it is, the book in all its forms is presented quite specifically as a thanks for Elizabeth's patronage and a hope of further patronage to come, and as a turn by Savile to the kind of scholarship that seemed appropriate for a monarch to appreciate and seek to foster.

The second volume's dedication even tantalisingly suggests that Elizabeth herself had granted Savile a period of time to produce some sort of scholarly work, during which he chose to focus on British history. As we saw, Savile argued that 'we ought no less to give an account of our leisure (*otium*) than our business time (*negotium*)'. 'How greatly would I transgress', Savile went on in a crucial passage, 'if this period of time, *which is available to me due to your royal kindness* [my emphasis], were I either to give over to idleness or to be a partaker in those studies from which, even if I may find some private delight, no usefulness would indubitably flow back into the commonwealth?'.[92] The suggestion is that Elizabeth had given Savile a period of *otium* to focus on scholarship. What that *otium* might have been is hard to determine exactly at this stage: it could be that Savile is referring to his time at court as Elizabeth's Greek tutor, away from the cares of his wardenship of Merton College,

[92] *Scriptores B*: 'quantopere peccarem, si hoc temporis, quod mihi plurimum regiâ benignitate tuâ suppetit, vel inertiæ penitus transmitterem, vel ijs saltem studijs impertirer, ex quibus tametsi mihi aliqua priuatim oblectatio quæratur, at in remp. vtilitas quidem certe nulla redundaret?'.

585 Oxford; or it could be that this is a reference to Savile's appointment as 'secretary of the
586 Latin tongue, and to hold the deanery of Carlisle in commendam' in early 1596, given to him
587 supposedly in order to 'stop his mouth from importuning [Elizabeth] any more "for the
588 provostship of Eton'; or it could even perhaps be a reference to the Eton provostship itself,
589 although the timelines feel probably too tight for this.[93] Nevertheless, it is clear that Savile's
590 *Scriptores* must be understood firmly as a product of his relationship to the queen. Often the
591 choice of a work's dedicatee was made toward the end of the publication process: I have
592 discussed elsewhere a slightly later example of just such a book (the 1695 edition of
593 Camden's *Britannia*), where the choice of dedicatee was still being debated in the last months
594 before printing concluded.[94] Savile's *Scriptores* seems almost exactly the opposite kind of
595 work: one where the dedicatee was the *first* thing to be decided upon, and the appropriate
596 work then produced to suit that dedicatee.

597 It is also notable that Savile stresses he has chosen to focus not on scholarship for his
598 'private delights' but for the 'public good'. Such scholarship as might have been more
599 befitting his 'private delights' would perhaps be Savile's own prior work pertaining to the
600 history of mathematics: the implication, in any case, is that Savile's work on medieval
601 historians constitutes a new departure in his career and that we are not mistaken to feel a
602 certain surprise that *this* is the volume Savile produced in 1596. The notion of the public
603 benefit of British history is prominent in slightly different ways in all three dedications
604 penned by Savile for his *Scriptores*: Savile's work was designed to diminish the over-reliance
605 on foreign historians and galvanize a native historical tradition. The emphasis of that native
606 tradition would be on factual accuracy, not on rhetoric: in this respect, modern historians
607 need to take as their model the medieval chroniclers whom Savile prints, rather than Italian

[93] Thomas Birch, *Memoirs of the Reign of Queen Elizabeth from the Year 1581 till her Death*, 2 vols (London, 1754), 1: 441.
[94] Thomas Roebuck, 'Edmund Gibson's 1695 *Britannia* and Late-Seventeenth-Century British Antiquarian Scholarship', *Erudition and the Republic of Letters* 5 (2020), 427-481, at 476.

humanists such as Polydore Vergil. This kind of scholarship is not only useful for the commonwealth; it is apt reading matter for a monarch in particular. Savile's historians record the deeds of Elizabeth's ancestors; Æthelweard is even a blood relative of one of those distant ancestors. In the first dedication, Savile hopes that Elizabeth will pass her own 'most honourable *otium*' reading William of Malmesbury: this is a kind of historical reading which can channel leisure into utility for a monarch, as she learns about her realm, her ancestors, and the *exempla* they offer. Indeed, the sequence of dedications uncovered here shows that William of Malmesbury's works of royal, political history were fundamental to Savile's conception of the whole volume. The *Gesta regum* and *Historia novella* were the first to be presented to the queen, with the *Gesta pontificum* relegated in importance, added out of sequence *after* Henry of Huntingdon. The latter was himself presented 'as a companion' to William, with the further historians added as companions to the companion. Savile gives centre stage to works of civil and political history written by the greatest of the medieval historians and most suitable for a monarch.

Moreover, the whole tenor of the dedication -- with its allusions to Virgil and Cicero, its emphasis on the discovery of Britain by the Romans -- is secular, classical, and humanistic. Perhaps the essentially secular presentation of his historians suggests continuities with his own earlier work on classical history (although the emphasis on Caesar in the first dedication at the expense of any mention of Tacitus, the historian translated by both Savile and Elizabeth, is striking). The fact remains that in all of Savile's now three extant dedications to the *Scriptores* there is no mention that the histories the work comprises were largely written by monks or that could be made to help tell the history of the church. Savile could certainly have chosen to draw out the implications of the writings' ecclesiastical context for Protestant readers. This is what had been done by the former Carmelite friar and later passionate advocate of the Reformation, John Bale (1495-1563), whose bio-

bibliographical writings framed many antiquaries' responses to medieval historians. Savile certainly knew Bale's enormous *Catalogus* of 'illustrious British writers', based on the researches of John Leland and published in Basle in 1557; he had cited Bale's 'massive bibliographies' in the course of his research on the history of mathematics, as Robert Goulding has shown.[95] Jerome Commelin had printed extracts from Bale's biographies to frame his own edition of British medieval historians.[96] Savile could well have done the same. Bale's writing, however, is always caught between a desire to lionise the British medieval past for its role in historical preservation and to condemn it for its Roman Catholic superstition.

These contradictory impulses are found in Bale's biographies of William of Malmesbury and Henry of Huntingdon. William was, on the one hand, 'plainly most learned in all kinds of good letters, and unique in his intelligence, diligence and industry in the uncovering of antiquities'. On the other, he was 'immoderately carried away with some terrible superstitions', living in 'an age that was most corrupt' 'with Satan, after escaping from the Abyss, so impetuously and rudely reigning among the Papist clergy'.[97] Henry of Huntingdon was, similarly, 'pronounced a worthy author by John Leland the antiquary', who 'not infelicitously set down in writing the deeds of his own people from the coming of Saxons into Britain, lest by any injury of time they come into oblivion'. Yet, 'what he added of silly fables, is to be imputed to his time'.[98] A feeling of ambivalence towards Britain's

[95] Robert Goulding, *Defending Hypatia: Ramus, Savile and the Renaissance Rediscovery of Mathematical History* (Dordrecht, 2010), 120.
[96] Jerome Commelin, ed., *Rerum Britannicarum* [...] *scriptores*, n.p. and no sigs.
[97] John Bale, *Scriptorum illustrium maioris Brytanniae catalogus*, 2 vols (Gregg International Publishers Limited, 1971), 1: 186-187: 'Vir erat suo seculo in omni genere bonarum literarum planè eruditissimus, & in eruendis antiquitatibus ingenio, diligentia & industria singularis [...] nisi quod ex Christianae prudentiae defectu, immoderatè extulerit execrabiles quasdam superstitiones. Enimuerò corruptissimum esse illud seculum, ineuitabile quodammodo fuit, Satana post solutionem ex abysso tam impetuose atq*ue* importunè in clero Papistico regnante'.
[98] Bale, *Catalogus*, 1: 192: 'probatus author à Ioanne Lelando antiquario pronunciatur [...] In quo officio suae gentis res gestas à Saxonum aduentu in Brytanniam, membranis non infoeliciter commendauit, ne ulla unquam temporis iniuria in obliuionem irent. [...] Interim si quid addiderit nugalium fabularum, tempori imputandum est.'

Middle Ages certainly comes through in Savile's dedication: William of Malmesbury was learned 'as the times went' (*ut erant illa tempora*). Savile's ambivalence is, then, about the period's learning, not about its 'terrible superstitions'. His presentation dissociates the historians from the Protestant apologetic context in which they had been received in the post-Reformation period, part of the function of which must have been to enable Protestants to read medieval authors while feeling safely dissociated from the 'superstitions' voiced and chronicled in these works. At the same time, the trade-off of such framing was that these editions were marked as polemics for Catholic readers. Together with Savile's lack of even a simple framing commentary and marginal notes on his authors, which would inevitably have been flashpoints for controversy when the edition was distributed abroad, one can only suspect that Savile is deliberately departing from the Parkerian presentation of medieval historians. Readers of Savile's edition -- potentially readers from any faith or political point of view -- were left to make up their own minds about the historians Savile published, taking advantage of his largely blank margins to make their own commentaries through annotation (examples of which practice will be highlighted in the conclusion to this article).

