

The English Bibliographical Tradition from Kirkestede to Tanner*

Richard Sharpe

Magni interest scire qui, quando, quibus de rebus, ubi scripserint, quorumque ope et typis libros ediderint.¹

The tradition of *virii illustres* is an old one. It was the title used by Suetonius for his catalogue of Roman writers,² and it was from Suetonius that Jerome took the title for his catalogue of Christian writers, drawn up around AD 392. Jerome's approach set the standard for most later books: he summarized what he could from a convenient source, Eusebius's *Historia ecclesiastica*, composed in the 320s, and added what he knew at first

* I am grateful to those who have read drafts of this paper and allowed me to benefit from their advice: Prof. James Carley, Prof. Anne Hudson, Dr Martin Kauffmann, Prof. Paul Nelles, Prof. Mark Vessey, and Mr James Willoughby.

The following abbreviations will be used: CPL = E. Dekkers, *Clavis Patrum Latinorum*, 3rd edn, Turnhout, 1995; Davies = W. T. Davies, *A Bibliography of John Bale*, Oxford Bibliographical Society Proceedings and Papers, 5, 1936–9, pp. 201–79; Goff = F. R. Goff, *Incunabula in American Libraries: A Third Census of Fifteenth-Century Books Recorded in North American Collections*, New York, 1964, corrected repr. 1973; PL = Patrologia Latina, ed. J.-P. Migne, 221 vols, Paris, 1844–55, 1864; SC = F. Madan et al, *A Summary Catalogue of Western Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library at Oxford Which Have Not Hitherto Been Catalogued in the Quarto Series*, 7 vols, Oxford, 1895–1953; Shaaber = M. A. Shaaber, *Check-List of Works of British Authors Printed Abroad, in Languages Other than English, to 1641*, New York, 1975; STC = A. W. Pollard and G. R. Redgrave, *Short-Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland, and Ireland, and of English Books Printed Abroad, 1475–1640*, 2nd edn, rev. by W. A. Jackson et al, 3 vols, London, 1976–91.

1. 'It is of great interest to know who wrote books, at what date, upon what subjects, and at whose cost and by whose types they published them.' Quoted as a motto by Thomas Tanner on the opening leaf of his draft collection of material on authors not known to Leland, now MS Bodleian Library, Tanner 470; the source (precisely cited by Tanner) is Jean Garnier [1612–1681], *Systema bibliothecae collegii Parisiensis Societatis Iesu*, Paris, 1678, p. 82, from a section headed 'Dispositio librorum quibus Historia Literaria continetur'. He defined books of literary history as 'Catalogi Autorum (Bibliothecas vulgo vocant) quorum alii sunt universales, alii particulares', and the second category he subdivided into six classes, authors grouped by their academic faculty, nationality, membership of a religious order or a particular university, and the more fortuitous groupings in library catalogues or sale catalogues.

2. Only parts of Suetonius's *De viris illustribus* survive. The extant Lives from the section *De grammaticis et rhetoribus*, discovered in 1425 in a manuscript that also preserved Tacitus's *Agricola*, *Germania*, and *Dialogus*, were printed three times in the 1470s (Goff S812–14); most recent edition by R. A. Kaster, Oxford, 1995. The section *De poetis* has been thought to have contributed to the Lives of some poets transmitted with copies of their works. A still earlier example is mentioned by Suetonius's patron Pliny, who writes of another protégé Titinius Capito: 'scribit exitus inlustrium virorum, in his quorundam mihi carissimorum' ('he writes of the deaths of distinguished men, among them some very dear to me' (presumably Domitian's victims: Pliny, *Ep.* VIII.12); compare also Tacitus, *Ann.* XIV.19. The phrase *vir inlustris* was familiar long before it became a conventional honorific in the 4th century.

THE ENGLISH BIBLIOGRAPHICAL TRADITION

hand.³ The mention of a work in Jerome's *De viris illustribus* is no guarantee that he had seen a copy or even that copies could still be found. Jerome's work was widely circulated, and about a hundred years after it was written a continuation was added by Gennadius, priest of Marseille.⁴ He seems largely to have worked from experience in his Gallo-Roman environment, so that his interests are more predominantly western than Jerome's. A further continuation was drafted by Isidore of Seville in the early seventh century, much shorter than its precursors and reflecting the more restricted resources available to a scholar in Visigothic Spain.⁵ In the Carolingian period these three works were supplemented by the addition of the first book of Cassiodorus's *Institutiones*, his programme of Christian reading. The result was an influential handbook of Christian bibliography widely known in the west.⁶

There were twelfth- and thirteenth-century continuations of this tradition, though none enjoyed the popularity of the original works nor of the Carolingian handbook.⁷ Early in the thirteenth century the Dominican encyclopaedist Vincent of Beauvais included bibliographical entries on selected authors throughout the thirty-two books of his *Speculum historiale*.⁸ The wide distribution of this work would arguably make it the most readily available point of reference after Jerome's own work. In a concise format, the Dominicans also began to keep a catalogue of new works by the learned members of their own order. The earliest *Tabula ordinis fratrum Praedicatorum* is reckoned to date from about 1310, but copies were distributed in various provinces of the order and augmented to reflect later and local knowledge. We can only glimpse the original through several of the local versions.⁹

National chauvinism played no part in this medieval tradition, and the restricted scope of some contributions to the tradition reflects not partiality so much as the limited circulation of books by most writers later than the Fathers. It was incidental, therefore, rather than deliberate, that Sigebert of Gembloux in the twelfth century was

3. Jerome, *De viris illustribus* (CPL 616), ed. E. C. Richardson, *Texte und Untersuchungen*, 14, Leipzig, 1896, pp. 1–56; ed. A. Ceresa Gastaldo, *Gerolamo: Gli uomini illustri*, Florence, 1988 (text and translation, pp. 55–234); annotated English translation by T. P. Halton, *Saint Jerome: On Illustrious Men*, Fathers of the Church, 100, Washington, 1999.

4. Gennadius, *De viris illustribus* (CPL 957), ed. E. C. Richardson, *Texte und Untersuchungen*, 14, Leipzig, 1896, pp. 57–97.

5. Isidore of Seville, *De viris illustribus* (CPL 1206), ed. F. Arévalo, *S. Isidori Hispalensis opera omnia*, 7 vols, Rome, 1797–1803, VII, pp. 138–64, repr. in PL 83, cols 1081–1106; ed. C. Codoñer Merino, Salamanca, 1964.

6. R. A. B. Mynors, *Cassiodori Senatoris Institutiones*, Oxford, 1937, pp. xv–xvi, xxxix–xlix.

7. R. H. Rouse and M. A. Rouse, 'Bibliography before Print: The Medieval *De viris illustribus*', in eid., *Authentic Witnesses: Approaches to Medieval Texts and Manuscripts*, Notre Dame, Ind., 1991, pp. 469–94.

8. Manuscripts and editions are listed by T. Kaeppeli, *Scriptores ordinis Praedicatorum medii aevi*, 4 vols, Rome, 1970–94, IV, pp. 440–46. The standard edition is that printed at Douai, 1624; in sourcing Henry de Kirkestede's extensive use of Vincent, the Rouses prefer to cite that printed by J. Mentelin, Strassburg, 1473, as nearest to the form of the text used by Henry.

9. The Stams catalogue of the mid-14th century is the copy that comes closest to the original *tabula*; ed. G. G. Meersseman, *Laurentii Pignon Catalogi et chronica*, Monumenta ordinis fratrum Praedicatorum historica, 18, Rome, 1936, pp. 56–67.

RICHARD SHARPE

much better acquainted with authors from France than from Italy or England.¹⁰ The first deliberately national work of this kind was drawn up by Iohannes Trithemius OSB (1462–1516), abbot of Sponheim, a catalogue of the *virii illustres* who adorned Germany by their intellectual efforts. This was a short sequel to a much larger work which developed and brought up to date the international tradition of ecclesiastical bibliography.¹¹ Trithemius's work was the first of its kind to reflect the much wider accessibility of texts that print was bringing about.

From the early sixteenth century, however, English bibliographers did take a deliberately national view.¹² The Carmelite John Bale was the first to put it into words, though he could have found the idea in his sources. Laurentius Burellus (d. 1505), Carmelite of Dijon, composed *De illustribus patribus ordinis Carmelitarum catalogus*, in which there is a strong notion that men of learning bring honour to their country.¹³ So, for example, on the Englishman Osbert Pickenham:

Anglia quam genuit sequitur sanctissima proles
Carmeli proprio iure vocata suo.
Hic est Osbertus Anglus cognomine dictus,
Quin etiam potius Angelus ipse fuit.
Tanta animi virtus, tanta experientia rerum
Ut patrie patribus addat honoris opem.¹⁴

10. Sigebert of Gembloux [d. 1112], *Liber de scriptoribus ecclesiasticis*, ed. J. A. Fabricius, *Bibliotheca ecclesiastica*, Hamburg, 1718, repr. with notes from the edition of A. Le Mire, *Bibliotheca ecclesiastica sive nomenclatores VII veteres*, 2 vols, Antwerp, 1639–49, in PL 160, cols 547–88; ed. R. Witte, Frankfurt a.M., 1974. There is also a later 12th-century continuation, ed. N. M. Häring, 'Two Catalogues of Medieval Authors', *Franciscan Studies*, 26, 1966, pp. 193–211.

11. The general work is Iohannes Trithemius, *Liber de scriptoribus ecclesiasticis*, Basel, 1494 (Goff T452: some 180 surviving copies, a high number for an incunable); ed. Marquard Freher [1565–1614], *Johannis Trithemii opera historica, quotquot hactenus reperiri potuerunt, omnia; partim e vetustis fugientibusque editionibus revocata, et ad fidem archetyporum castigata, partim ex manuscriptis nunc primum edita*, 2 vols, Cologne, 1601, repr. Frankfurt a.M., 1966, I, pp. 184–400; its national sequel is his *Catalogus illustrium virorum Germaniam suis ingenii et lucubrationibus omnifariam exornantium*, Mainz, [after 1495] (Goff T433: rare outside Germany); ed. M. Freher, I, pp. 121–83. For detailed discussion see K. Arnold, *Johannes Trithemius (1462–1516)*, 2nd edn, Quellen und Forschungen zur Geschichte des Bistums und Hochstifts Würzburg, 23, 1991, and id. 'De viris illustribus: Aus den Anfängen der humanistischen Literaturgeschichtsschreibung. Johannes Trithemius und andere Schriftstellerkataloge des 15. Jahrhunderts', *Humanistica Lovaniensia*, 42, 1993, pp. 52–70.

12. A concise survey of bibliographical works, rich on antiquity and the patristic period but sketchy on the Middle Ages and 16th century, is R. Blum, 'Die Literaturverzeichnung im Altertum und Mittelalter: Versuch einer Geschichte der Bibliographie von den Anfängen bis zum Beginn der Neuzeit', *Archiv für Geschichte des Buchwesens*, 24, 1983, cols 1–256. After noting Trithemius's priority in national bibliography, Blum observed, 'Daß gerade Engländer es waren, die als erste nach Trithemius einen allgemeinen Schriftstellerkatalog anfertigten, der nur die Autores einer Nation berücksichtigte, mag auf die Isolierung des Inselvolkes zurückführen sein.' It is surely not so simple.

13. On Laurentius Burellus, Laurent Bureau in French, the standard point of reference is C. de Saint-Étienne de Villiers, *Bibliotheca Carmelitana*, 2 vols, Orleans, 1752, II, pp. 217–22, who says that he died in 1504. Bale gives the date of his death as 8 June 1505 in his own *De praeclaris ordinis Carmeli scriptoribus*, fol. 72^{r-v}, MS BL Harley 3838, fol. 227^{r-v}. The work of Burellus, which Villiers refers to as 'De viris illustribus ordinis sui', was then regarded as lost; he cited Trithemius's mention of it and Bale's use of it, but he did not know that copies were preserved. Villiers cites evidence that Burellus visited England in 1495.

14. The work is preserved in Bale's notebooks, MS BL Harley 1819 (collections in France, c.1525), fols

THE ENGLISH BIBLIOGRAPHICAL TRADITION

Here follows the most holy issue which England bore, by their own right called of Carmel. Here is Osbert, known as *Anglus* 'the Englishman', though he was rather an Angel. So great was his quality of mind, so great his experience of things, that he adds a meed of honour to his homeland's fathers.

Bale takes up this theme in the preface to his own English Carmelite bibliography, *Anglorum Heliades* (1536), addressed to his friend John Leland, another bibliographer, who was gathering material for a new history of England:

Peculiariter certe nostram Angliam tibi demereri, quam talibus illustras ornamentis que sola verum et immortale decus afferre possunt. Utinam omnibus eque cordi esset hoc certamen tam frugiferum atque tibi plurimum vere glorie tum tibi tum universe nostre nationi pariet historia illa quam pre manibus habes, quam spero ad omnium utilitatem in brevi e tuis officinis in publicum prodituram.¹⁵

You more than anyone deserve the thanks of our England, which you make famous for such adornments as alone can bring a true and lasting glory. Would that this effort which is so fruitful were equally pleasing to everyone! Then that History, on which you are working, will produce true praise for you and for our whole nation. I hope that it will be put forth soon from your study into public view for the use of all.

Leland's national approach made him want to know more about the 'sanctiores viros et peculiare scriptores' ('holier men and particular writers') of every religious order, 'ut nihil te pretereat quod ad patrie decorem efficiat' ('so that nothing should escape you that may work to the glory of the homeland'). Bale associates himself explicitly as a contributor to Leland's national undertaking, suggesting that Leland has asked him to investigate his own, by now former, order:

et quia nullus poterit etiam si Lynceos habuerit oculos omnia prospicere, mihi provinciam iniungis ut Carmelitarum in Angliam ingressum, progressum, et tandem illustrium virorum Cathalogum tibi depingam.

And since no one, though he have the eyes of Lynceus, can investigate everything for himself, you enjoin a province on me, namely that I should depict for you the coming of the Carmelites into England, their history, and a catalogue of their famous men.

And in the general preface, still addressed to John Leland:

Nihil credimus reperiri posse apud ceteras nationes, quod habunde non sit apud Anglos. Non est quo alieni inaniter gloriantur, quod et Angliam non reddiderit splendidam atque ad astra usque non extulerit.

We believe that it is not possible to find anything among other nations that does not exist in abundance among the English. There is nothing of which foreigners may vainly boast that has not also made England famous and raised her to the stars.

13^r–16^v, continued at 65^r–70^v; a secondary copy in MS Bodleian Library, Selden Supra 41 (SC 3429), fols 376^r–385^v. Such passages on English Carmelites are frequently quoted in his *Anglorum Heliades*, MS BL Harley 3838, fols 1^v–100^v. So, this passage can be found in MS Harley 1819, fol. 65^v, and in *Anglorum Heliades*, fol. 49^r; the Gregorian pun on *Anglus* and *Angelus* was a cliché to English readers, perhaps less so in France. It is perhaps noteworthy that Bale and Villiers record a work of Burellus entitled *Heliades*.

15. *Anglorum Heliades*, MS BL Harley 3838, quotations from fols 1^r, 1^v, and 3^r.

RICHARD SHARPE

It is no accident that this strong national sentiment emerges during Henry VIII's time, and that it finds expression in the 1530s, the decade when the Act in Restraint of Appeals (1533) invoked 'sundry old authentic histories and chronicles', in which 'it is manifestly declared and expressed that this realm of England is an empire'. The theme of national pride dominates the prologue to Bale's *Summarium* (1548), where he lists his international precursors, Jerome, Prosper, Gennadius, Isidore of Seville, Frechulf of Lisieux, Honorius Augustodunensis, Sigebert of Gembloux, and from nearer his own time Jean Trisse of Nîmes, Iohannes Trithemius of Sponheim, Arnold Bostius of Gent, Jacopo Filippo Foresti of Bergamo, referred to simply as Bergomas, and (as recently as 1545) Konrad Gesner of Zurich; when it comes to learned writers:

Neque est in Europa regio (si omnia plene exhiberem) quae particulares et proprios hac in re non habuerit consarcinatores, sola hucusque infoeliciter dormitavit Britannia, eorum licet uberrima tellus.¹⁶

Nor is there in Europe any area (if I were to set out the facts in full) which has not had its own specialized compilers in this matter; only Britain has unfortunately slept till now, though its land is very fertile in writers.

He refers to the unfinished work of a Carthusian of Lincoln and to that of Leland, before launching his own enterprise. Since only Trithemius wrote a national bibliography, Bale is making a rhetorical point. Elsewhere, in 1553, in his prologue to Leland's *Viri illustres*, Bale took an opposite line, no less rhetorical in its substance, and provided an extended catalogue of those English writers whom he could regard as bibliographers or at least as sources for bibliography: Bede, Honorius Augustodunensis, William of Malmesbury, Henry of Huntingdon, William of Gillingham, the compilers of *Registrum Angliae*, 'Boston of Bury' (the name under which he knew Henry de Kirkestede), John Wheathampstead, John Rous, and 'in suis collectaneis' William Thorne, Robert Ivory, John Capgrave, William Worcestre, and Thomas Gascoigne.¹⁷ The point now is not the dearth of interest but its climax:

Sed hos omnes in hoc scribendi genere longissime superat Joannes Lelandus, tam styli venustate, quam virorum eruditorum numero quos tam in isto quam in maiore suo opere depingit.

But John Leland tops them all in this branch of literature, both as regards the attractiveness of his style and in the number of learned men whom he depicts in this draft and in his larger work.

Leland wrote his *Viri illustres*, as he himself says, 'ne Britanniae nostrae fama tot erudi-

16. John Bale, *Illustrium Maioris Britanniae scriptorum, hoc est, Angliae, Cambriae, ac Scotiae summarium*, Ipswich [recte Wesel], 1548 [cited as Bale, *Summarium*], fol. 1^{r-v}.

17. MS Cambridge, Trinity College R. 7. 15 (on which see n. 73 below), fol. 2^{r-v}; the draft survives, the revised *opus maius* to which Bale refers may never have been written (below, pp. 101–2, 110–11 and n. 98). Few of these can be regarded as bibliographers. Honorius of Regensburg's *De luminaribus ecclesie* belongs to the international tradition (though the writer was not English). Bale's knowledge of *Registrum Anglie*, a source he used sparingly, is discussed by R. H. Rouse and M. A. Rouse, *Registrum Anglie de libris doctorum et auctorum veterum*, Corpus of British Medieval Library Catalogues, 2, London, 1991, pp. xlvi–l.

THE ENGLISH BIBLIOGRAPHICAL TRADITION

torum et elegantium Scriptorum deperiret' ('so that the reputation of so many learned and elegant writers of our Britain should not perish'), but he did not live to present his work to the public with a rhetorical preface.¹⁸ There was no place for national sentiments in the prologue to Bale's later *Catalogus* (Basel, 1557), published in exile.¹⁹ Half a century later, patriotism marks the opening sentence of another English bibliographer's work:

Quantas vires habeat amor ille naturalis, qui unicuique erga patriam, parentes, et amicos insitus est, nemo non experitur.²⁰

No one does not experience how powerful is that natural love inborn in everyone towards native land, family, and friends.

This writer, John Pits, was as staunchly Catholic as John Bale was fervently Evangelical, yet on that they agreed.

In an age when a new nationalism swept through most of Europe, it was in England alone that it gave birth to a strong and lasting tradition of literary history embodied in the cataloguing of the nation's writers, though the bibliographers defined their compass in terms of the islands of Great Britain and Ireland rather than only England. The focus on learned writers, not belles-lettres, meant that Latin was always dominant.²¹ Leland included a few who wrote in English, but Bale rendered titles and incipits of any vernacular works into Latin: the title of Geoffrey Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales* was already translated by Leland, *Fabulae Cantianae*, and Bale Latinized the beginning of the general prologue, 'Dum imbribus suavibus Aprilis'.²²

In focusing on this tradition in England, I shall deal mainly with four writers. Three

18. For the quotation see below, p. 100.

19. When Bale added a preface addressed to Queen Elizabeth in a reissue of 1557–9, he still did not claim glory for Britain from its writers, but he called for the conservation and publication of useful works: 'Quique in regno tuo librorum armamentorum praefecti sunt, id summo curare debent opere, ut non in tenebris lateant, et iaceant situ obducti et pulvere: sed ut in lucem publicumque proferantur, qui ullo modo vel rempublicam bonis legibus instituere et conformare, vel religionis evangelicae negotium promovere poterunt' ('All those who have responsibility for librarians' cupboards in your realm ought to take care with the utmost diligence that those [writers] do not hide in darkness or lie covered with filth and dust but shall be brought into light and public knowledge, who in any way will be capable of shaping and guiding the state with good laws or of forwarding the cause of the evangelical faith') (John Bale, *Scriptorum illustrium Maioris Britanniae catalogus*, 2 vols, Basel, 1557–9 [cited as Bale, *Catalogus*]).

20. J. Pits, *Relationes historicae de rebus Anglicis*, Paris, 1619, *Prooemium universale*, p. 1.

21. This largely accounts for Wellek's dismissal of 'dry catalogues', which did not fall within his anachronistic notion of literary history; he was looking for precursors of Thomas Warton and Samuel Johnson (R. Wellek, *The Rise of English Literary History*, Chapel Hill, NC, 1941, pp. 4–5). He preferred George Lily's humanist Lives, evoking the circle of Bishop John Fisher, *Virorum aliquot in Britannia, qui nostro seculo eruditione et doctrina clari memorabilesque fuerunt, elogia*, printed with Paolo Giovio's *Descriptio Britanniae, Scotiae, Hyberniae*, Venice, 1548.

22. John Leland, *Commentarii de scriptoribus Britannicis*, ed. A. Hall, Oxford, 1709 [cited as Leland, *Scriptores*], pp. 419–26; Bale, *Catalogus*, I, pp. 525–7; it is perhaps surprising that the *Canterbury Tales* is not among the thirty or more works of Chaucer listed by Bale in *Summarium*, fol. 198^{r-v}. Trithemius had included some writers better known for their vernacular than their Latin works, such as Dante and Petrarch, whose names are invoked by Leland and Bale alongside Chaucer's. John Gower and John Lydgate were also approved English writers. William Langland's poem *Piers Plowman* is referred to by Leland, p. 423, under Chaucer; it was Bale, *Catalogus*, I, p. 474, who first listed this poem under 'Robert Langland', following the edition printed by R. Crowley, London, 1550 (STC 19903).