On the basis of this sequence of dedications alone, therefore, it would be easy to conclude that Savile's *Scriptores* was a courtly, political volume, with no roots in the ecclesiastical contexts that had been fundamental to the Parkerian editing of medieval texts in the 1570s. And yet its origins nonetheless *do* appear to have been ecclesiastical. Two documents especially help to demonstrate this. The first is a letter from Henry Savile the Elder (d.1607), father of the manuscript collector, Henry Savile of Banke (1568-1617), to the London chorographer John Stow (1524/5-1605).[99] The letter is addressed 'from Halifaxe this

[99] BL Harley MS 374, fol. 24r. The letter is signed 'Henry Savill': see Andrew G. Watson, *The Manuscripts of Henry Savile of Banke* (London, 1969), plate V. (c), where he identifies the signature of Henry Savile the Elder in BL Harley MS 530 (discussed below), which is very similar to that of Harley MS 374; Watson notes that both letters are by Henry Savile the Elder at ibid., 5. Although the signatures of both letters are the same, the handwriting itself is not an exact match: however, similarities are sufficient that the differences can be put down

first of Maye'; it lacks a year. Because this has caused confusion as to the letter's meaning -- and the letter is of such significance for the understanding of Savile's book -- it is necessary to pause to establish its dating.[100] This letter must have been written in 1592. For one thing, Savile the Elder asks after 'good Mas*te*r Hare' and 'what towardnes his good workes for the privileges of Oxforth is'. This is Robert Hare (*c*.1530-1611), the antiquary who prepared magnificently illuminated sets of transcriptions of charters and other documents which he presented to both Oxford and Cambridge.[101] That Savile the Elder was asking after Hare *in 1592* is confirmed by a second letter in this sequence, which is dated 21 May 1592 and addressed from Savile the Elder to Stow.[102] This letter makes reference to 'yo*u*re l*ett*re dated the tenthe of maye', which Savile the Elder received 'at halyfax. That this letter from Stow -- which seems sadly no longer to survive, but would likely have shed much light on Savile's *Scriptores* -- is a reply to the letter sent by Savile the Elder on 1 May is confirmed by the fact that *this* letter (the one dated 21 May 1592) directly continues the questions about Hare and his work on Oxford. Savile the Elder writes: 'since I am come to oxford wheare I haue made enquirie to know wheare the booke showlde bee that Mr Hare showlde sende hyther as yo*u*r l*ett*re dyd ymporte'. In other words, the sequence is as follows: Savile the Elder wrote to Stow from Halifax to ask after Hare's book on 1 May 1592; Stow replied on 10 May 1592 to say that Hare has already sent it to Oxford; Savile the Elder, now in Oxford, then replied to Stow to say that he was trying to find the book there. This alone is enough to show that the first letter was written in 1592, but there is further evidence. In the letter Savile the Elder asks Stow 'to certifye me if wigornensis is printed and wheare I maye send to buye it'. This is

to contingent factors, such as Savile having used a different pen. For the date of Henry Savile the Elder's death see ibid., 5.

[100] e.g. John Stow, *A Survey of London*, ed. C. K. Kingsford, 2 vols (1908), 1: lxviii-lxix: 'The allusion to Matthew Parker -- "my lordes Grace" -- shows that the date was at the latest 1 May, 1575'. This dating is followed in Watson, *Henry Savile of Banke*, 5.

[101] Elisabeth Leedham-Green, 'Hare, Robert (*c*.1530-1611)', *ODNB*, online edn.

[102] BL Harley MS 530, fol. 1r.

William Howard's edition of John of Worcester, which was indeed published in 1592, albeit later in the year.[103] The confidence with which Savile the Elder writes about it suggests he knows its publication is imminent.

The exact dating of this letter matters because it refers to the book which would become -- over four years later -- Henry Savile's *Scriptores*. Savile the Elder's final question (in a letter of many questions) is this: 'forther I woulde vnderstande if my Lordes grace be aboute to print Roger Howden Maulbesburie and Huntingtone and in what forwardnes they be'. This cannot be a coincidence: Savile the Elder is asking after the publication of the three historians who take up 471 of Savile's book's 520 folios. The letter suggests that it is 'my Lordes grace' who is about to print these historians. Without any more specific referent, this phrase seems to apply to only one person in the kingdom: the archbishop of Canterbury, John Whitgift (*c.*1530-1604). Were this the only evidence of Whitgift's involvement in Savile's *Scriptores*, I would be inclined to suggest simply that Henry Savile the Elder was mistaken in associating the volume with the archbishop. However, that Whitgift was indeed involved in Savile's book is confirmed by the second important document, a letter from William Camden to the geographer, Abraham Ortelius (1527-1598), the draft of which survives among Camden's papers. This letter is dated 9 November 1596 and begins with Camden's apology for not having written to Ortelius for so long: it was simply the case, he explains, that there was nothing much of interest about which to write. However, things had changed. 'For now truly indeed the Writers of our English affairs [Anglicarum rerum scriptores]', Camden tells Ortelius, 'at long last having come into the light from the prison of libraries due to the care of the Archbishop of Canterbury and the labours of Henry Savile, these writers have brought an end to that silence'. '[T]hey have demanded', Camden goes on, imagining that the 'Writers of

[103] [John of Worcester], *Chronicon ex chronicis*, ed. William Howard (London, 1592). That it was published after Savile the Elder's letter was written is shown by Howard's prefatory address to the reader, which is dated 1 August (A4r).

our English affairs' have themselves placed the burden on Camden of writing to Ortelius, 'that when I have nothing else to do that I would write this, and send them to you, to whom they hope to prove most pleasing'.[104] The letter then proceeds to note that Camden had asked Jacob Colius (1563-1628), Ortelius's nephew and an important intermediary between scholars in England and the Low Countries in this period, to bring both the letter and the *Scriptores* volume to Ortelius.[105]

Despite the sequence of dedications to Elizabeth for Savile's *Scriptores*, then, it appears that the book was far from only a product of Savile's royal patronage. The pair of manuscript letters from Savile the Elder to Stow and from Camden to Ortelius, respectively, suggests several things. Firstly, *Scriptores*' gestation was long, which is hardly surprising. The project of editing these chronicles was a work in progress between 1592 and 1596, and probably for significantly longer than that, given that Savile the Elder thinks that Whitgift might be 'about to print' the historians in 1592. Read alongside the early versions of Savile's dedications, which suggest that Savile had recently decided to devote himself to British history, it may have been that Savile was not even involved in the edition in 1592 -- although perhaps it feels too much of a coincidence that a member of his family (albeit a distant relation) was asking after it. Secondly, that Camden was aware of Whitgift's involvement in Savile's edition points to his insider knowledge of the book's production, which may have come from Savile himself or from Whitgift, with whom Camden seems to have had some correspondence.[106] Camden seems likely therefore to have been one of the 'many who had a thirst after our Antiquities' who desired the printing of William of Malmesbury (in the first

[104] BL Add. MS 36294, fol. 50r: 'Nunc vero quidam Anglicar*um* rer*um* scriptores e Bibliothecar*um* carcere cura Archiepiscopi Cantuariensis, & H Savillj opera in lucem aediti diuturnj illius silentij finem attulerunt, imperarunt enim cu*m* nihil aliud habeam, vt hoc scribam, & ipsos tibi cui gratissimos se fore sperant com*m*endatos mitterem.'

[105] Ibid., 'Quod per Jac Colius*m* <Ortelianum tuum> optimu*m* iuuene*m* efficere spero, cui illas & has vnà literas tibi deferenda com*m*isi'. On his biography see Ole Peter Grell, 'Cool, Jacob [Jacobus Colius; called Ortelianus] (1563-1628)', *ODNB*, online edn.

[106] See the letter from Whitgift to Camden, 28 July 1592, BL Cotton MS Julius C V, fol. 47r. This letter was not printed by Smith in his 1691 edition of Camden's correspondence.

dedication) and then Ingulph (in the second), both historians with whom Camden had worked closely when writing his own *Britannia*.[107] Thirdly, it is striking that Savile the Elder assumes Stow had some particular knowledge of the progress of the archbishop's projected edition. Whitgift appears to have been Stow's patron around this time. Probably about a month after this letter, Stow published his *Annales of England* (printed by Ralph Newbery, who would be one of the printers of Savile's *Scriptores*) and dedicated to Whitgift.[108] In his dedication, he extols Whitgift's 'great loue and entire affection to all good letters in generall, and to the Antiquities in particular', further noting that he himself had begun to study antiquities thirty years earlier when 'your woorthy predecessor, and my especiall benefactor Archbishop Parker animated me in the course of these studies'.[109] Stow is implicitly styling Whitgift as the successor to Parker's role as leading patron of British antiquarianism. It would not seem at all surprising if Stow had been involved in the projected edition of medieval historians at this point.

Fourthly, and most fundamentally, these two letters tell us that Archbishop Whitgift was somehow involved in the *Scriptores* edition; however, in quite what capacity he was involved would depend on what Camden means by the edition having come forth with the 'cura' of the archbishop of Canterbury. Given that, according to Camden, Savile supplied 'opera' (exertion, labour) to *Scriptores*, 'cura' (care, management, administration) implies that Whitgift was not literally transcribing manuscripts and compiling a text to print. However, for Camden to highlight Whitgift's involvement (and indeed for Savile the Elder to

[107] *Scriptores A*: 'Quem [i.e. 'Gulielmum Malmesburiensem'] cum magnopere à plurimis Antiquitatum nostrarum sitientibus desiderari'. Savile, *Scriptores*, ¶ijv: 'quibus Ingvlphvm à plurimis antiquitatum nostrarum sitientibus magnopere desideratum adiecimus'.

[108] This must be the book which Henry Savile the Elder asks after in his letter: 'I woulde vnderstande that your last booke weare forthe that I might sende vnto you for one or twoe for my money' (BL Harley MS 374, fol. 24r). His next question is then about whether 'my Lordes grace' has yet printed the various historians: this question flows directly from the mention of *Annales*, which is dedicated to Whitgift.

[109] John Stow, *The Annales of England* (London, 1592), a2v. For a sceptical account of Stow's claims in this dedication that he was much involved in Parker's antiquarian circle see Ian W. Archer, 'John Stow: Citizen and Historian', in *John Stow (1525-1605) and the Making of the English Past*, eds Ian Gadd and Alexandra Gillespie (London, 2004), 13-26, at 22.

have alluded to him alone) he must have done something more than, say, simply license the book for the press (otherwise the archbishop would be mentioned in every one of Camden's letters dispatching books abroad). Whitgift was, perhaps, an encourager or patron of the project; he may, for instance, have enabled Savile to gain access to 'libraries' (note that Camden specifically says that the writers have been released from the prison of *libraries* in the plural). Whitgift was certainly a substantial manuscript collector in his own right and a supporter of antiquarian projects, as a letter from Thomas James (1572/3-1629), the first librarian of Oxford's Bodleian Library, to Thomas Allen shows. James describes the hospitality he received at the library of John, Lord Lumley (1534-1609) when he went there to hunt for a manuscript of Asser's *Life of Alfred*. '[N]o lesse Curtesy', James then explains, 'but rather greater haue I found w*i*th my Lo*rd*s grace of Canterburie, who doth so imbrace my p*ro*ceedinges that there is not any thinge w*hi*ch he may doe w*hi*ch he will not doe for me'. 'A stranger as longe as I stay in towne', James goes on with discernible pride, 'I must not be from his graces house & studie w*hi*ch both haue beene very open vnto me'.[110] At the very least, he must have given the same 'imbrace' to the 'p*ro*ceedinges' which led to Savile's volume. His involvement serves to strengthen the parallels between Savile's edition and those produced by the Parker circle, with Whitgift inheriting the role of Parker as patron of a 'circle' of antiquaries around him. Perhaps Savile the Elder's first 1592 letter to Stow implies that the project was Whitgift's all along, and that Henry Savile somehow picked it up in the middle of the 1590s to bring it to fruition. Whitgift must surely have been one of the 'famous men' whom Savile notes had encouraged him to print William of Malmesbury in the first King's Lynn volume's dedication. Savile himself certainly also owed a debt of patronage to Whitgift as a more general matter, for Whitgift had endorsed Savile's appointment as warden

[110] Thomas James to Thomas Allen, 1 April 1600, in Bodl. MS Rawl. D. 912, fols 685-686, quotations at fol. 686r.

of Merton College.[111] Savile's work on *Scriptores* may have been a form of repayment not only to the queen, but to the archbishop, too.

Taken together, the sequence of *Scriptores*'s dedications suggest a rich array of continuities and departures from the earlier traditions of British medieval textual editing embodied in the work of Matthew Parker. Parker was known for the creation of elaborately-decorated, unique gift-copies of his books, such as the copy of the chronicle attributed to Matthew of Westminster presented to the queen which was bound by Jean de Planche in a spectacular inlaid ivory binding with Elizabeth's armorial.[112] Parker's close relationship with the printer and bookseller, John Day (1521/2-1584), led him to handle the printing process with an exceptional degree of flexibility (even by the standards of the period), producing books that contain numerous stop-press variants. The idea of producing bespoke dedicatory material for volumes of history that are of such consequence for the nation seems a natural continuation of Parker's practice. What is particularly striking in the case of Savile's *Scriptores* is that Whitgift's involvement in the edition, whatever form that took, is not mentioned on the title page of *Scriptores*, nor in the course of any of the three dedications Savile wrote for it. This is again not entirely dissimilar to the approach taken by Parker, where Parker's name, as with those of the scholars who worked for him, does not appear on title pages or as a signatory of prefatory epistles. However, the printers of Parker's editorial projects did use subtle means to underline the archiepiscopal patronage of at least some of the published editions: for instance, Parker's arms decorate the initial letter 'T' in the prologue to the *Flores historiarum* attributed to Matthew of Westminster. These arms offer splendid opportunities for illumination in presentation copies of the book, further underlining the source from which these works emerged.[113] Whitgift, on the other hand, seems absent from

[111] John M. Fletcher, *Registrum annalium collegii Mertonensis 1567-1603* (Oxford, 1976), 194-195 (for Whitgift's letter to Savile confirming his appointment).
[112] BL c.18.b.11
[113] C[ambridge] U[niversity] L[ibrary], Sel.3.95.

805 Savile's volume to a far more radical degree than Parker had been from those he helped to
806 engineer and promote. Whitgift's own copy of *Scriptores* survives in Lambeth Palace
807 Library. The binding bears Whitgift's coat of arms, but there are no notes to suggest that this
808 was anything other than one of the many learned books he owned.[114]

809 In addition, the prefaces to Parker's editions do forcefully underline their polemical
810 significance for ecclesiastical history. Parker's 1571 edition of Matthew Paris, in particular,
811 was directly presented as a contribution to confessional debates. Matthew Paris, Parker
812 argued, deserved our admiration because of his bold attacks on the papacy: 'This is truly to
813 be admired, that in this work he dared so often, so manifestly, so vehemently and intrepidly
814 to note, and likewise to detest, the arrogant pride, insatiable desire of wealth, tyranny and
815 unjust imperium of the Roman Pontif'.[115] By contrast, Savile presents his volume in
816 nationalistic terms, as an opportunity for the people of Elizabeth's own kingdom to write the
817 nation's history on firmer foundations, and as a dynastic paean to the deeds of Elizabeth's
818 ancestors. Ecclesiastical history is sidelined in favour of an emphasis on the deeds of
819 monarchs themselves. The language he uses in his dedications is that of a classical humanist,
820 with appeals to exemplarity, the worthwhile employment of *otium*, and scholarship tethered
821 to the *utilitas* of the state. In this, he reflects the nature of his own immediate relationship
822 with Elizabeth and their mutual interest in reading and translating classical texts, including
823 ancient historians.[116] But he also reflects the changing nature of antiquarianism itself between
824 Parker's time and his own. In this period, a special focus had emerged on more secular
825 antiquities, represented most notably in the triumph of Camden's *Britannia*, which, for all

[114] Lambeth Palace Library, [ZZ]1596.14.
[115] Matthew Parker, ed., *Matthæi Paris, monachi Albanensis, Angli, historia maior* (London, 1571), †ij^{r}: 'Illud uerò est admirandum, quod in hoc opere ausus sit tam sæpè, tam manifestè, tam vehementer & intrepidè notare, & simul detestari arrogantem superbiam, insatiabilem diuitiarum cupiditatem, tyrannidem, & iniustum imperium Romani Pontificis'.
[116] John-Mark Philo, 'Elizabeth I's Translation of Tacitus: Lambeth Palace Library, MS 683', *Review of English Studies* 71 (2020), 44-73, e.g. 51.

826 that work displays Camden's knowledge of the history of monastic institutions, embodied
827 Camden's particular interest in ancient Roman Britain (especially in its earliest versions).
828 This was the antiquarian work that was supported above any other by William Cecil, whom
829 we have already seen was centrally involved in Savile's election to the Eton provostship in
830 exactly the period in which Savile worked on *Scriptores*, and whom, as Mordechai Feingold
831 has demonstrated, Savile also seems to have cultivated as a supporter of his work on
832 Tacitus.[117] It is surely not too speculative to suggest that Cecil was another of the 'famous
833 men' who had encouraged Savile to edit William of Malmesbury. Savile's book, then,
834 emerged from a culture of antiquarianism that had changed significantly between the 1570s
835 and 1590s, becoming appreciably more focussed on secular fields of study.
836
837 **Henry Savile's Practice as an Editor of Medieval Texts**
838
839 How did the publication context we have just traced shape Savile's editorial practice in
840 *Scriptores*? I shall argue that Savile's practice as an editor cannot be separated from the
841 political and patronage contexts within which he worked. But establishing *how* Savile worked
842 on this edition is not easy. He never gives any indication of the specific manuscripts he used;
843 he certainly chose between several manuscripts, and often classicized Latin spellings he
844 found there, further obscuring the book's manuscript origins. For William of Malmesbury,
845 Henry of Huntingdon, and Roger of Hoveden, he relied on more than one manuscript,
846 sometimes recording variants in the margins; for Ingulph and Æthelweard, in contrast, he
847 seems to have used single manuscripts for each author.[118] The difficulties that editors of

[117] Mordechai Feingold, 'Scholarship and Politics: Henry Savile's Tacitus and the Essex Connection', *Review of English Studies* 67 (2016), 855-74.
[118] This is suggested by the fact that Savile does not record any textual variants in the margins of the edition of these texts. In the case of Æthelweard, it is likely Savile relied on the sole known exempla, BL Cotton MS Otho A. x.

Savile's texts have encountered in tracing his footsteps are striking, and has led them sometimes to conclude that the manuscripts Savile used no longer survive. That was W. G. Searle's conclusion about Savile's edition of Ingulf, which he showed was based on a manuscript similar to an Elizabethan copy of an earlier medieval manuscript, yet with decisive differences.[119]

Nevertheless, editors have offered plausible suggestions, even if not quite certainties, as to some of the manuscripts upon which Savile seems likely to have relied, and therefore the repositories he must have used. The example of Savile's work on William of Malmesbury is instructive here. When it came to *Gesta pontificum,* Savile seems to have made use of manuscripts in Cambridge, probably in the University Library. One of the modern editors of William's *Gesta pontificum* observes that Savile's text is 'where I have checked it, consistently close' to that of a twelfth-century manuscript that Parker donated to Cambridge University Library in 1574.[120] The manuscript prominently announces its Parkerian provenance on the first folio. Not only does it bear the inscription 'Matthaeus Cantuar*ensis* 1574', but a member of Parker's staff has painted the archbishop's coat of arms into the initial letter 'D' for the work's title (*De pontificum gestis*), creating a historiated initial (a practice carried over into print from medieval manuscript production). It was clear that when Savile worked on *Scriptores* this manuscript was still firmly associated with Parker. In his catalogue of Cambridge University Library's manuscripts published not long after *Scriptores*, Thomas James noted that the manuscripts gifted to the library by 'Matthew Parker, Most Reverend Father in Christ, of Blessed Memory' are 'most diligently preserved in a certain

[119] W.G. Searle, *Ingulf and the Historia Croylandensis* (Cambridge, 1894), 46. The surviving Elizabethan manuscript is BL Arundel MS 178.
[120] CUL Ff.1.25.1. William of Malmesbury, *Gesta pontificum Anglorum = The History of the English Bishops*, eds Michael Winterbottom and Rodney Thomson, 2 vols (Oxford, 2007), 1: xxv.

chest shut up within the Library'.[121] This particular manuscript was numbered 244 by James, and at this time was bound together with two sixteenth-century copies of works by William of Malmesbury that are today each bound separately: the fifth book of the *Gesta pontificum* (written, as James says, by a 'recent hand, because it was formerly missing') and *Historia novella*.[122] This does present a significant puzzle, however: if Savile used this manuscript (as it seems likely he did), why did he not include the fifth book of *Gesta pontificum* in his edition? Given that book is headed 'Prologus libri quinti Will*elm*i Malmesb*uriensis* de pontificibus', it would be hard to imagine that Savile failed to understand this *was* a fifth book. Perhaps the modern script in which that book was written left him suspicious of the work's status or authenticity. One might also wonder why, out of the large number of manuscripts of *Gesta pontificum* which survive, Savile chose this one. To a modern editor, the manuscript has 'no virtue apart from its age'.[123] We might conjecture that Parker's importance within British medieval textual editing and the manuscript's association with him gave it some particular authority. However, in Savile's edition of John Chrysostom he simply refers to another Parker manuscript as 'from the library of the University of Cambridge', with no further discussion of its provenance.[124] It may be the sheer fact that this manuscript was relatively easily available in a prominent institutional repository that made it appealing to Savile.