RICHARD SHARPE

of these devoted their efforts to the bibliography of British writers, John Leland (? 1503–52), his contemporary John Bale (1495–1563), and Thomas Tanner (1674–1735). Their medieval antecedent in England, whom I shall also consider, was Fr Henry de Kirkestede OSB (c.1314–p.1378), a monk of Bury St Edmunds, who was concerned with the generality of Christian Latin authors.

Too little is known of their English antecedents to take the story earlier. The work of Walter, precentor of St Albans in the late twelfth century, is now lost, but it was known to Bale. His few references suggest that Walter's compilation, 'a Library under the title of *Indiculus*', was a work of bibliography rather than merely a catalogue of the library at St Albans abbey.²³ The *Tabula de viris illustribus* by William of Gillingham (d. 1411), a monk of Christ Church, Canterbury, was cited by both Leland and Bale, but they derived little from it.²⁴

The accomplishments of our four bibliographers reflect sufficient interaction to allow us honestly to regard them as forming a distinct English tradition in the etymological sense of the word. Henry de Kirkestede's work was not known to Leland, but it was much used by John Bale, and it was preserved for us by Thomas Tanner. Bale also made heavy use of Leland, and Leland had access to some of Bale's early work; we know that the two assisted one another. Tanner set out to publish Leland's catalogue of British writers with Henry's catalogue as an appendix, and he made much use of Bale's published work and of his unpublished collections, among them in particular Bale's reworked copy of Leland's catalogue. In this way bibliographical information was handed down, and it has continued to be treated as a tradition, too often without inquiry into the sources, which in many cases still exist and can speak for themselves. In

23. Bale's description, made from a copy in Leland's possession, is not at all clear; 'Gualtherus, cantor S. Albani, scripsit ex omnibus librorum monumentis eiusdem cenobii, Bibliothecam quandam sub titulo Indiculi \vel de libris ecclesie/ li. i. *Prima pars Bibliothecae a beato Hieronymo*. Ex bibliotheca Ioannis Lelandi' ('Walter, precentor of St Albans, wrote on the basis of all the literary monuments of his abbey a Library under the title of *Indiculus* \or concerning the books of the Church/, in one book, [beginning] The first part of the Bible by St Jerome': *Index Britanniae scriptorum*, eds R. L. Poole and M. Bateson, Oxford, 1902, p. 100). The interlined words, 'concerning the books of the Church', suggest a bibliography of Christian authors based on the books available at St Albans; this is more explicit in Bale's *Catalogus*, II, p. 40, 'ex omnibus veterum ac novorum auctorum eiusdem coenobii monumentis insignem bibliothecam congegit, cui operi addidit titulum, *De libris ecclesie*' ('from all the remains of ancient and modern authors in the library of the abbey he assembled a notable Library, to which work he gave the title *On the Books of the Church*'). The word *bibliotheca* would not normally be used of a library catalogue, but its use in the sense of 'bibliography' began with Gesner in 1545, whose work was well known to Bale. Walter's *Indiculus* evidently began with a multi-volume copy of Jerome's Latin Bible, and (like Possidius's *Indiculus* to the writings of St Augustine) it included incipits. Bale cites it for Walter himself, and the following authors, Aelred, Alcuin, Bachiarus (mistakenly taken for British), Bede, Berengar of Tours, William of St Albans, William of Jumièges, William of the White Hands, Lanfranc, Marianus Scotus, Pelagius, Ralph Gubium, 'Abbot Robert', as well as for some anonymous texts; his extracts are brought together in R. Sharpe et al, *English Benedictine Libraries*, Corpus of British Medieval Library Catalogues, 4, London, 1996, pp. 544–51. If Walter's catalogue did not contain many rare British writers, Leland and Bale may not have had much reason to cite it.

24. William of Gillingham's Benedictine *Tabula de viris illustribus* was cited by Leland for a work attributed to William of Ramsey, MS Bodleian Library, Top. gen. c. 3, pp. 20–21, and Leland, *Scriptores*, pp. 213, 216; P. D. Clarke, *The University and College Libraries of Cambridge*, Corpus of British Medieval Library Catalogues, 10, London, 2002, p. 554. Bale's references probably came only from Leland.

THE ENGLISH BIBLIOGRAPHICAL TRADITION

assessing what each of the four contributed to this tradition, there are three angles to be taken into account: its achievement judged by contemporary standards, its subsequent reception and influence within and beyond this tradition, and its value to current research. Their interdependence attests a sense of common enterprise, of building on the work of predecessors, but this manifest tradition must not prevent us from seeing the great differences between them, even when judged only as bibliographers. They worked in very different circumstances, their aims and methods differed, and each relates very differently to the evolving approaches to bibliography in continental Europe.

HENRY DE KIRKESTEDE (c.1314–p.1378)

Let us start with the first surviving English catalogue of Latin authors. Henry takes his name from Kirstead Green, a manor near Norwich that belonged to the great Suffolk abbey of Bury St Edmunds.²⁵ He became a monk at Bury c.1331 and was ordained priest in 1338. He acted as both novice master and librarian of the abbey during the 1340s and 1350s. Neither office constituted an obedience with its own endowments, but there is no direct evidence that Henry also served as precentor, the obedientiary on whom responsibility for the library had usually fallen.²⁶ From 1361 Henry was prior for a period of ten years or so, but he had certainly retired from office by 1373. In his old age he resumed his interest in commissioning books for the library, and the last datable evidence that he was alive is a heading in his own hand, 'Urbanus VI^{us}', naming the pope elected on 8 April 1378.²⁷

Henry's contribution to the tradition of *viri illustres* is a catalogue, entitled in the opening word's of the author's prologue *Catalogus de libris authenticis et apocryphis*. Henry's experience as librarian was the essential background to this large bibliographical repertory, and his activity is visible in dozens of books surviving from the abbey, in which he entered a class mark, also folio numbers through the book, and very often a note describing the contents of the manuscript. In some cases he entered at the front of the volume a fuller notice of bibliographical interest, whether about the author, or about the incompleteness of the text it contained and the availability of a better copy in another volume or even at another house, or other information useful to the alert reader. Such notices merit collection and comparison with his *Catalogus* towards a closer understanding of his bibliographical work.²⁸ There is also evidence that he compiled

25. In what follows I have depended heavily on the work of R. H. Rouse and M. A. Rouse, *Henry of Kirkestede's 'Catalogus scriptorum ecclesie'*, Corpus of British Medieval Library Catalogues, 11, London, 2004; also R. H. Rouse, 'Bostonus Buriensis and the Author of the *Catalogus scriptorum ecclesiae*', *Speculum*, 41, 1966, pp. 471–99.

26. R. M. Thomson, 'Obedientiaries of St Edmund's Abbey', *Proceedings of the Suffolk Institute of Archaeology*, 35, 1981–4, pp. 91–103 (98), could find only one occurrence (in the years 1312, 1325, and 1346) for each of three different precentors in the 14th century, so the succession is far from complete.

27. MS Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 404 (1370s) (marked with class mark P. 163 by Henry), fol. 95^r; M. R. James, *Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts of Corpus Christi College Cambridge*, 2 vols, Cambridge, 1912, II, p. 275.

28. Some of them are illustrated by Rouse, 'Bostonus Buriensis and the Author of the *Catalogus*' (above, n. 25), plates viii–xiv; discussion in Rouse and Rouse, *Henry of Kirkestede* (n. 25 above), pp. li–lxiv.

RICHARD SHARPE

a register of the library using his own class marks.²⁹ In a few instances these notes are initialled or even signed, so that Richard Rouse was able to establish the identity of the librarian.³⁰ This had been clouded for centuries because, in 1549, John Bale had referred to his catalogue of authors as the work of 'Boston of Bury', when he cited it appreciatively as the first English catalogue of the names and works of learned writers.³¹ That name became famous among English antiquaries of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and it was under that name that it was proposed to print Henry's catalogue in 1694, when Thomas Tanner was commissioned to prepare the text for publication. The reason for the confusion is that the medieval copy used by both Bale and Tanner contained a colophon alluding to *Botulphi villa* 'Botulf's town' (i.e. Boston, Lincs.) as the scribe's name, but with no mention of the author's name. When M. R. James began to devote serious attention to the manuscripts that have survived from Bury, he quickly associated the notes at the front of so many books with 'Boston of Bury', even though he had in front of him the evidence that would later allow Richard Rouse to identify the writer as Henry de Kirkestede.³² It was thanks to James's knowledge of the published extracts from this catalogue that he recognized a complete transcript of the work when it was offered for sale in 1898 from the remains of the library of Sir Thomas Phillipps. This turned out to be the copy made in 1694 by Thomas Tanner from the medieval exemplar; Tanner had also copied Boston's hexameter colophon, 'Scriptoris nomen Botulphi villa vocatur, | Qui condempnatur, nisi gratum det Deus omen'. Tanner's transcript is now MS Cambridge, University Library, Add. 3470 (formerly Phillipps 10428).³³

Henry's bibliographical catalogue comprises brief notices of some 674 authors, in most cases followed by a list of their works; wherever he could, Henry gives the first word or two of the text, and also a word indicative of the ending of the text; in many instances he also adds numerical references that designate religious houses where a copy

29. R. Sharpe, 'Reconstructing the Medieval Library of Bury St Edmunds: The Lost Catalogue of Henry of Kirkstead', in *Bury St Edmunds: Medieval Art, Architecture, Archaeology, and Economy*, ed. A. Gransden, British Archaeological Association, Conference Transactions 1994, [n.p.], 1998, pp. 204–18.

30. Rouse, 'Bostonus Buriensis and the Author of the *Catalogus*' (n. 25 above), pp. 474–80.

31. *The Laboryouse Journey & Serche of Johan Leylande, for Englande's Antiquitees, geuen of hym as a newe yeares gyfte to Kynge Henry the viii*, written for presentation to the king on 1 January 1546 (and hence usually known as *A newe yeares gyfte*), edited and interleaved with observations by John Bale, London, 1549, sigs C8^v, D1^v, G4^v. Bale again refers to Boston as the author in his notebook, where he mentions that his source for the work was Ailott Holt, a former monk of Bury; Bale, *Index Britanniae scriptorum* (n. 23 above), p. 49.

32. MS Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 404, fol. iii^r, contains his name in the *ex libris* inscription, 'Quaternus monachorum S. Edmundi quem scripsit pro maiori parte Frater Henricus de Kirkestede in quo subscripta continentur, videlicet . . .'; James says that this is 'in Boston's (?) hand'. Also MS Cambridge, Pembroke College 92 (s. XIV) (class mark J. 35 in Henry's register), 'Memorandum quod fr. H(enricus) de K(irkestede) solvit pro scriptura et aliis sumptibus istius libri xxij s.'; James noted that the book was partly in the hand of Boston (?) and that the bibliographical note on the flyleaf matched Boston's catalogue. MS Cambridge, St John's College 170 (s. XIV) (H. 56 in Henry's register), 'Liber monachorum S. Edmundi quem scribi fecit H. de K.', and again on fol. 147^v a note of the expenses, 'Frater H. de K. solvit pro scriptura istius libri . . .'; James in this case made no connection with Boston. MS BL Royal 8 F. xiv (ss. XIII–XIV) is a collection of booklets brought together by Henry, letter-marked G. 15, and 'Per Fr. H. de K.' on the flyleaf.