[121] 'Libri omnes subsequentes, ex dono Beatissimæ memoriæ, Reuerendissimi in Christo Patris Mathiæ Parkeri Archiepiscopi, in cista quadam intra Bibliothecam inclusi, diligentissimè custodiuntur', in Thomas James, *Ecloga Oxonio-Cantabrigiensis, tributa in libros duos* (London, 1600), Book 1, 67.
[122] James, *Ecloga*, 68, item 244: '1. *Gu. Malmesbury* de Pontificum gestis, lib. 59. vltimus liber scriptus est à Neoterico, cum prius desideraretur. 2. Nouella historia Anglorum *Gu: Monachi*, ad *Robertum Comitem* Glocestriæ, Pr. *Domino amantissimo*'. The fifth book of *Gesta pontificum* is now CUL Ff.1.25.2 and *Historia novella* is Ff.1.25.3. They were rebound in their present form in the nineteenth century.
[123] William, *Gesta pontificum*, 1: xxv.
[124] Henry Savile, *S. Ioannis Chrysostomi Opera Graece, octo uoluminibus*, 8 vols (Eton, 1613), 8, part 2, col. 722: 'Tertius ex biblioth. Vniuersitatis Cantabrigiensis'. This is CUL MS Ii.3.25, which contains Chrysostom's homilies on King Uzziah, which Parker believed to belong to Theodore of Tarsus, Archbishop of Canterbury from 668 to 690. It is in reality a far later manuscript.

There is one extant manuscript that it seems almost certain Savile used in his editing of William of Malmesbury. This was a thirteenth-century manuscript of *Gesta regum* and *Historia novella* which is now in the library of Trinity College, Cambridge.[125] Roger Mynors noted that it was used in Savile's edition of *Historia novella*.[126] This manuscript originally divided *Historia novella* into three books, although the close of the first book and start of the second lack an excipit or incipit. However, a hand dating from before Savile's time altered the manuscript's rubrics to rename books two and three as the sixth and seventh books of *Gesta regum*.[127] Savile, though, disregarded these major structural divisions found in this manuscript. What confirms that this manuscript must have been used in Savile's edition is that minute marginal and interlinear corrections and additions have been added in a late sixteenth- (or early seventeenth-century) hand. All these corrections appear in Savile's text in 1596. The corrections cease in the third book of *Historia novella*, just after the manuscript's rubrication between books two and three has been crossed out (probably by the same hand that emended the text). Savile's division of his text into two books was inserted into this manuscript, with 'Liber Secundus' written at the relevant point in the same hand which has made the corrections and additions.[128] All this cannot be accidental. The only other possibility is that the manuscript's alterations were introduced from Savile's printed edition itself. However, collating and emending a medieval British manuscript against a printed edition with such thoroughness would be unusual in this period. More likely this manuscript was used as a kind of base text, with corrections inserted into it from other manuscripts, before it could be transcribed for the printers. This manuscript was donated to Trinity by

[125] Trinity College, Cambridge, MS R.7.1. For more details on this manuscript see William of Malmesbury, *Historia novella*, ed. Edmund King, trans. K. R. Potter (Oxford, 1998), lxxiii.
[126] R. A. B. Mynors, 'The text', in William of Malmesbury, *Historia Novella*, ed. K. R. Potter (London, 1955), xxxviii-xliii, xl: 'this [i.e. Trinity MS R.7.1] or a MS twin to it seems to have been [Savile's] principal source, though no doubt he had access to at least one other copy'.
[127] For the amended rubrics see MS R.7.1, fols 132r and 141r.
[128] Trinity College, Cambridge, MS R.7.1, fol. 137r.

Thomas Neville (*c*.1548-1615), who was master of the college from 1593 and dean of Canterbury from 1597, where he was able to draw on books from the Cathedral Priory to augment his manuscript collections.[129] Neville's ownership of the manuscript makes it even more plausible that Savile would have used it: Neville's career had been cultivated by Whitgift himself. Neville's brother, Alexander Neville (1544-1614), was secretary to Parker, Grindal, and Whitgift, and it may have been through his brother that Neville acquired former Parkerian manuscripts. That Whitgift's support for the project may have included encouraging Neville to lend Savile a relevant manuscript is entirely plausible. May McKisack has suggested that one of the manuscripts Savile used in editing *Gesta regum*, and from which he may have corrected Neville's manuscript of *Historia novella*, had been bequeathed to Trinity by Whitgift himself at his death.[130] It is now Trinity College MS R.7.10. Bearing Whitgift's coat of arms, this manuscript may have been in the archbishop's possession when Savile produced his edition. Alongside the use of a major institutional library, then, it seems likely that key manuscripts were acquired through the project's ecclesiastical sponsorship.

When it came to his work on Henry of Huntingdon, Savile, as we have already noted, seems to have used a manuscript acquired in Oxford.[131] Oxford and its connections may also have led Savile to one of the very rare manuscripts of Æthelweard. Thomas Allen records seeing a manuscript of this author in 1588, and it seems likely to have been Allen that drew Savile's attention to Æthelweard and this manuscript.[132] Another of Savile's manuscripts for his edition, however, came from a large private library rather than an institutional one. This is a manuscript of Roger of Hoveden that belonged to William Howard of Naworth (1563-

[129] On the manuscripts in Canterbury, including discussion of Neville's collecting, see Nigel Ramsay, 'The Cathedral Archives and Library', *A History of Canterbury Cathedral*, eds Patrick Collinson, Nigel Ramsay, and Margaret Sparks (Oxford, 1995), 341-407. On Neville's life see J.B. Mullinger revised by Stanford Lehmberg, 'Neville [Nevile], Thomas (*c*.1548-1615)', *ODNB*, online edn.
[130] McKisack, *Medieval History*, 64. For Whitgift's bequest of books see Trinity College MS R.17.8, pp. 89-91, with 'Malmesb; de gestis Anglorum' listed at 91.
[131] BL Egerton MS 3668.
[132] Eric E. Barker, 'The Cottonian Fragments of Æthelweard's Chronicle', *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research* 24 (1951), 46-62, 55.

1640), the manuscript collector and recusant; despite his religion, he was active on the London antiquarian scene in the 1590s.[133] The manuscript in question has been marked up with variant spellings of particular names in the margins, although these variants are by no means always included in Savile's edition. Savile made an attempt to imitate a visual element of the manuscript, incorporating an image of an illustrated seal of William II, king of Sicily, into his edition.[134] Very seldom does Savile seem to treat the appearance or structure of his manuscripts as genuinely meaningful: in the case of Roger of Hoveden, he even invents a new division of the work into *prior* and *posterior pars*, which has no manuscript authority at all.[135] Savile's printing of the seal seems thus a rare moment of recognition on his part that manuscripts are not merely vessels for text that can be readily translated into another medium.

In producing *Scriptores*, Savile is likely, therefore, to have relied on manuscripts from a variety of sources: institutional libraries, private collections, his own manuscripts. What is perhaps most significant, though, is that Savile chose not to tell the reader which manuscripts he used in his edition. This is the opposite of his practice elsewhere. In the commentary he provided to his edition of Chrysostom (in the second part of volume 8) he meticulously itemized the manuscripts he used for each of Chrysostom's works. The Eton edition of Xenophon's *Cyropaedia* contains no prefatory material at all, but this edition was likely to have been aimed locally at students of the college, where prefatory explanations of the scholarship behind such a set text might not have seemed necessary.[136] By the time he published *Scriptores* Savile was well aware of the value of printing rare manuscript material:

[133] MS Arundel 150. Stubbs notes that 'it is to the use of this MS that some at least of the various readings found in Savile's margin are to be traced' (Roger Hoveden, *Chronica magistri Rogeri de Houedene*, ed. William Stubbs, 4 vols (London, 1868), 1: lxxxii).
[134] MS Arundel 150, fol. 64v. Savile's reproduction is *Scriptores*, 316. For the identification of this ms as Savile's source for the picture of the seal see Roger Hoveden, *Chronica*, ed. Stubbs, 2: 98.
[135] Roger Hoveden, *Chronica*, ed. Stubbs, 1: xxv.
[136] Henry Savile, ed., *Xenophontis de Cyri institutione libri octo* (Eton, 1613).

he had copied scientific manuscripts on his journey around Europe, an example of which he was already encouraging his friend John Chamber to publish in the early 1580s.[137] It seems unlikely, therefore, that Savile had simply not yet realised the need to provide more precise bibliographical information about manuscript provenance. We can interpret this lack of specific manuscript references in several ways. A deliberate eschewal of pedantic apparatus might be part of the work's courtly *sprezzatura*. Savile described the book, after all, as a product of his own *otium*, and as ideal reading material for the queen in hers; in this context, it makes sense that the book would wear its learning lightly. Rigorous manuscript reference was also not a strictly necessary part of British antiquarian scholarship by 1596: Camden was similarly opaque about many of his sources. It should be said, however, that both Parker's editions and the more recent editorial work of William Howard gave far more detail about the manuscripts they used.[138] It may also have mattered to Savile that he was printing *editiones principes*, such that there was accordingly no need to prove superiority over any previous edition by flaunting the robustness or significance of its exact manuscript underpinnings. Richard Montagu's edition of Gregory of Nazianzus (produced at Eton under Savile's auspices) justified itself in exactly that way, as an improvement on the 'most depraved' (*depravatissimè*) Basel edition and the more recent Parisian one, owing to its careful reliance on good manuscripts.[139]

Most of all, however, the lack of detailed manuscript references was a way of signalling what kind of work this was not. The comparison here with Savile's practice in his Chrysostom edition is instructive. Jean-Louis Quantin has shown that Savile's edition was

[137] John Chamber, ed., *Barlaami monachi logistica nvnc primvm Latinè reddita, & scholijs illustrata à Ioanne Chambero Collegij Etonensis apud Anglos socio* (Paris, 1600). In the letter to the reader, Chamber acknowledges the work's long gestation ('twice nine years') and thanks Savile for sending him the manuscript (aiijr-v).
[138] e.g. *Matthæi Paris [...] historia*, †iijr and *Chronicon ex chronicis*, A3v.
[139] Richard Montagu, ed., *Sancti Gregorii Nazianzeni in Ivlianvm invectivæ dvæ* (Eton, 1610), ¶4r, which refers to both *Γρεγοριου του Ναζιανζηνου του θεολογου απαντα τὰ μέχρι νῦν μὲν εὑρισκόμενα* (Basel, 1550) and *Sancti Gregorii Nazianzeni, cognomento theologi, Opera* (Paris, 1609).