33. Described by Rouse and Rouse, *Henry of Kirkestede* (n. 25 above), p. ccvii; on its recognition by M. R. James, see Rouse and Rouse, *Registrum Anglie* (n. 17 above), pp. xxi–xxiv.

THE ENGLISH BIBLIOGRAPHICAL TRADITION

of the work in question could be found. The number of different texts so documented is in excess of 3,700. For this considerable undertaking, worked on, it would seem, over a long period, he had a twofold inspiration. First, he was well acquainted with the works of the *virii illustres* tradition. Indeed, the Bury copy that he used has come down to us, now MS Bodleian Library, e Musaeo 31 (SC 3574). It is a twelfth-century manuscript, written at Bury St Edmunds, with the *ex libris* of the abbey, 'Liber sancti Ædmundi', with the class mark, added by Henry himself, A. 31; it comprises Augustine's *Retractiones* preceded by a summary of the titles of the works treated, Cassiodorus's *Institutiones*, three scriptural works of Isidore, and then Jerome's *De viris illustribus*, a copy of the Gelasian *Decretalis epistola de recipiendis et non recipiendis libris*, and the catalogues of *virii illustres* of Gennadius and Isidore. Second, Henry had ready access to a copy of the *Registrum Anglie*, a union catalogue of works by some ninety-nine authors, mainly patristic, though with some major Carolingian and twelfth-century authors also included. This provided the model for including numerical references to institutions where a copy could be found, and Henry copied its numbers selectively but added additional union references in some cases from his own searches, mostly in East Anglia. Henry used both of these sources thoroughly though not strictly systematically. From a range of other sources, now investigated by Richard and Mary Rouse, he added other authors and other titles, and some of these sources were used also to supply incipits for texts already included, or sometimes other information such as the author's date. He also added a good deal of information from manuscripts available to him at Bury and at some other places. The whole was arranged alphabetically by the first letter of the author's name. Within that rather crude order, one can sometimes see how Henry had added a batch of authors from a single source – this is how he used the Dominican *Tabula*, for example – while in other stretches he moves between sources.

Henry's method is synthetic. The basic structure must have been put together largely from his two main sources, *Registrum Anglie* and the catalogues of authors in his MS A. 31; he supplemented this from other reading, and he had some recourse to manuscripts to complete the information he wished to give. Books in the monastic library of Bury provided the greater part of this additional material, though he also used the library of the local Franciscan friary and some other religious houses in the area, as well as pursuing his research occasionally in London and Oxford.³⁴ He was unable to control much of this information by a critical use of actual texts, though, from our perspective, where we can be sure that he saw a copy of the text, it is possible that his testimony can provide significant information from a lost manuscript.

A medieval copy of Henry's work, made by the scribe called Boston, remained at Bury until around the time when the abbey was dissolved in 1539. It passed from a former monk of Bury, Ailot Holt, into the hands of John Bale, who first refers to it in 1549.³⁵ One might suppose that it passed from Holt to Bale when both were parish

34. Rouse and Rouse, *Henry of Kirkestede* (n. 25 above), pp. lv–lix, cxviii–cxxiv. The extent of his use of resources more than a day's journey from Bury is limited and was probably the result of his happening to see something when in London or Oxford for other purposes.

35. The monks of Bury signed the deed of surrender on 4 November 1539. 'Ailot Halstede a. Holt' [i.e.

RICHARD SHARPE

clergy in Suffolk in 1539–40, before Bale went into exile; the fact that it was not used in the *Summariium* may rather point to an encounter in 1548–9.³⁶ More than a fifth of the writers treated by Henry were British, or mistaken for British – some 120 names – so this was a valuable quarry. Bale has left a quite precise description of it:

Horum hic nomina, aetates, et opera cum eorum initiis laboriose adiunxit, ac in quibus essent reperienda coenobiis, per calendarium aptissime demonstravit. Et haec insignissima librorum et authorum collectio, in magno volumine apud me est, quae Bibliothecarum Anglicarum thesauros, proh dolor! hac nostra aetate prorsus exhaustos hucusque prodit.³⁷

Of these [writers] he added with great labour names, dates, and writings together with their incipits, and he showed very conveniently by means of a table in what religious houses they could be found. This magnificent compilation of books and writers is now in my possession in a large volume; it betrays, alas! how far the treasures of English libraries have been entirely emptied in our own time.

Bale made heavy use of it during the next few years, adding information on writers already known to Leland and also on some thirty-five further writers; but it was one of the many manuscripts that he had to leave behind him in Ireland when he fled to the Continent again in 1553.³⁸ He never recovered it, but his use of ‘Boston of Bury’ ensured that knowledge of this catalogue was not lost. Richard and Mary Rouse have traced ownership and knowledge of the medieval copy since his time. It may have remained in Ireland for more than fifty years, for it next surfaces in 1606 in the possession of James Ussher (1581–1656). Ussher was at that date acquiring manuscripts both in Ireland and in England, and he enjoyed friendly relations with English antiquaries such as Sir Robert Cotton. Ussher became bishop of Meath in 1621, archbishop of Armagh in 1626, and achieved a great name as a scholar. While the book was in Ussher’s library, it was used by James Ware. After Ussher died, in England, in 1656, his copy of Henry’s catalogue turns up in the hands of Sir Roger Twysden (1597–1672), an English anti-

Ailott Holt, also named from Halstead, in Essex, 25 miles south of Bury] accepted a pension of £6. 13s. 8d. (*Letters and Papers of the Reign of Henry VIII*, 21 vols in 35 and 2 vols of Addenda, London, 1862–1932, XIV/2, no. 462) and spent the remainder of his life as a priest in Suffolk; in his will, dated 8 July 1570, ‘Eliot Holt, clerke’ left his books to ‘R. Holt, precher’, from whom we infer they passed to Jeremiah Holt, another Suffolk clergyman, who in 1634 gave ten medieval manuscripts, most of them identifiably from Bury, the others presumably, to St John’s College, Cambridge (Rouse and Rouse, *Henry of Kirkestede* [n. 25 above], p. clxxxi n.; J. P. Carley, ‘The Dispersal of the Monastic Libraries and the Salvaging of the Spoils’, in *A History of Libraries in Britain and Ireland*, vol. I, eds M. T. J. Webber and E. S. Leedham-Green, Cambridge, 2005; I am grateful to Professor Carley for sight of this paper ahead of publication). See M. R. James, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of St John’s College, Cambridge*, Cambridge, 1913, p. xii, for a list of the manuscripts.

36. Rouse and Rouse, *Henry of Kirkestede* (n. 25 above), pp. clxxx–clxxxii; they also note that Holt is cited in the notebook from Bale’s work during 1548–52.

37. From the account of previous English bibliographers from Bede to Leland in Bale’s own reworked copy of Leland, MS Cambridge, Trinity College R. 7. 15, fol. 2^v; compare also his later description, *Catalogus*, I, p. 541 (quoted by Rouse and Rouse, *Henry of Kirkestede* [n. 25 above], p. clxxxiii), where, however, the size of the medieval manuscript is not mentioned.

38. It is no. 61 in a list Bale subsequently drew up of the manuscripts he had left in Ireland (see below, n. 74).

THE ENGLISH BIBLIOGRAPHICAL TRADITION

quary. Around 1685 it passed into the possession of Thomas Gale (1635–1702), then high master of St Paul's School in London. By the 1690s it had been acquired by the London booksellers Awnsham and John Churchill, who traded just outside St Paul's churchyard at the sign of the Black Swan in Paternoster Row, and who agreed a deal with the young Thomas Tanner to prepare an edition. The transcript that Tanner made in 1694 has preserved the text of Henry's work, but the medieval copy made by Boston has disappeared.³⁹ From Bale's references to the work, and from frequent allusion to it among the English antiquaries, Boston's work achieved something resembling fame, though few actually studied or even saw the manuscript.

JOHN LELAND (? 1503–1552)

The case of John Leland is different. He did not begin with any prime source from which to quarry his material but worked from scratch, collecting information both from wide reading in printed sources and from extensive manuscript searches. For this he was well equipped. Born in London a year or two before 1505, he enjoyed as good an education as the age afforded, first in London at St Paul's School (recently renewed by the dean, John Colet), then at Christ's College, Cambridge (founded 1505–11 by the king's mother Lady Margaret Beaufort), and finally (it is argued) in Paris, once again a fashionable centre of contemporary humanist learning.⁴⁰ His stylish humanist Latin attracted patronage, and from his early twenties he was employed by the king as library keeper and antiquary. He was in priest's orders and was rewarded for his labours in the traditional way, by being presented to several benefices, though he can have spent little of his time in the discharge of parochial duties. For most of the period between 1534 and 1543, momentous years for the church in England, Leland spent part of every year travelling the country in search of antiquities; he was interested in ancient buildings and ruins, inscriptions, coins, manuscript books, and not least literary antiquities. He took notes for a whole range of projected works, of which only his book on British writers was even drafted.⁴¹ Towards the end of 1545 he reflected that his commission allowed him

to peruse and dilygently to searche all the lybraryes of monasteryes and collegies of thys your noble realme, to the entent that the monumentes of aunicyent wryters, as wel of

39. In September 1725 John Anstis told Thomas Hearne that the manuscript was still in the hands of John Churchill (T. Hearne, *Remarks and Collections*, Oxford Historical Society, 11 vols, Oxford, 1885–1921, IX, p. 24), but it is not heard of again after that.

40. Modern biographical sketches of John Leland include T. D. Kendrick (1895–1979), in his reissue of L. Toulmin Smith, *The 'Itinerary' of John Leland*, 6 vols, London, 1964, I, pp. [i]–[xv], and most recently J. Chandler, *John Leland's 'Itinerary': Travels in Tudor England*, Stroud, 1993, pp. xi–xxiii. For new information on many points one must consult the articles of J. P. Carley, among them, on Leland's education, 'John Leland in Paris: The Evidence of his Poetry', *Studies in Philology*, 83, 1986, pp. 1–50.

41. These notes were printed in two series by Thomas Hearne, who would have liked also to print Leland's bibliographical work (R. Sharpe, 'Thomas Tanner (1674–1735), the 1697 Catalogue, and *Bibliotheca Britannica*', *Library*, 7th ser., 6, 2005, pp. 381–421 [396]). Leland's *Itinerary* survives in several copies, published as *The Itinerary of John Leland*, 9 vols, Oxford, 1710–12; ed. L. Toulmin Smith, 6 vols, London, 1906–10. Leland's *Collectanea*, three autograph volumes, were published as *Joannis Lelandi antiquarii De rebus Britannicis collectanea*, 6 vols, Oxford, 1715. On Leland's various projects see J. P. Carley, 'The Manuscript Remains of John Leland', *Text: Transactions of the Society for Textual Scholarship*, 2, 1985, pp. 111–20.