971 'studiously de-confessionalized'.[140] Most strikingly (and calamitously, for the commercial
972 prospects of the Chrysostom edition), Savile did not translate Chrysostom into Latin, as
973 translations were frequently sites for Catholic cries of Protestant foul play. But he also kept
974 his notes focussed on philological (as opposed to theological) matters, showing off the
975 immense effort that had gone into cross-confessional manuscript collecting in order to correct
976 his Chrysostom text.[141] In a climate where Thomas James could argue that the falsities of
977 Catholic patristic editions required untainted British manuscripts to amend them, it is easy to
978 see that clear manuscript citation was necessary to allay suspicion.[142] However, as Quantin
979 has pointed out, even Catholic theologians and scholars were willing to admit that Protestants
980 would transcribe a manuscript faithfully enough.[143] Editions of medieval authors, despite
981 containing plenty of historical examples for religio-political controversy, did not anticipate
982 the same level of scrutiny that was applied to Savile's great patristic edition. Add to this the
983 rather local, courtly framing of Savile's book, and the need for rapid production for
984 presentation to Elizabeth, and it is easy to see that *Scriptores* was a work of a very different
985 genre than that of the Chrysostom edition, without the same expectation of rigorous
986 manuscript citation.

987 How, then, did Savile choose between the many different readings he found in his
988 manuscripts? The case of his work on *Gesta regum* is instructive. Savile had access to two
989 different versions of the text, the A and B recensions.[144] Both are authorial: B is a version of
990 A that William himself revised. As his modern editors explain, William's revisions 'toned

[140] Jean-Louis Quantin, 'A European Geography of Patristic Scholarship in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries', *International Journal of the Classical Tradition* 27 (2020), 300-331, 303.
[141] Quantin, 'Chrysostome grec', especially 326-328.
[142] Paul Nelles, 'The Uses of Orthodoxy and Jacobean Erudition: Thomas James and the Bodleian Library', *History of Universities* 22 (2007), 21-70.
[143] Quantin, 'Chrysostome grec', 327: 'Quelqu'un comme Fronton était prêt à faire confiance à un protestant pour "reproduire de bonne foi le texte et les variantes" des manuscrits'.
[144] For *GR*'s manuscripts see William, *Gesta regum*, eds Mynors, Thomson, Winterbottom, xiii-xxi. On the textual history of Savile's edition see William Stubbs, *De Gestis regum Anglorum*, 1: xciii-xcvii.

down much that might have been offensive to the great'.[145] In general, the two traditions do not bear conflation, as B is clearly a textual *revision*, rather than a set of *additions* that can easily be interpolated into A. Savile, however, does take one early opportunity to conflate the two versions, in William's early account of Glastonbury Abbey. William introduces the 'noble monasteries' that were built by King Ine in this time, 'above all Glastonbury'. The A version of the text then describes the abbey: it is 'a house outstanding in our times too. He built it in a sequestered marsh, intending that the more confined the monks' view on earth, the more eagerly they would hold to heavenly things'. In the B version, this brief account is replaced by William's reference to his own book on the subject: 'Ine's addition to whose splendour will be found described in the little book I have composed on the ancient history of the house'.[146] Instead of replacing one with the other, or subordinating one version to the margin, Savile puts *both* versions into the body-text, so A's reading is followed by B, which Savile puts into brackets. No manuscript authorised this: it was Savile's editorial decision to bring the two versions together to provide as much William for the reader as possible. Elsewhere, Savile inserts *additions* from the B tradition into the A recension, but this moment is striking because he brings together William's *revisions* of a single passage.[147]

As *Gesta regum* proceeds, however, Savile does primarily make selections between variant readings, especially in books 3 and 4. Sometimes he records variants in the margins, and his manuscript preferences, interestingly, appear different between books 3 and 4. In

[145] William, *Gesta regum*, eds Mynors, Thomson, Winterbottom, 2: xxv-xxvi.
[146] Savile's text is as follows: 'Indicio sunt Monasteria regijs sumptibus nobiliter excitata; Praecipuè Glasconiense [broadly following A reading:] nostris quoque diebus insignissimum, quod in quodam palustri recessu construxit, vt silicet eo tenaciùs Monachi supernis inhiarent, quo castigatiùs terrena haurirent ([And now adding B reading] cui quantum splendoris adiecerit, libellus ille docebit, quem de antiquitate eiusdem Monasterij elaboraui)' (Savile, *Scriptores*, 7r; *GR* i.35.3). All translations from William of Malmesbury are those of William, *Gesta regum*, eds Mynors, Thomson, Winterbottom.
[147] For Savile's addition of material from the B recension to A see fol.12v (GR i.66), where he adds (from the B recension): 'Iacet in Francia apud S. *Paulum* de Cormarico: quod cœnobium *Carolus* magnus eius consilio construxit: vnde hodiéq*ue* quatuor monachorum victus & potus pro eiusdem *Alcuini* anima quotidianæ infertur eleemosynae in eadem ecclesia' ('He lies in France at St Paul's Cormery, a house built by Charlemagne on his advice. That is why even today in that church food and drink for four monks are distributed as daily alms for the soul of Alcuin').

book 3, William gives a brief vignette of the clergy. ‘Such was at that time the competition in religious fervour between bishops and abbots and between nobles in high-minded generosity’, William writes, ‘that it is astonishing...’. And here we have a choice of readings. A’s reading goes on to put the knife into clerical corruption: ‘it is astonishing that before sixty years have passed both parties have become sterile in good works and have bound themselves by oath to fight wars against justice: the clergy in their ambition for ecclesiastical office embracing wrong rather than what is right and good, the others with no thought for shame seizing every opportunity to beg some pecuniary gain as though it were their daily alms’. In the B version, William has toned down this attack: ‘it is astonishing’, here instead, ‘to see how after the lapse of so few years, almost everything in both estates has changed: the churchmen in some things more lukewarm, yet more open-handed, the laymen wiser in every way, yet more close-fisted; but in the defence of their native land both parties valiant in action, prudent in counsel, determined to advance their own fortunes and depress those of their enemies’. Savile prints the more anti-clerical A version and puts B into the margin as a variant reading.[148] One could, therefore, surmise that he, like Matthew Parker before him, is drawn to those moments when medieval historians seem to anticipate the need for ecclesiastical Reformation.

But Savile was not printing attacks on the clergy wherever he found them. In book 4, his manuscript preferences are reversed. Here, where William attacks the clergy or the monarchy in the A recension, Savile chooses the gentler B version. For instance, when William in the A recension denounces three bishops as ‘acting out of lust for gold, all out of venal ambition and a disregard for ecclesiastical law’, Savile prefers the B recension, with its milder (if still critical) comment that the bishops behaved ‘with more worldly ambition than

[148] Savile, *Scriptores*, 56r.

ought to have found a place in the activity of such great men'.[149] In this case, Savile does not even include the more savage version in the margin. It would have been easy for Savile to pick and choose his readings as they suited him, rather than sticking consistently to a particular manuscript tradition in each book (while acknowledging the other tradition by occasionally recording its variant readings). It is hardly worth pointing out that Savile's approach created a highly idiosyncratic text of *Gesta regum*, moving between different textual traditions at the breaks between books. What seems more significant is that Savile's editorial decisions do not map coherently and consistently onto confessional priorities. There are lots of ways this might have come about: Savile could have employed different amanuenses with different approaches to the transcription of particular books; Savile might have changed his mind about which manuscripts he preferred.[150] It is hard to imagine that this is exactly the edition that Parker and his circle would have produced of William of Malmesbury. Savile seems driven by different editorial priorities than Parker -- priorities which were shaped, among other things, by the courtly setting within which the work would be received.

Many of William's most forceful attacks in the A recension (especially in book 4) are aimed at the court and at King William II, in particular, rather than at those with high ecclesiastical office. Take, for instance, Savile's treatment of a variant passage in William's account of the death of William II, after he had been accidentally shot by an arrow when out hunting. William II was taken to Winchester Cathedral, where he was 'laid in the ground,

[149] William, *GR*, iv.338.1: A: 'omnes nummorum maleficio, omnes venalitatis ambitu et sacrilegio'; B: 'omnes majori ambitu quam ut tantorum virorum debuisset interesse studio' (Savile, *Scriptores*, 72v (this is the second of two leaves with folio number 72)).

[150] This was Stubbs' conclusion: 'The general result of this collation is to confirm the impression that Sir Henry Savile began his transcription in belief in the superior antiquity, and probably in the superior execution of the manuscripts of the first edition; and that, as he proceeded, he was won over by the improved readings and important additions of a later copy, but that he did not think the matter of sufficient importance to turn back on the earlier portions and reduce them to conformity with the superior text, and contented himself with giving in the first book a more copious supply of various readings than he furnishes for the rest of the work' (*De gestis regum Anglorum*, 1: xcvi-xcvii). Stubbs assumes that the only criteria for Savile's manuscript selections must have been the quality of the readings found there.

within the tower, many nobles being present, but few to mourn him'.[151] Then the editor is again faced with a choice. The A recension sets a damning seal on William's life: 'Nor were those lacking who said that the tower's fall, which occurred some years later, was due to his sins; that it had been wrong to inter, in such a sacred spot, him who had been his whole life wanton and lecherous and even died without receiving the Last Rites'.[152] The B revision is far more circumspect: 'Next year the tower fell; and this event gave rise to much comment, which I refrain from repeating, lest I be thought to lend an ear to idle talk. In particular, the fabric might easily have collapsed through unsound construction, even had he never been buried there'. The latter is the version that Savile printed and he does not even record the earlier reading in the margin.[153] This seems to comport with Savile's dedications of William of Malmesbury to Elizabeth, the whole combined thrust of which is that William celebrated and memorialised the great deeds of the queen' ancestors, and thus would make for suitable reading in her *otium*. It would be unfortunate if those ancestors turned out to be flawed. But Savile's practice, once more, was not consistent here either: he continued to prefer the A tradition of William in book 3, even to the point of incorporating William's attacks on the monarchy found there. The effect is that Savile's edition of *Gesta regum* is far from single-minded. Savile knowingly missed opportunities to let medieval monastic historians -- eyewitnesses to church corruption at the height of the era when the pope had become the Antichrist -- attack their own clerical institutions. He seems caught between competing priorities -- those of politics, patronage, and religion, and also, perhaps, a degree of faith in the textual authority of particular manuscripts. Again, that he chose not to make any of this

[151] Savile, *Scriptores*, 71r: 'Ibi infra ambitum turris multorum procerum conuentu, paucorum planctu terræ traditum'.
[152] 'Neque defuere opiniones quorundam dicentium ruinam turris, quae posterioribus annis accidit, peccatis illius contigisse, quod iniuria fuerit illum sacrato tumulari loco qui tota uita petulans et lubricus moriens etiam Christiano caruerit uiatico' (iv.333.6).
[153] Savile, *Scriptores*, 71r: 'Secuta est posteriori anno ruina turris, de qua re, quæ opiniones fuerint, parco dicere, ne videar nudis nugis magis credere: præsertim cùm pro instabilitate operis machina ruinam fecisse potuisset, etiamsi ipse nunquam ibi sepultus fuisset'.

explicit suggests that he did not envisage the edition would be subjected to the kind of scrutiny that his work on Chrysostom would inevitably receive. Yet, as we will see in the conclusion to this article, that did not prove to be an entirely correct assumption.

Conclusion: 'Epistola Deleatur, Liber Currat': The Reception of Henry Savile's *Scriptores*

According to the Catholic antiquary and reformer of learning, Edmund Bolton (b. 1574/5, d. in or after 1634), writing in the late 1610s or early 1620s, Savile's *Scriptores* sparked hopes that Savile might turn his attention to writing the history of England. For Bolton, the essence of Savile's epistolary dedication of *Scriptores* to Elizabeth (of which he knew only the final, published version) was the hope, '[t]hat the Majesty of Handling our History might once Equal the Majesty of the Argument'. 'Great *Savil* himself gave hope, when this Epistle came abroad, that he would be the man' finally to produce such a history, 'and all the learned of England were arrected and full of Expectation'. 'Somewhat he is said to have attempted in that Argument', Bolton recalls, 'and made Searches in the Tower for Furniture out of Records'. But these researches, if they took place, came to nothing: 'if he did any such thing, whether impatient of the harsh and dusty Rudeness of the Subject, or despairing that he could so truly as the Honour and Splendour of his Name and as the Nature of the Work requir'd', he 'desisted' from this great undertaking.[154] For the rest of Savile's life, the study of medieval British documents and historians was a scattered and occasional area of interest. He would mine medieval historians at the start of James I's reign for his anatomisation of various forms of political union that he produced for the new king. Having drawn upon Matthew Paris to

[154] Edmund Bolton, *Hypercritica: or a Rule of Judgment for the Writing of our Histories*, printed in *Critical Essays of the Seventeenth Century*, ed. J. E. Spingarn, 3 vols (Oxford, 1908), 1: 96-97.

show that Scotland's king traditionally offered fealty to England's, he observed: 'I know the common Scottish exception is these writers were monks'. But, he argued, 'they were such monks as well enough knew the world, as whosoever shall look into their writings shall easily see'.[155] To Savile, Britain's medieval historians were surprisingly astute political observers, even if they were monks. Despite the civil and political lens through which we have seen Savile tended to read these medieval monks, he did also publish medieval British theological writing, as his edition of Thomas Bradwardine attests, where Savile was again working at the encouragement of the archbishop of Canterbury.[156] Once Savile moved to Eton, however, his scholarly centre of gravity lay in the editing and printing of Greek texts.

That takes nothing away from the importance of Savile's *Scriptores*, which went on to shape readers' encounters with the British Middle Ages for years and years. Many copies of the book survive and many of these are annotated. It was a book owned by the royal family, as is attested by a copy gloriously bound with the arms of Prince Henry (1594-1612), son of James VI and heir to the English and Scottish throne before his premature death, which became part of the Lumley Library.[157] Copies that belonged to notable British scholars allow their engagement with the book to be traced in detail. For William Camden, Savile's printed book was only a starting point for the study of the authors it contained. His own copy became an archive in itself, a repository of antiquarian papers connected to those medieval authors whom Savile had published, which Camden had bound into his volume.[158] The greatest English antiquary of the next generation, John Selden (1584-1654), similarly treated his own copy as a starting point for the study of Anglo-Norman history, comparing his own

[155] Henry Savile, 'Historicall Collections', in *The Jacobean Union: Six Tracts of 1604*, eds Bruce R. Galloway and Brian P. Levack (Edinburgh, 1985), 191-192.
[156] See Mandelbrote, 'Calculators'.
[157] BL C.191.b.25: Savile, ed., *Scriptores* (London, 1596).
[158] Camden's copy of the 1596 London edition is BL C.62.g.2. I am preparing a study of this copy, which contains John Leland's autograph notes on manuscripts he had seen at Glastonbury Abbey and an autograph letter from Thomas James to Camden.

manuscript of William's *Gesta pontificum* against Savile's edition.[159] Indeed, the annotations of several readers show that Savile's work had, in their eyes, far from rendered the manuscript tradition redundant. William Howard of Naworth noted in the margins of his manuscript of Roger of Hoveden (which, as we have seen, is likely to have been one of the manuscripts Savile used in his edition) the point at which Savile's edition had divided the work into 'Pars Prior' and 'Pars Posterior', and Howard notes the lack in his own manuscript of the laws of William I and the genealogies of Norman Dukes, both of which are in Savile's printed edition.[160] Here we have a medieval manuscript and printed book being read side-by-side, informing each other.

Disputes great and small with Savile's edition arose in its margins. One owner of a copy of the 1596 London edition (in a seventeenth-century English binding) has made only a single, and rather incidental, marginal intervention: to move the date of Christ's birth (in the chronology which Savile appended to the historians) two years earlier, on the basis of the chronological work of the Swiss scholar, Henricus Glareanus (1488-1563).[161] A copy now in the National Library of Wales annotated in an eighteenth-century hand shows the demand for wholesale revisions to Savile's work. It seems to have been designed to form the basis of a new edition, bearing collations with manuscripts in the Cotton Library.[162] The owner has copied onto the title page the damning judgment on the book (or at least on its Anglo-Saxon scholarship) offered by the leading Anglo-Saxon scholar and Non-Juror, George Hickes (1642-1715), who says that Savile, 'rather lacking in understanding of Anglo-Saxon letters', noted quite a few variant readings in the margins which are 'unworthy of his own name and

[159] Selden's copy is in Gloucester Cathedral Library, SEL 1.2. Selden notes on fol.168r that his own manuscript ('mss. meus') finishes with 'exercere ibi vitam'.
[160] BL MS Arundel 150, fols 45r ('Incipit pars posterior in libro Henrici Savile') and 76v ('Tam Leges Gulielmi conquestoris quam genealog: Ducu*m* Normanniae in loca isto omnino desiderantur').
[161] Brotherton Library, BC GB C16/17 qSAV: Savile, *Scriptores* (1596), *2^{r}: 'Chronologia Hen. Glareanj in hunc annu*m* refert Christi natiuitatem vt videre licet ad fine*m* Dec. V T. Liuij'.
[162] National Library of Wales, DA 130 S26 (fol). The annotator has collated *Gesta Regum* with BL Cotton MS Claudius C.IX, a thirteenth-century manuscript from Battle Abbey, Sussex.

erudition'.[163] By the early eighteenth century, it is clear that Savile's edition was the subject of much criticism. Thomas Hearne (1678-1735), who admittedly criticised most scholarly works, records that the great editor of Bede, John Smith (bap.1659, d.1715), was in Oxford in 1713 saying that 'we very much want an Edition of Will*iam* of Malmes*bury* the Edition put out by S*i*r H. Savile being very faulty'.[164] But while William Fulman (1632-1688) had already brought out a new edition of pseudo-Ingulph (from a manuscript owned by John Marsham, with Peter of Blois and other anonymous continuations), most of the authors would have to wait for new editions until the Rolls Series of the nineteenth century.[165]

From among the vast subject of Savile's book's reception, however, it is its re-publication in Frankfurt in 1601 I wish to examine briefly by way of conclusion. This will, inevitably, invite us to return once more to questions about the book's relationship to earlier, more explicitly polemical editions of medieval British texts. I have been arguing that Savile's *Scriptores* departs from the Parkerian tradition of confessional medieval textual editing in important ways. That Savile did not pursue the most anti-clerical manuscript variants he could find, that he did not frame his edition as an attempt to record or to refute the superstitions of the Catholic church, or mention the 'cura' of the archbishop of Canterbury for his book, all suggest that conclusion. This came about partly owing to the improvisatory nature of the book, as a response to immediate patronage needs in the Elizabethan court. This encouraged a focus on the glories of English history rather than complex appeals to questions of church power or ritual. That it was an acknowledged and deliberate departure from Savile's usual scholarly remit might have caused the edition to be more sparsely annotated

[163] George Hickes, *Lingarum vett. septentrionalium thesaurus grammatico-criticus et archaeologicus* (Oxford, 1705), in 'Dissertatio Epistolaris', 149: '*Henricus Savile*, qui literarum *Saxonicarum* forte prorsus rudis, variantes Lectiones haud paucas, suo quidem nomine & eruditione indignas, ut quæ insulsæ sunt, passim adnotavit in marginibus singularis voluminis, in quo *rerum Anglicarum Scriptores post* Bedam, Londini publicavit, MDXCVI'.
[164] Thomas Hearne, *Remarks and Collections of Thomas Hearne*, 11 vols (Oxford, 1885-1921), 4: 222.
[165] William Fulman, ed., *Rerum Anglicarum scriptorum veterum tomus unus* (Oxford, 1684).

than some of Savile's other works. Clearly Savile did anticipate international interest in his work: he must have been aware, for instance, that it would soon be sent to European scholars like Abraham Ortelius, who had a particular interest in British history. But by presenting the book (in the only framing Savile offered) as a locally English political work -- a nationalistic work, even, offering a new foundation of an English history to be written by English men -- the effect is to minimise the book's implications for ecclesiastical history. A textual and philological apparatus designed to reassure a sceptical, cross-confessional international audience was not felt necessary. It was this nexus of factors, I would suggest, that led to what might be called the book's puzzling blankness, which we noted above in this article's introduction.