RICHARD SHARPE

other nacyons as of your owne prouynce, myghte be brought out of deadly darkenesse to lyuelye lyght, and to receyue lyke thankes of their posterite, as they hoped for at suche tyme, as they employed their longe and great studyes to the publyque wealthe.⁴²

Much of his work derives from first-hand acquaintance with manuscripts in many parts of the country. His antiquarian taste was not focused entirely on chronicles; he took note of books of many periods, covering a great many topics, and he seems always to have kept in mind the aim of drawing together a study of the writers of this country:

Wherfor I knowynge by infynyte uaryete of bokes, and assyduouse readyng of them, who hath bene learned and who hath written from tyme to tyme in this realme, have digested into .iiii. bokes, the names of them wyth their lyues and monumentes of learnynge. And to them added thys tyle, *De viris illustribus*, folowynge the profytable example of Hierome, Gennadie, Cassiodore, Seueryane, and Trittemie a late writer. But alwaye so handlynge the matter, that I have more expacyated in this campe, than they did, as in a thyng that desyred to be sumwhat at large, and to haue ornature.⁴³

And again:

Now farther to insynuate to your grace, of what matters the writers, whose lyues I haue congested into .iiii. bokes hath treated of. I may ryghte boldely saye, that besyde the cognycion of the .iiii. tungues, in the whych part of them hath excelled, that there is no kynde of lyberall scyence, or any feate concernynge learnynge, in the whych they haue not shewed certayne argumentes of great felycyte of witte.⁴⁴

Some of his information to this purpose was obtained by reading texts that he came upon in manuscript in the course of his travels: Leland was not a bibliographer who looked only for titles, and through studying texts wherever he found them, or in some cases taking away the manuscript, he was able also to collect secondary information on authors or works that he had not himself seen. He sometimes provides a vivid glimpse of his research, at the same time revealing his method of work: so, for example, at Jervaulx the abbot received him, examined the king's letter, and took him to the library:

Tum ille ad publica munia; ego vero, et auide quidem ad vetera exemplaria, inter quae unum se mihi obtulit cum hac inscriptione, *Nennius de origine Britanniae*. Titulus hic mihi prima fronte adblandiebatur. Putabam etenim me thesaurum aliquem nactum. Sed cum operis aliquantulum gustassem, de spe illa [-totum] \aliquantulum/ decidi. Nolui tamen librum prius deponere quam perlegissem. Quis unquam liber tam inepte scriptus est, ut nullum prorsus ab eius lectione fructum sperare queas?⁴⁵

42. *A newe yeares gyfte* (n. 31 above), sig. B8^r. Sir T. Duffus Hardy (1804–1878), deputy keeper of the public records, noted in 1862 that 'no such commission as that here mentioned is enrolled' (*Descriptive Catalogue of Materials relating to the History of Great Britain and Ireland*, 3 vols in 4, Rolls Series, 26, London, 1862–71, I/1, p. xxxviii).

43. *A newe yeares gyfte* (n. 31 above), sig. C7^v–8^r. Leland proceeds to describe the scheme of four books. Of the models cited, Severian eludes me; he is not the Roman rhetorician Julius Severianus nor the Syrian preacher Severianus of Gabala.

44. *A newe yeares gyfte* (n. 31 above), sig. D2^r.

45. MS Bodleian Library, Top. gen. c. 4, p. 62; Leland, *Scriptores*, p. 74.

THE ENGLISH BIBLIOGRAPHICAL TRADITION

He went about his official duties, and I to the ancient books, and that right eagerly. Among them was one in which was written the title, *Nennius on the origin of Britain*. This title enticed me at first sight, for I thought I had found a treasure. When I had sampled the work a little, my enthusiasm cooled [—completely] \somewhat/. I did not want to put it down, however, until I had looked through it thoroughly. For what book was ever so ineptly written that one could not hope to learn something of value from reading it?

Leland expressly recognized the value of manuscript *tituli* as evidence for the authorship of medieval texts, and he often makes a point about recording them. In this case he goes on to discuss precisely what he learnt from this manuscript, while we can now also compare these reflections, surely largely from his memory of the visit, with the concise note he copied from the manuscript and his judgement on the quality of Nennius's work:

Nennii libellus de origine Britanniae. *Ego Nennius, sancti Elboldi discipulus*. Leland: Scribit confuse et sine iudicio, sordidis etiam verbis, non dubitans fabulas subinde interserere plus quam aniles. \Fit mentio Nennii in vita Finnani.//⁴⁶

Nennius's little book on the origin of Britain. *I Nennius, pupil of holy Elboldus*. Leland: He writes in a confused manner, lacking judgement, and in filthy prose, not hesitating to include fables that are worse than old wives' tales. \There is a mention of Nennius in the Life of St Finnan.//

Leland recognized monastic libraries as treasure-houses of antiquities, and something of his feeling for the waste of learning in their abandonment can be got from the elegiac digression on the library of St Augustine's abbey outside Canterbury, from where books containing 'multos praeclari nominis scriptores' ('many writers of distinguished repute') had been taken to the king's library and some also into Leland's own possession.⁴⁷ He came to regard it as a serious matter to rescue authors in this way, reporting to the king:

Fyrst, I haue conserued many good authors, the whych otherwyse had been lyke to haue peryshed, to no small incommodyte of good letters. Of the which parte remayne in the most magnificent libraryes of your royall palaces. Part also remayne in my custodie, whereby I trust right shortly, so to describe your most noble realme, and to publyshe the maiestie of the excellentes actes of youre progenytours, hytherto fore obscured, bothe for lacke of empryntynge of such workes as laye secretly in corners. And also because men of eloquence hath not enterprised, to set them fourth in a floryshynge style, in some tymes past not commenly used in Englande of writers, otherwise wele learned, and now in suche estymacyon, that except truth be delycately clothed in purpуре her written uerytees can scant fynde a reader.⁴⁸

46. MS Bodleian Library, Top. gen. c. 3, pp. 40–41; *Collectanea*, ed. Hearne (n. 41 above), IV, p. 44; D. N. Bell, *The Libraries of the Cistercians, Gilbertines, and Premonstratensians*, Corpus of British Medieval Library Catalogues, 3, London, 1992, p. 30. The manuscript seen by Leland is now MS Oxford, St John's College 99 (s. XII); the prologue in which Leland read the names of Nennius and Elfoddw was added in the 13th century, and its source has been identified as MS Cambridge, University Library Ff. 1.27 pt 1 (s. XIIIⁱⁿ, Sawley); D. N. Dumville, "Nennius" and the *Historia Britonum*, *Studia Celtica*. 10–11, 1975–6, pp. 78–95 (79). Bale saw 'Nennius's *Historia*' in a copy at the Norwich Carmel (*Summarium*, fol. 37^r).

47. Leland, *Scriptores*, pp. 299–301.

48. *A newe yeares gyfte* (n. 31 above), sig. C2^r, 3^r.

RICHARD SHARPE

Around 1548 John Bale took notes on some two hundred titles ‘ex bibliotheca Ioannis Lelandi’, and some of the actual books have been traced.⁴⁹ Occasionally Leland can be seen at work in his notes added in their margins.⁵⁰

Leland was not only able to carry out much more widespread research in English libraries than Henry de Kirkestede. He had contacts, and he was able to draw on the researches of friends, among them principally John Bale.⁵¹ A new development in English bibliography was the access that printing provided to modern bibliographical works from continental Europe, such as those of Trithemius and Leandro Alberti, which may have influenced his aspirations, though the specific information he drew from these was mainly obscure addenda, authors unknown to him from more direct, English, sources.⁵² Again, unlike Henry, Leland digested the material in continuous prose, though like Trithemius and Alberti, he often tabulates the list of an author’s works, using two columns where he was able to add their incipits. Leland’s interest was not simply in finding the evidence of surviving or attested works; he extended his scope to include men and women of attested learning, at any rate for the centuries before about 1100, for which he had little more substantial material. The work amounts to some 593 chapters – these chapters are the real units of composition, and the division is largely obvious in the manuscript, but numbering and headings were added only by Leland’s eighteenth-century editor – and most of the chapters were devoted to a single author. Leland refers to this work in the notes that accompany his poem *Κύκνειον ᾄσμα. Cygnea cantio*, printed in 1545, where he tells any reader wanting more information about Humfrey, duke of Gloucester, the great fifteenth-century patron,

Plura de hoc tam claro Duce dicemus libro tertio de viris illustribus. Hoc enim opus magna diligentia, cura, et labore congegimus, atque adeo iam in tomos quatuor digessimus, ne Britanniae nostrae fama tot eruditorum et elegantium Scriptorum deperiret. Quotus enim quisque est hac nostra aetate, vel inter eruditos, qui recte norit quos literarum flores Britanniae hortus protulerit.⁵³

We shall have more to say about this famous Duke in Book III of *Viri illustres*. We have brought together this work with great diligence, care, and labour, and we arranged it in

49. Carley, ‘The Dispersal of the Monastic Libraries’ (n. 35 above). It appears that some of the books had passed into the hands of Thomas Keye before 1552, where Bale seems to have noted some of the same titles again without giving sign that he knew he had seen the book before.

50. J. P. Carley, ‘John Bale, John Leland, and the *Chronicon Tinemutensis coenobii*’, in *Text and Controversy from Wyclif to Bale: Essays in Honour of Anne Hudson*, eds H. Barr and A. M. Hutchison, Turnhout, 2004, pp. 163–87.

51. See below, p. 111, for Bale’s testimony that he was himself Leland’s *amiculus* who reported to him on books that he had seen in Norwich.

52. For example, he cites Trithemius’s *Scriptores* (n. 11 above) as his source for ‘John Walsingham’ (Leland, *Scriptores*, p. 359, using Trithemius, fol. 90^r), ‘Sertorius, archbishop of Ravenna’ (Leland, *Scriptores*, p. 340, following Trithemius, fol. 87^v); at *Scriptores*, p. 322, he cites Leandro Alberti, *De viris illustribus ordinis Praedicatorum*, Bologna, 1517, fols 180^r, 227^r, for Bricius and Laurentius, two Dominicans not known from other sources, and on the same page Leland based his brief entry for Thomas Stubbs on Leandro Alberti, fol. 149^v (‘Thomas Stolbez’). The references to Alberti are all additions in Leland’s autograph manuscript.

53. J. Leland, *Commentarii ad Cygneam cantionem*, London, 1545, sig. I1^v.

THE ENGLISH BIBLIOGRAPHICAL TRADITION

four books, so that the fame of so many learned and elegant authors from our Britain should not perish. For there is scarcely anyone in our age, even among the learned, who rightly knows what flowers of literature Britain's garden has brought forth.