Its Frankfurt publication in 1601 brought *Rerum Anglicarum scriptores* to a huge audience across Europe, Protestant and Catholic. At the end of the sixteenth century, one of the book's printers, George Bishop, seems to have been developing increasing ties with continental publishers, including those in Frankfurt and with Wilhelm Antonius in Hanau.[166] In the 1580s, one of Frankfurt's leading publishing houses had been that of André Wechel, a Huguenot exile who sought refuge in Germany. At his death, the firm divided into two strands, and Bishop seems to have had relationships with both of them.[167] In 1594, the less distinguished side of the Wechel family, Johann Wechel, put out one of Bishop's books, Camden's *Britannia*. But it seems to have been Savile's *Scriptores* that gave Bishop an entrée to the superior arm of the Wechel family business, the house of Claudius Marnius and Jean Aubri. In the autumn Frankfurt Book Fair of 1600, the London edition of Savile's *Scriptores*

[166] For more on Antonius and Bishop, and on the relationship between London and German printers in this period in general, see Ian Maclean, 'Alberico Gentili, His Publishers, and the Vagaries of the Book Trade between England and Germany, 1580-1614', *Learning and the Marketplace: Essays in the History of the Early Modern Book* (Leiden, 2009), 291-337.

[167] R. J. W. Evans, 'The Wechel Presses: Humanism and Calvinism in Central Europe, 1572-1627', *Past and Present Society Supplement* 2 (1975).

was advertised for sale.[168] This was, presumably, an effort to test the waters: to see whether there was a market for such a book. It must have seemed that there was, however, because in 1601 Marnius and Aubri brought out Savile's *Scriptores* in a new edition under their Pegasus imprint.[169] The edition was more or less identical to the London one, but the Frankfurt publishers added an index to the volume, a feature they advertised on the book's title page. Also in 1601, they released a new edition in a single volume (reprinting the prefaces) of two other works of English history: Matthew Parker's edition of Matthew of Westminster and William Howard's of John of Worcester.[170] This was quite a remarkable pairing: an evangelist for the antiquity of the English Protestant church and a Catholic recusant were brought together in the same volume. Savile's volume and the Parker-Howard hybrid seem to have constituted a paired set of their own, advertised together in the Frankfurt catalogue of spring 1601.[171] Both volumes were timely additions to Marnius's output, as around this time he was endeavouring to publish medieval historical documents from across Europe: Savile's book took its place alongside Jacques Bongars' *Rerum Hungaricarum scriptores* (1600) and *Germanicarum rerum scriptores* (1602). The 1601 publication of Savile's book also paved the way for Camden's edition of several more British medieval historians under the Pegasus imprint in 1603, to which Camden added a preface celebrating the whole tradition of British medieval editing (from Parker to Savile to Camden) and a paean to Claudius Marnius himself, he who has 'brought back to the light of the rest of the world (in his own presses) those writings of our own history which we ourselves produced, which were lurking in our

[168] *Catalogus novus nundinarum autmnalium, Francofurti ad moenum, anno M.DC. celebratarum* (Ursell, 1600), c1r.
[169] Henry Savile, ed., *Rerum Anglicarum scriptores post Bedam praecipui* (Frankfurt, 1601).
[170] *Flores historiarum per Matthaeum Westmonasteriensem collecti: praecipue de rebus Britannicis ab exordio mundi vsque ad annum Domini MCCCVII. Et chronicon ex chronicis, ab initio mundi vsque ad annum domini MCXVIII. deductum* (Frankfurt, 1601).
[171] *Catalogvs vniversalis pro nvndinis Francofvrtensibus vernalibus de anno 1601.* (Frankfurt, 1601), D1v.

corner of the world, and even now disappearing'.[172] In the longer term, these early seventeenth-century publications also helped develop links between English and Frankfurt publishing that would in turn be developed by John Norton and John Bill, two stationers with whom Savile would work closely.[173] The 1601 publication of Savile's *Scriptores* can, therefore, be seen as a decisive moment in the history not only of the dissemination of that work itself, but of English publishing on the Continent more broadly.

The book inevitably passed across Europe's confessional divide. Savile's own awareness of this is suggested in one of his letters to Dudley Carleton (1574-1632), England's ambassador to Venice and Savile's stepson-in-law, who assisted Savile with the complicated dissemination of his edition of Chrysostom in Europe. Savile's letter notes that he intends to send '50 ve a 100. copyes to serve you in Italy', but he has several concerns. One of them is that, were they to be sold at Venice, 'the bookes will have no inquisito*u*rs warra*n*t such as in popish cou*n*trees are pr*e*fixed before bookes'. Nevertheless, 'I doe assure you', he writes to Carleton, 'there is noe hereticall poi*n*t i*n* any epi*st*le or Note of o*u*rs, vnlesse it bee heresy to giue a good ki*n*ge good wordes'. He is confident 'that i*n* Rome the booke will assuredly passe', although the censors, Savile fears, 'may cha*n*ce serve mee, as they did in Anglicar*um* rer*um* scriptores, vpon w*hi*ch the c*en*sure was there, Epistola deleatur, liber currat'.[174] In the case of *Scriptores*, then, it was specifically the dedicatory epistle to Elizabeth that caught the censor's attention. Once that single leaf had been taken out, the book was free to be sold. That the censors took issue with the dedicatory letter specifically because it was addressed to Elizabeth I, rather than because of any other aspect of its content

[172] William Camden, *Anglica, Normannica, Hibernica, Cambrica, a veteribus scripta* (Frankfurt, 1603), ***2v: 'ille enim nostrorum scripta apud nos edita, in hoc orbis angulo latentia, & iam euanesce*n*tia in lucem reliqui orbis Christiani suis typis reuocauit'.
[173] Rees and Wakely, *Publishing*, 'John Norton, John Bill, and the Frankfurt Catalogue'.
[174] TNA SP 14/69, fol. 6r: Henry Savile to Dudley Carleton, 10th May 1612. I am grateful to Jean-Louis Quantin for drawing my attention to this letter. It is discussed in Jean-Louis Quantin, 'Historical Criticism, Confessional Controversy, and Self-Censorship: Henry Savile and the *Lives* of John Chrysostom', *Erudition and the Republic of Letters* 6 (2021), 136-221, 215.

(at least in Savile's mind), is hinted at by his suggestion that his Chrysostom might incur a similar fate because it gives 'a good king good wordes'. That, too, contains a prefatory epistle to a Protestant monarch. If merely mentioning a Protestant monarch is enough to receive 'the censure', then, Savile implies, his Chrysostom may well receive the same treatment as *Scriptores*.

Savile himself may not have been happy with the workmanship of the Frankfurt edition of his book, commenting in a letter to the diplomat Ralph Winwood (*c.*1563-1617), written not long after *Scriptores*' Frankfurt publication, that he would not countenance publication of Chrysostom in Frankfurt, 'theyr paper being ill' and their press correctors 'perchance unlearned'.[175] Given he was far away from the Frankfurt publishers, Savile is unlikely to have prepared the volume's index, which very occasionally seems less guarded than one might have expected, one entry describing Thomas Becket as 'Archbishop and martyr'.[176] Even so, despite carefully avoiding the confessional markers found in Parker's editions, when the work circulated outside England, even Savile's dedication to a Protestant queen was interpreted as a gesture of confessional affiliation. Luckily for Savile, however, that did not cause scepticism of the whole book. Ultimately, *Scriptores*' blankness ensured its relatively untroubled international reception. Even with the loss of its dedication, Savile's book *was* able still to be read, and able to circulate almost free of the marks of censorship that may not have made a book illegible, but that surely would have signalled to early readers that it was a book designed to bolster a particular argument or perspective, rather than purely an edition of a set of texts. Camden's 1603 Frankfurt edition of medieval historians offers an important point of contrast. This book was added to the list of prohibited books by the Spanish censors (along with Camden's *Britannia*), and the passages they marked for removal

[175] Quoted in Quantin, 'European Geography of Patristic Scholarship', 319.
[176] Savile, ed., *Scriptores* (Frankfurt, 1601), h3r (page signatures for this latter section of the book begin at Savile's chronological table, 'Fasti Regum et Episcoporum Angliæ'): 'S. Thomas Cantuar. Archiepiscopus & martyr'.

point up the differences between Camden's volume and Savile's.[177] For instance, in Camden's edition of Thomas of Walsingham (*c.*1340-*c.*1422), the censor demanded the removal of a piece of printed marginalia that says 'no heresy or falsity is able to be proved in all the doctrine of master John Wyclif'. This was to be replaced with something quite different: 'this doctrine and the conclusions of Wyclif abound with many errors'.[178] The framing of Gerald of Wales (1146-1223) by the Welsh clergyman and antiquary, David Powell (1549x52-1598), all had to be removed, including his condemnation of the 'absurda miracula' found in Giraldus, which echoes the kind of language used by John Bale.[179] Elsewhere, in *Britannia*, any honorifics for Matthew Parker specifically had to be removed.[180] Camden's book is surrounded by many of the confessional cues that are absent from Savile's. Perhaps Savile's own lack of deep investment in the traditions of post-Reformation British antiquarianism, which Camden's volume celebrates and memorialises, enabled him to produce a volume that could move with relative freedom across the confessional divisions of early modern Europe. The edition's blankness was its passport internationally, bringing the 'writers who cast off obscurity from former ages' to audiences across Europe for more than two centuries.