The book survives in manuscript in Leland's own hand, now MS Bodleian Library, Top. gen. c. 4 (SC 3120). This copy appears to have been a fair copy of the work as first composed around 1535–6. It was much worked over before 1545, but it remains incomplete in relation to what is known of Leland's intention.⁵⁴ There are no book divisions, though already in 1545 Leland had referred to Book III. Yet the undivided draft cannot pre-date 1545, for references were added by Leland to Konrad Gesner's *Bibliotheca universalis*, just published in that year. This may suggest that the planned division into four books was never realized and that the wording in *A neue yeares gyfte* optimistically treated plan as accomplishment.⁵⁵ Moreover, the text we have does not treat any author later than the death of Henry VII, though it was Leland's expressed intention in the fourth book to discuss those writing in Henry VIII's time.⁵⁶ For some entries two drafts sit side by side. So, for example, at p. 177, short paragraphs on three biographers of Thomas Becket were copied, amended, and then struck out; Herbert of Bosham got a new and fuller draft on the facing page; William of Canterbury lost his place and was added in abbreviated form to a previous entry on William fitz Stephen;⁵⁷ and Alan of Tewkesbury, 'Alanus Teochesburgensis abbas', was redrafted, again on the opposite page, as 'Alanus abba Theoci curiae monasterii', and the new entry was then further revised. The entry for Richard Fastolf was struck out and fused with 'Ricardus Anglicus et sacrista',⁵⁸ while the long article on Geoffrey of Monmouth was shortened by striking out more than six pages of text.⁵⁹ Some pages are overcrowded with revisions and additions. Little space seems to have been allowed for additional material or new entries, and where it was, it has often been filled – so, for example, Robert of Shrewsbury's entry, a dozen lines,

54. The only printed edition is *Commentarii de scriptoribus Britannicis auctore Joanne Lelando Londinate. Ex autographo Lelandino nunc primus edidit Antonius Hall* (Oxford: e Theatro Sheldoniano, 1709); on the background to this edition see R. Sharpe, 'Thomas Tanner' (n. 41 above). A new edition is in preparation by J. P. Carley.

55. Around 1553, Bale believed that Leland had digested the draft into four books, arguably on the strength of what he read in *A neue yeares gyfte*, though he asserted that he knew trustworthy men who had handled the revised version (below, p. 111 and n. 98); in 1557, when he wrote his own entry on Leland in the *Catalogus*, I, p. 672, he referred to *De viris illustribus* as being in four books.

56. *A neue yeares gyfte* (n. 31 above), sigs C8^r, C8^v–D1^r, for Leland's account of what each book covered; Carley, 'John Bale, John Leland, and the *Chronicon Tinemetensis coenobii*' (n. 50 above), p. 173 n. 47, and more fully in the introduction to his forthcoming edition.

57. MS Bodleian Library, Top. gen. c. 4, p. 169; Leland, *Scriptores*, p. 209. Thomas Tanner, *Bibliotheca Britannico-Hibernica*, London, 1748, p. 355, preserved William of Canterbury's name with a query, 'Annon idem cum Gul. Stephanide? Vide infra'.

58. MS Bodleian Library, Top. gen. c. 4, pp. 159, 147.

59. The whole article occupies pp. 149–57 in the manuscript, but most of it has been crossed out. Hall, in his edition (*Scriptores*, p. 190), added a footnote drawing attention to this passage, 'longa et bene erudita disceptatio adversus Polydorum Virgilium (quem Codrum appellat) de Arturio rege', struck out by the author because he had written a special treatise on the subject; the treatise in question is *Codrus, sive Laus et defensio Gallofridi Arturii Monumetensis contra Polydorum Vergilium*, in *Collectanea*, ed. Hearne (n. 41 above), V, pp. 1–10.

RICHARD SHARPE

was added in the space after William of Gillingham's⁶⁰ – but only close attention to changes of pen or ink will reveal such additions. In studying the evolution of Leland's bibliographical perceptions, such changes are important, and so too are his alterations to the names of authors. The final sequence of authors is not entirely deliberate, and an editor will be challenged to make clear all of Leland's significant changes.

Although this book remained unpublished when Leland went mad and ceased to be able to work in 1547, his reputation and his connections ensured the preservation of a large portion of his manuscript collections. His *Itinerary* survived in several copies. In 1548 four volumes of his autograph collections were already in the keeping of John Cheke (1514–57), a Cambridge humanist and tutor to the young King Edward VI. Among these was the surviving draft of his *Viri illustres* as well as a volume in which he had copied out for the printer notes on selected titles that he had seen in libraries around the country. The four volumes were presented in 1632 to the Bodleian Library, where they are now MSS Bodleian Library, Top. gen. c. 1–4 (SC 3117–20).

Leland's long-standing reputation as the first English antiquary, and the preservation of notes reflecting his primary researches (though not, I should add, primary notes), have ensured that his work continues to be respected. Even in *Viri illustres*, composed in Latin prose that is not always lucid, and made obscure by the sometimes fanciful, sometimes capricious Latinization of place names and surnames, Leland gives enough direct information about his sources for one to be able, in many instances, to work out what texts he was using. Sometimes he will tell us where he found it, and by careful correlation of final composition, the notebooks, and more recent work on the provenances of surviving manuscripts, it is sometimes possible to establish what actual copy of a work Leland used. It is always an effort for a modern reader to profit from reading Leland, but the task will be made easier by the publication of an annotated edition. Leland is also a valuable witness to long-lost works, from which he has sometimes preserved extracts.⁶¹

JOHN BALE (1495–1563)

John Bale was a slightly older contemporary of Leland. He started life with many fewer advantages, born in 1495, in humble surroundings, at Covehithe in Suffolk, between Southwold and Dunwich, and sent to the Carmelites of Norwich for schooling; he joined the order and by 1514 he was an undergraduate at Jesus College, Cambridge, and he later studied also at Louvain and Toulouse.⁶² Once a zealous traditionalist, in the 1530s he became an equally zealous reformer. By 1536 he had left the order, as he

60. MS Bodleian Library, Top. gen. c. 4, p. 173.

61. Examples include Michael Lapidge's recovery of evidence on Bede's *Liber epigrammatum*, 'Some Remnants of Bede's Lost *Liber Epigrammatum*', *English Historical Review*, 90, 1975, pp. 798–820.

62. Bale supplies autobiographical notices in his *Anglorum Heliades* (n. 14 above), fols 99^v–100^r; *Summarium*, fols 242^v–244^v; *Catalogus*, I, pp. 702–3 (which in turn served as the basis of Tanner's detailed list of Bale's writings, *Bibliotheca* [n. 57 above], pp. 68–70). The biographical particulars are brought together by Davies, pp. 203–30; see also H. C. McCusker, *John Bale, Dramatist and Antiquary*, Bryn Mawr, Penn., 1942; L. P. Fairfield, *John Bale, Mythmaker for the English Reformation*, West Lafayette, Ind., 1976, pp. 31–49; J. N. King, *English Reformation Literature: Tudor Origins of the Protestant Tradition*, Princeton, 1982, pp. 56–75.

THE ENGLISH BIBLIOGRAPHICAL TRADITION

clearly says, along with John Baret, Carmelite of King's Lynn.⁶³ At this point he spent two months in Ipswich writing his first mature work of bibliography, *Anglorum Heliades*, still unpublished, in which he recounts from various sources the history of his former order in England, adding as a second book, 'in modum catalogi, recitans preclaros quosdam theologos qui aliqua ad utilitatem ecclesie scripserunt' ('in the manner of a catalogue, listing any distinguished theologians who have written anything of use to the Church').⁶⁴ This work was dedicated to John Leland:

Non enim hec fecimus ut tibi sim adiumento in historiarum tuarum editione, sed ut commonstrem quis in te noster sit animus et quam sim tuis iussionibus parere paratus.⁶⁵

For we have not composed these things just so that I may be a help to you in publishing your histories but in order to demonstrate our feelings towards you and how far I am ready to do your bidding.

Leland was not entirely enthusiastic about Bale's writing, which did not meet his own standard of humanist learning.⁶⁶ Bale's subsequent preaching in Suffolk landed him in trouble in 1536–7, and he went on to attract further attention through his putting on reformist plays. It was Leland who in January 1537 provided Bale with an introduction to the king's chief minister Thomas Cromwell, who became for a short time his protector and patron.⁶⁷ At this time Cromwell was responsible for dissolving the religious houses of England, the squandering of whose libraries would be such a source of regret to both Leland and Bale. After Cromwell's fall in 1540 Bale lived among other evangelical exiles in Germany until after Henry VIII's death and the succession of Edward VI. By the time he returned to England around 1548, he had already compiled his own *virii illustres*, grandly entitled *Illustrium Maioris Britanniae scriptorum, hoc est, Angliae, Cambriae, ac Scotiae summarium, in quasdam centurias divisum, cum diversitate doctrinarum*

63. 'Effulgescere tandem cepit Evangelica veritas, cuius inardescens amore, sinistri voti eum pefato Baretto mutavi quoque decretum [referring back to his chapter on Baret, fols 98^v–99^r], traditionibus humanis divina preferens iura' ('The truth of the gospel began to shine brightly, so exciting me with love thereof that along with the said John Baret I changed my decision regarding an improper vow, choosing instead to put the laws of God before the traditions of men': *Anglorum Heliades* [n. 14 above], fol. 99^v).

64. The manuscript, now MS BL Harley 3838, is a professional copy with corrections in Bale's own hand; quotation from the title of Book II, fol. 42^r (in original foliation). The preface is dated at Ipswich, 1536, and the colophon gives the date and a clear indication of Bale's reformed sentiments, 'In presentis operis editione per duos fere menses laborans, ad ultimum effectum perduxit Anno post natum Salvatorem MCCCCXXXVI sub felicissimo Anglorum rege Henrico illius nominis octavo, supremo totius Anglicane ecclesie capite et monarcha [sub Christo inserted in Bale's hand], etatis mee anno XL' (fol. 100^v).

65. *Anglorum Heliades* (n. 14 above), preface, fol. 4^r.

66. Leland attributed the dating of William of Coventry OCarum to Bale, 'ut Joannes Baleus Covensis homo Anglus refert in quodam collectaneo de Carmelitis tumultuaria opera consulto' ('as John Bale of Cove, an Englishman, mentions in a compilation about Carmelites stitched together with hasty work': MS Bodleian Library, Top. gen. c. 4, p. 253; Leland, *Scriptores*, p. 346; Carley, 'John Bale, John Leland, and the *Chronicon Tinemutensis coenobii*' [n. 50 above], p. 164). The source is Bale's *Anglorum Heliades* (n. 14 above), fol. 62^r.

67. PRO MS SP1/115, fol. 63^r (cited by Fairfield, *John Bale* [n. 62 above], pp. 48, 190); *Letters & Papers Hen. VIII* (n. 35 above), XII/1, no. 230). The letter was first published by T. D. Hardy, *Descriptive Catalogue* (n. 42 above), I/1, pp. xxxix–xl. A letter from Bale to Cromwell also survives in MS BL Cotton Cleopatra E. iv, fol. 134 (*Letters & Papers Hen. VIII*, XII/1, no. 307).

RICHARD SHARPE

atque annorum recta supputatione per omnes aetates a Japheto . . . ad annum Domini. M.D.XLVIII; the colophon declares it as printed in Ipswich, but the book was in fact printed at Wesel in Germany.⁶⁸ The coverage amounted to some five hundred writers.

In 1549 Bale published in London John Leland's address to Henry VIII, written for presentation at New Year 1546, but prepared for the press by Bale himself, who added substantial passages in his own name: *The laboryouse Journey [é] serche of Johan Leylande, for Englandes antiquitees, geven of hym as a newe yeares gyfte to kyng Henry the viij. in the xxxvij. yeare of his reygne, with declaracyons enlarged by Johan Bale (STC 15445, Davies 21)*.⁶⁹ In this Bale refers to Leland's *Viri illustres*, 'into iiii bokes deuyded', and to his own *Summariium*:

Sumwhat more is it than a yeare past, sens I put fourth a worke of the same argument, entytled *de scriptoribus Britannicis*, conteynynge .v. bokes wyth serten addycyons whych I gathered togyther beyng out of the realme. Sens I returned agayne therunto, by the serche of dyuerse most ruynously spoiled, broaken vp, and dyspersed lybraryes, I haue collected by no small labour and dylygence, so muche as wyll make so many bokes more, besydes the necessarye recognycyon and frutefull augmentacyon of the seyd first worke.⁷⁰

At the back of the book, by way of advertisement, Bale included 'Regystre of the names of Englysh wryters, whome the seconde part of my worke, *De scriptoribus Britannicis*, shall comprehend as it cometh fourth', in which he describes his work in libraries in Cambridge, Oxford, London, Norwich, and elsewhere, particularly in East Anglia (territory similar to that accessible to Henry de Kirkestede nearly two hundred years before):

Among the stacyoners and boke bynders, I found many notable Antiquitees, of whom I wrote out the tytles, tymes, and begynnynge, that we myghte at the least shewe the names of them, though we haue not as now their whole workes to shewe.⁷¹

At Norwich Bale says that he found books in the hands of grocers, candlemakers, soapsellers, 'and other worldly occupyers', but he recorded what he could

concerning the authors names and titles of their workes, . . . and as much wold I haue done through out the whole realm, yf I had bene able to haue borne the charges, as I am not.⁷²

68. STC 1295 (followed by Shaaber B89) described the original state of the book, dated 31 July 1548, with no imprint on the title-page but a colophon on fol. 248^r, 'excusumque fuit Gippeswici in Anglia per Ioannem Ouerton', and the same date; more commonly found is the altered state, with the year 1549 (MDXLVIII) at the foot of the title-page, which now also has an imprint, 'Wesaliae per Theodoricum Plateanum' (STC 1296, Davies 16, Shaaber B90), though the colophon remains unchanged. Bale, in his additions to Leland's *A newe yeares gyfte* (n. 31 above), says, 'Sens I returned home agayne from Germany, where as I both collected and emprented my symple worke, *de scriptoribus Britannicis*' (sig. G2^r).

69. The date in the title indicates that the work was intended for the king on 1 January 1546. This work was included in William Huddesford's *The Lives of John Leland, Thomas Hearne, and Anthony à Wood*, Oxford, 1772 (and reprinted from here in 1993 by Chandler, *John Leland's 'Itinerary'* [n. 40 above], pp. 1–15); also ed. W. A. Copinger, *Bibliographiana*, 1, Manchester, 1895.

70. *A newe yeares gyfte* (n. 31 above), sig. D1^v; quoted by Poole and Bateson (n. 23 above), pp. xix–xx.

71. *A newe yeares gyfte* (n. 31 above), sig. G2^v–3^f. The list of writers' names occupyes nineteen pages (sigs G4^f–H5^f) and comprises some 517 names.

72. *A newe yeares gyfte* (n. 31 above), sig. G3^v–v.

THE ENGLISH BIBLIOGRAPHICAL TRADITION

Bale had been able to borrow the draft of Leland's *Viri illustres* from John Cheke, and had transcribed what he could while the manuscript was in his hands. He had then prepared a fair copy, reorganized and abridged, but often interleaved with his own researches.⁷³ He equipped this with a prologue, and it appears to have been his intention to print it as a sequel to his *Summarium*, the work of two authors, rather like his edition of Leland's *A newe yeares gyfte*, but if so this was overtaken by other plans. He was also able to make use of other notes made by Leland that do not now survive. Bale appears to have stepped in quite deliberately to fill Leland's place as a bibliographer at a time when the more celebrated antiquary ceased to be able to work. In so doing, he avoided taking over Leland's title, *De viris illustribus*, and so makes a formal break with that ancient tradition.

The detailed progress of Bale's own research is available to us in a notebook, begun about this time. It mostly reflects his twelve months' exploring of manuscript books between his return to England in 1548 and his publishing Leland's *A newe yeares gyfte* in 1549. Bale continued to add notes down to 1552, and some further notes were added still later. For a few months, between December 1552 and September 1553, Bale lived in Ireland as bishop of Ossory, with his cathedral at Kilkenny; but the succession of Queen Mary caused him to flee again to the Continent, leaving behind a considerable library of manuscripts and printed books; many were irretrievably lost to him, including the Bury copy of Henry de Kirkestede's *Catalogus*.⁷⁴ The notebook, however, went with him to Germany, and it played its part while he drafted the enlarged edition of his work on the writers of Britain, published at Basel in September 1557 under the title *Scriptorum illustrium maioris Britanniae, quam nunc Angliam & Scotiam vocant: multorumque aliorum, qui in eadem vixerunt et obierunt insula, Catalogus . . . usque ad annum hunc Domini 1556*. This advertised twelve books on the original title-page, but only one copy in this state is known.⁷⁵ The common state, issued in the same month, alters the year to 1557 and advertises in its title only nine books, each treating one hundred authors, which corresponds to the contents of the volume.⁷⁶ This

73. This copy is now MS Cambridge, Trinity College R. 7. 15, with the title in Bale's hand, 'Opus Joannis Lelandi de illustribus viris Anglice nationis a Joanne Balyo apud hibernos episcopo epitomatum ac plerisque in locis emendatum et auctum'. The evidence for his borrowing Leland's work from John Cheke in 1548 is provided by John Foxe; see C. Brett and J. P. Carley's introduction to the reprint of Poole and Bateson (n. 23 above), Woodbridge, 1990, p. xiv n. 14. The allusion in the title and elsewhere to his being bishop of Ossory suggests that the fair copy, at least, dates from the brief period in 1552–3 when Bale was in Ireland, certainly not earlier.

74. McCusker, *John Bale* (n. 62 above), pp. 29–54; W. O'Sullivan, 'The Irish "Remnaunt" of John Bale's Manuscripts', in *New Science out of Old Books: Studies in Manuscripts and Early Printed Books in Honour of A. I. Doyle*, Aldershot, 1995, pp. 374–87, corrects and extends her identification of surviving books.

75. Now preserved in the British Library, shelf mark 598.i.13; Davies, p. 269, mistakenly places this second in his catalogue of editions, 26b; Shaaber B91. This copy lacks all other preliminary pages, but the colophon has the date of completion, September 1557; it shows that a title-page had been set up in the early stages of the work. When printing was finished, later than foreseen, the title was reset and shortened with the date 1557 when the preliminaries were added.

76. Davies 21b; Shaaber B92. Bale's own annotated copy survives, now in the British Library, shelf mark C.28 m.6. It was owned by Sir William Glynne, Bt, of Amersden, in the 1690s, when it was borrowed by Tanner (and variously cited as 'Bale MS. Glynn.', 'Bal. Glyn.', etc.). It later passed through the hands of the

RICHARD SHARPE

work was dedicated to Ottheinrich (1502–1559), Elector Palatine of the Rhine from 1556, who founded the Palatine Library in Heidelberg and brought the Reformation to the Palatinate.⁷⁷ An address to the reader on the final leaf promises three more books to make a total of twelve, in line with the earliest title-page. In the course of printing, it seems, a decision had been made to split the book into two. When the second, much briefer, volume followed in 1559, it added a further five books and five hundred authors, not counting some seventy or so included without numbers between Books XII and XIII. Tucked away among the latter is a short entry for Queen Elizabeth, who ‘claruit anno 1558 quo haec edidimus’.⁷⁸ The change of monarch was more publicly recognized in a new dedication added to the first volume in March 1559.⁷⁹

These two published volumes represent a massive increase in scale since the original *Summarium*, nearly fifteen hundred writers instead of five hundred. A dozen authorities, including both ‘Bostonus Buriensis’ (as Henry de Kirkestede was by now renamed) and Leland, are mentioned on the title-page of the first volume.⁸⁰ It completely supplanted the earlier edition, which is now consulted only by those curious to trace the progress of Bale’s knowledge of a writer’s work. Bale’s *Catalogus* was widely read, and it ensured that the names of many Latin writers from Great Britain were known to European scholars, along with the titles of their works. It has been used mainly as a quarry of information on writers, but Bale linked his bibliographical work in the manner of Leland with his polemical view of the history of the English Church.⁸¹ His at times intemperate digressions on the Roman Catholic Church, its successions of ‘Papae uel

antiquary White Kennett (1660–1728), vicar of Amersden from 1685 to 1700. In 1715 Kennett, by then dean of Peterborough, had lent the book to Thomas Baker in Cambridge, who transcribed Bale’s notes (now MS BL Harley 7045, pp. 241–52); from this copy they were printed by Thomas Hearne in his *Johannis de Trokelowe Annales Eduardi II*, Oxford, 1729, pp. 276–92, 426. It was sold in 1728, and Hearne was aware that it was bought by Robert Harley (C. E. Wright, *Fontes Harleiani*, London, 1972, p. 61). It has the later bookplate of the lawyer Philip Carteret Webb (1700–1770), who presumably bought it from Harley.

77. *Ottheinrich: Gedenkschrift zur vierhundertjährigen Wiederkehr seiner Kurfürstenzeit in der Pfalz (1556–1559)*, ed. G. Poensgen, Heidelberg, 1956.

78. Bale, *Catalogus*, II, p. 112; the same date is included in a similar way in several other entries on pp. 112–13.

79. Two states issued in 1559 are briefly described by Shaaber B93, B94, which are more fully described as three states by Davies; Davies 26c, 26d add or substitute the new dedication; Davies 26e alters the tally of books on the title-page to fourteen – that is, to include the five in the second volume.

80. This list is more focused than that in the *Summarium* (above, p. 90). Jerome, Prosper, Isidore, Freulf, Sigebert, and Foresti are omitted; added are Bede, Boston of Bury, John Wheathampstead, John Capgrave, Laurentius Burellus, and John Leland. In his edition of *A neue yeares gyfte* (n. 31 above), sig. D1^v, Bale had also mentioned ‘Suidas Grecus’ and Hildefonus of Toledo.

81. Fairfield, *John Bale* (n. 62 above), pp. 96–100, seeks to emphasize, unpersuasively in my view, how the organization of the authors in *centuriae* reinforces Bale’s reading of history. ‘It is not at all clear that the antiquarian motive preceded the polemical one. . . . To argue that the antiquarian motive was primary (either in time or importance) would be to impose our modern preferences upon him’ (p. 97). To Bale antiquarian knowledge was always meaningful, yet the meaning he drew from his research changed over the years. The conception of the work long pre-dated Bale’s polemical obsessions and must be linked with his wish to accomplish what Leland had been working towards; only in bringing it to fruition does Bale superimpose a skeleton of his later historical polemic.

THE ENGLISH BIBLIOGRAPHICAL TRADITION

Antichristi Romani', and (perhaps) the near impossibility of authenticating much that is said, have left Bale's reputation lower than Leland's.