Appendix

Henry Savile's First Dedication to Queen Elizabeth, printed in *Scriptores A*: King's Lynn Public Library, DL-A4-8:

[177] *Index librorum prohibitorum et expurgandorum novissimus: pro Catholicis Hispaniarum regnis Philippi IV, regis cathol.* (Madrid, 1667), 449-450. On the censorship of Camden see T. A. Birrell, 'William Camden (1552-1623) and his European Reading Public', *English Studies* 92 (2011), 400-404, 403.
[178] *Index librorum*, 449: 'ante finem, dele notam, quae incipit, *Nulla haeresis*, &c. & adde, *haec Wiclephi doctrina, & conclusiones multis scatent erroribus*'. See Camden, *Anglica*, 283, 'Nulla haeresis vel falsitas in tota doctrina magistri Ioh. Wiclif poterit probari'.
[179] *Index librorum*, 449, 'Pagin. 818. post initium, dele totam admonitionem ad Lectorem, quae incipit, *Hoc te unum*, &c.'.
[180] *Index librorum*, 446.

Serenissimæ Potentissimæque Principi Elizabethæ, Angliæ, Franciæ, & Hiberniæ Reginæ, &c.

Si quantum maiores tui (Serenissima Regina) belli pacisq*ue* artibus floruerunt, tanta eruditissimorum hominum copia ad easdem literis prodendas abundassent, non minus nobis hodierno die ex annalium monumentis, quam olim æqualibus suis ex recenti clarissimorum facinorum memoriâ innotuissent. Cæterùm, quia nondum ea fuit huiusce insulæ fœlicitas, vt maximorum principum virtutes magnorum ingeniorum quasi lumine illustrarentur, graui sanè vtrorumque incommodo accidit, vt & illi iustis rerum à se gestarum præconijs orbentur, & nos tanto post interuallo egregijs, ijsque domesticis bene agendi exemplis careamus. Hinc illa tam indigna potentissimorum non vnius sæculi regum ignoratio; quæ profecto tanta est, vt quorum opera vetustate iam collapsa suspicimus tamen atque admiramur, eorum ne nuda quidem certe nomina præ scriptorum pœnuriâ teneantur. Primus enim, si à fabulis abeamus, (quæ dum falsa & incredibilia nostris hominibus permulta affinxerunt, prudentium iudicio etiam vera detraxerunt) Julius Cæsar Britanniam nostram antiquioribus illis nomine tenus duntaxat cognitam, in commentarijs suis, tanquam in tabellâ, spectandam proposuit: primus cœli solique naturam, incolarum mores & motus, reip. formam, leges, religionem ipsam si minus accurate descripsit, at certe leuiter adumbrauit. Quem deinceps Claudius, Domitianus, Seuerus, Constantius, alij complures consequuti, quo longius in Britanniam imperij sui terminos propagarunt, eo plus lucis & notitiæ rebus nostris attulerunt. Nec ita multo post, inclinatâ iam ac planè fractâ Romanæ potentiæ magnitudine, cum Britanni vndique à Pictis Scotisque premerentur, Angli partim illorum nuncijs acciti, partim rerum oportunitate allecti patriæ nostræ imperium verbo ac specie Britannis, re autem sibimet ipsis asseruerunt. Qui vt virtutis & sapientiæ gloriâ veteribus Britanniæ incolis non inferiores, sic vna ex parte longè fœliciores extiterunt, quod homines (vt illa secula ferebant) nacti eruditos, seris (vt Poeta

loquitur) nepotibus suorum temporum memoriam transmiserunt. Quorum ego sanè principem tum narrationis fide, tum iudicij maturitate Gulielmum Malmesburiensem dicere non dubitarim, hominem literatè doctum, qui septingentorum plus minus annorum res tanta fide & diligentia pertexuit, vt è nostris prope solus historici munus explesse videatur. Quem cum magnopere à plurimis Antiquitatum nostrarum sitientibus desiderari intelligerem, partim publicæ vtilitatis studio, partim clarissimorum virorum hortatu, è tenebris eruendum, tuoq*ue* Augustissimo nomini inscribendu*m* curaui: vt qui olim sæculoru*m* aliquot obscuritatem ingenii sui lumine discussit, nunc vicissim rediuiuus à serenissima Maiestate tua lucem & splendorem mutuetur. Illud fortasse audacius, quod tantillum tantæ principi munusculum offerre non erubescam. Sed me recreat tua mihi toties spectata ma*n*suetudo, nec vereri patitur, quin illi Regiæ benignitatis tuæ radii, qui nostris antea qua*n*tuliscunq*ue* laboribus perpetuò affulserunt, nequaqua*m* his maiorum tuoru*m* monume*n*tis sint defuturi. Et verò, si recte ratiocinamur, cui potius Britannoru*m*, Saxonum, Normannorum res gestas offerre debui, quàm Maiestati tuæ, quæ non modo quas singuli singulas ditiones obtinuerunt, has vna vniuersas hæreditario iure adiisti, verum etiam omnes istorum omnium virtutes animo planè heroico es complexa? quæ sola tot annos in co*m*munibus Europæ totius tempestatibus suauissimæ patriæ tuæ beatissimam tranquillitatem quasi virgulâ diuinâ præstitisti: quæ deniq*ue* sola quid in summa potestate summa bonitas possit, tuo nos exemplo docuisti. Verùm enimuerò non committam vt tuis apud te laudibus recensendis tibi quoq*ue* ipsi videar ineptus: maioris sunt illæ operis, maioris otii; quo si mihi perfrui licebit, enitar mehercle sedulo, vt quæ hactenus nobis omnibus dulce decus & præsidium fuisti, eadem posteris etiam nostris summæ in omni virtutu*m* genere præstantiæ specimen existas. Interim verò singularia illa ac pæne diuina Maiest. tuæ ornamenta, tanquam sacra, religioso potius colens silentio quàm exili & ieiuna oratione persequens, hunc ad te scriptorem, verissimum superiorum temporum indicem, meique addictissimi erga te obsequii testem mitto: quo si forte, quoties a

grauioribus regni tui curis respirare voles, honoratissimum otium tuum oblectabis, dabo operam vt propediem cæterorum quoque historicorum reliquiæ veluti cumulus accedant. Deus opt. max. Maiestatem tuam nobis reique pub. Christianæ quam diutissimè incolumem conseruet.

Serenissimæ Maiestati tuæ deuotissimus

Henricus Sauile.

Henry Savile's Second Dedication to Queen Elizabeth, printed in *Scriptores B*: King's Lynn Public Library, DL-A4-14:

Serenissimæ Potentissimæque Principi Elizabethæ, Angliæ, Franciæ, & Hiberniæ Reginæ, &c.

Qvæ me causæ (Serenissima Regina) non ita pridem adduxerunt, vt Malmesburiensem nostratium historicorum principem e tenebris eruerem, tibiq*ue* omnium omnis memoriæ fœminarum Principi dicarem; altera, publicæ vtilitatis studium; altera, singularis meæ in te obseruantiæ testificandæ desideriu*m*; eædem profecto, vt in hoc tempore Huntindoniensem illi quasi comitem adiungerem, non difficulter obtinuerunt. Nam si, quod olim sapientissimis hominibus visum est, moderatrix illa rerum humanarum prouidentia nos in hoc terrarum orbe tanquam in vnâ quapiam vrbe eâ lege collocauit, vt si minus singuli cæteris præsumus, at prosimus tamen, nec minorem nobis otij quam negotij rationem reddendam putemus; quantopere peccarem, si hoc temporis, quod mihi plurimum regiâ benignitate tuâ suppetit, vel inertiæ penitus transmitterem, vel ijs saltem studijs impertirer, ex quibus tametsi mihi aliqua priuatim oblectatio quæratur, at in remp. vtilitas quidem certe nulla redundaret? Itaque cum

vniuersim literas, quoad possum, persequor; tum ex literis eam præcipue partem, quæ hactenus a nostris plærisque partim neglecta, partim ignorata, ab exteris sic tractata est, vt quæ a veteribus non eloquentissimis fortasse, fidelibus tamen & religiosis rerum gestarum narratoribus accepissent, disertius multo quam verius nobis tradiderint. Etenim ne illas ex vltima antiquitate Brutorum, Androgiorum, Arturorum familias ex Monumetensis, vt nonnulli suspicantur, ingenio natas, a Polydoro, ac cæteris deinceps illustratas repetere necesse habeam, quot & quanta vbique sese offerunt, quibus recentiores isti, dum cornicum oculos, quod dicitur, configere, rudemque vetustatem dicendi artificio antecellere conantur, no*n* tam orationis lucem addidisse, quam historiæ fidem detraxisse merito videantur? Nimirum ceu flumina quanto maiore a suis fontibus interuallo feruntur, tanto plus cœni & sordium vnà secum ferunt; sic historiæ, quo longius a rerum quæ narrantur temporibus quasi a capite absunt, eo certe pluribus fabularum, vt ita dicam, sordibus inquinantur. Quocirca, vt aliquam huic malo medecinam facerem, fontes ipsos superiorum temporum incuriâ obstructos aperire studui, quibus facile quid neoterici vel ex vetustissimis annalium monumentis hauserint, vel de suo, vt argutius dicere viderentur, adfinxerint, intelligamus. Iam vero no*n* id agam, vt longiore oratione, cur in tuo potissimum nomine hoc quantulumcunque operis apparere voluerim, ostendam; neque rem per se exilem verborum amplitudine ornabo. Nam si, quod a Philosophis accepimus, dissimilis sit munerum & debitorum conditio, quòd in muneribus magna eorum quibus offeruntur habenda ratio, debita vero vel minima maximis quibusq*ue* sunt persoluenda; quid me hac in caussâ facere æquum fuit, quem diuinis Maiestatis tuæ virtutibus iampridem in tui amorem, obsequiu*m*, admirationem raptum, ita porro summis tuis beneficijs deuinxisti, vt me meaque omnia non vsu solum & fructu sed mancipio etiam ac nexu tua esse libentissime agnoscam? Quamobrem hanc alteram quasi votiuam tabulam, mediocrem illam fateor, sed tamen nostræ non mediocris erga Maiestatem tuam obseruantiæ indicem supplicissimè offerendam censui; quam si regiâ tua & benignitate complecti, &

autoritate tueri voles, mihi certe animum ad maiora illa maturanda, quæ iam diu in tui gratiam parturio, incredibiliter excitabis. Vale principum decus.

Serenissimæ Maiestati tuæ deuotissimus

Henricus Sauile.