In matters of fact, it is true, Bale cannot always be relied upon, for he would guess or amplify what he knew without indicating that he was doing so. In any matter of colour – someone's personal qualities, for example – he would not just guess but would traduce his cited sources. The Franciscan John Pecham, archbishop of Canterbury, for example, is described as

equus ad Antichristi usum ferocissimus. Erat hic primo ex parentum fortunis pauper, sed animo semper superbus et arrogans, eloquio, incessu, ac gestu pompaticus, ut eum Trevetus depingit.⁸²

a horse very fierce in the service of the Pope. He was at first poor because of the family he was born into, but in spirit he was always proud and arrogant, showy in speech, deportment, and conduct, as Trevet depicts him.

What the fourteenth-century Dominican Nicholas Trevet said was very different in tone:

ordinis sui zelator erat precipuus, carminum dictator egregius, gestus affatusque pompatici, mentis tamen benigne, et animi admodum liberalis.⁸³

he was a prominent defender of his order, an outstanding composer of verse, a person of extravagant gesture and speech, yet of gentle mind, and quite liberal spirit.

The one perceived fault has been emphasized at the expense of his qualities. Bale's words 'ex parentum fortunis pauper' are no more than rhetoric: Pecham had written on the subject of apostolic poverty, an active issue among Franciscans in his time, but Bale knew nothing of Pecham's family, poor or otherwise; the jibe comes only from his hostility to the friars.

In spite of such failings, however, Bale can provide modern scholars with more information than Leland does, because we are more often able to see behind the published text to Bale's sources. The notebook in which he began to organize his information supplementary to the *Summarium* turns up again in the library of the seventeenth-century antiquary John Selden (1584–1653). With the greater part of Selden's books, it came into the Bodleian Library in 1659 and is now MS Selden Supra 64 (SC 3452).⁸⁴ This was published in 1902 under the editorial title *Index Britanniae scriptorum*, edited by R. L. Poole and Mary Bateson. The first sentence of their preface says that this notebook 'has been long known and often used by editors of mediaeval texts'. It was not known to Tanner, however, and I do not know when it was first brought to light again.⁸⁵ It has very considerable value for bibliography, because here Bale usually shows where he

82. Bale, *Summarium*, fol. 121^r; id., *Catalogus*, I, p. 348.

83. Nicholas Trevet, *Annales sex regum Angliae*, ed. T. Hog, London, 1845, p. 300. The example is cited by Fairfield, *John Bale* (n. 62 above), pp. 208–9.

84. The route from Bale to Selden is unknown. John Selden's copies of Bale's *Summarium* (1548) and *Catalogus* (1557–9) are in the Bodleian, 4^o Th. Seld. B. 38 and B. 5. 15 Th. Seld.; they are not annotated.

85. Tanner, *Bibliotheca*, pp. 69–71, cites from several of Bale's *collectanea*, among them MS Bodleian Library, Selden Supra 41 (SC 3429), but he makes no mention of MS Selden Supra 64 here and does not employ it in his work. It is not mentioned by Mandell Creighton in his *DNB* article on John Bale, which

RICHARD SHARPE

found his information on particular copies of texts. This allows us to control for his own errors of interpretation and identification. Particularly useful is Bale's recording of incipits, which frequently allows us to discover what texts he saw, even when he misinterpreted the books in which he found them.

INTERACTION BETWEEN LELAND AND BALE

What is often not sufficiently appreciated is that Bale had been interested in work of this kind for well over twenty years before he published his *Summarium*. He was making notes on English Carmelites and their writings as early as the 1520s, and these notes have come down to us in MS Bodleian Library, Bodley 73 (SC 27635), a book which was later used by Thomas Tanner before being presented to the Bodleian in 1710 by Dr Hans Sloane.⁸⁶ Other surviving notebooks, and even some finished works, have been little consulted, though they can be of some importance in tracing his sources and understanding his interpretations.⁸⁷ Also relevant are the notes Bale left in the medieval manuscripts he handled – his hand is quite recognizable – some of which may be followed through into his own works.⁸⁸

The personal relationship between Bale and Leland dated back well before Bale's sudden claiming of Leland's mantle on his return to England in 1548. The first evidence of contact between them comes in 1536, the year in which Bale left the order. Bale's *Anglorum Heliades* on English Carmelites – a work in the tradition of *virii illustres* belonging to a religious order – was dedicated to Leland in 1536, and Leland wrote to Cromwell on Bale's behalf in 1537.⁸⁹ The extent of their contact over the three years before Bale left England is impossible to discover, but it is apparent that Leland was able to make use of Bale's Carmelite collections, for he sometimes cites him by name, e.g. in connexion with 'Gulielmus Carmelita', tutor to Thomas Netter of Walden.⁹⁰ References to Bale are

appeared in 1885. Indeed, the first reference I have found comes from R. L. Poole himself, in the *DNB* in 1886, s.n. Brunyard, William, *fl.* 1350 (a ghost).

86. Sharpe, 'Thomas Tanner' (n. 41 above), pp. 394–5.

87. Bale's surviving notebooks, which in some cases preserve extracts from otherwise lost texts, are: notes on Carmelite histories made in Cambridge (MS Cambridge, University Library Ff. 6. 28, c.1515–20); *Collectiones Gallicae* (MS BL Harley 1819, c.1525–7); *Collectiones Germanicae* (MS Bodleian Library, Bodley 73 [SC 27635], c.1523–7); further notes on Carmelite histories (MS BL Harley 3838, fols 118–249); extracts from (mainly) Carmelite works (MS BL Cotton Titus D. X, fols 101^r–194^r); the so-called *Index Britanniae scriptorum* (MS Bodleian Library, Selden Supra 64); and *Varia doctorum virorum* (MS Bodleian Library, Selden Supra 41, fols 17^r–106^v). Described among Bale's works by Tanner, *Bibliotheca* (n. 57 above), pp. 68–70; Fairfield, *John Bale* (n. 62 above), pp. 157–64.

88. For example, Bale owned a copy of *Fasciculi zizaniorum*, now MS Bodleian Library, e Musaeo 86 (SC 3629), written around 1439; in it he 'has written many notes, filled up blank leaves, and contributed indexes' (as the *Summary Catalogue* reports); one of his additions is dated 1543, showing that the manuscript accompanied Bale in his first exile.

89. Above, p. 103 and n. 67.

90. Leland, *Scriptores*, p. 438. The entry is meant to refer to William Ufford OCarm but confusion with William Woodford OFM appears to have crept in (R. Sharpe, *A Handlist of the Latin Writers of Great Britain and Ireland before 1540*, Turnhout, 1997, p. 815). Surprisingly, Ufford does not appear in Bale's *Anglorum Heliades*, nor in his *Summarium*, nor in his notebook, nor in his *Catalogus*.

THE ENGLISH BIBLIOGRAPHICAL TRADITION

also found in his *collectanea*.⁹¹ In other instances, we can infer that Bale was Leland's source. So, for example, it was almost certainly Bale who made the work of Laurentius Burellus on Carmelites accessible to Leland.⁹² Bale's account of John Kenningham, a Carmelite from Suffolk, like himself, served as the source for Leland's list of works, which includes incipits for most of them; none of these works survives.⁹³ Leland at one point refers to his friend who had visited the libraries of Norwich – a town whose libraries were thoroughly explored by Bale – and found there a copy of the mythography associated with Master Alberic of London, 'Albricius de origine deorum'; in his own copy of Leland's work, Bale makes it clear that he was himself Leland's source here.⁹⁴

Co-operation in the 1530s, before Bale's first exile, lay behind Bale's opportunity to gain unrestricted access to Leland's manuscripts in 1548, when he found himself pursuing his interests now with neither help nor rival. During the eight crucial years of separation, however, Leland polished his *Viri illustres* and Bale composed his *Summarium*. What Leland knew of Bale's collections pre-dated anything that Bale published; he wrote his *Viri illustres* without sight of the *Summarium*. What Bale had seen of Leland's collections before 1540 is now far from clear. References to Leland in the *Summarium* will need to be collected and compared with the primary level of drafting in the manuscript of *Viri illustres*, if we are to establish how much Bale had been able to derive from sight of that work before 1540.

Now, in his first account of Alberic of London, published in 1548 and uninfluenced by Leland, he wrote:

Albricius Londinensis, Anglus natione, prima literarum rudimenta Cantabrigiae et Oxonii in florentissimis Anglorum academiis didicit, atque altiora postmodum aliis in regionibus perquisivit. Est Londinum amplissima civitas, urbium regni caput... Admodum pauca de hoc viro historici tradunt, nisi quod fuerit philosophus ac medicus nobilissimus atque omni bonarum disciplinarum genere peritus. Ingenium habebat foelix, et ad literas quodammodo natum, ut ex operibus constat. Reliquit vero nobis rarissimae doctrinae suae pignora, et eximia et multa, quamvis haec sola in Bibliothecis viderim.

<i>De origine deorum,</i>	Lib. 1	<i>Fuit vir in Aegypto ditissimus</i>
<i>De ratione veneni</i>	Lib. 1	<i>Ratio veneno potissime convenit</i>

91. For example, in MS Bodleian Library, Top. gen. c. 3, p. 53, on John Toney's works at the Austin friary in London, he noted, 'Ioannes Baleus, si recte memini, significavit mihi se vidisse epistolam Grece scriptam ab hoc Tuneio' (*The Friars' Libraries*, ed. K. W. Humphreys, London, 1990, p. 9); MS Bodleian Library, Top. gen. c. 3, p. 56, on a work of Thomas Gascoigne at Osney abbey, 'In libro Balei de Baccalaureis Carmel' ordinis, erat mentio de Thoma Gascoyne, baccalaurio Oxoniensi, sed is ait Carmelitam hominem fuisse non magnae eruditionis' (*The Libraries of the Augustinian Canons*, eds M. T. J. Webber and A. G. Watson, Corpus of British Medieval Library Catalogues, 6, London, 1998, p. 404). The source appears not to be *Anglorum Heliades*, but must be another of Bale's collections.

92. The work is known only through Bale's transcripts (above, pp. 88–9 and n. 14). Leland quotes from it a couplet about the Carmelite holy man Simon Stock (*Scriptores*, p. 294) and six lines on John Baconsthorpe (*ibid.*, pp. 350–51).

93. Bale, *Anglorum Heliades* (n. 14 above), fols 21^v, 73^{r-v}; Leland, *Scriptores*, p. 386; Bale, *Summarium*, fol. 158^{r-v}; Bale, *Catalogus*, I, pp. 457–8.

94. Leland, *Scriptores*, pp. 301–2; see below, pp. 111–12.

RICHARD SHARPE

Virtutes antiquorum, Lib. 1 *Quoniam misericordia & veritas*
Canones speculativos, Lib. 1

In re medica ac philosophia plura edidisse comprobatur, quae sparsim habentur in Anglorum Bibliothecis. In penultimo tractatu . . . Claruisse fertur anno ex quo salus mundo contigit .1090. in Anglia regnante Guilhelmo Rufo.⁹⁵

Albricius of London, an Englishman, learnt the basics of scholarship at Cambridge and Oxford in the very flourishing universities of the English, and afterwards he sought out higher learning in other countries. London is a large city, chief of the cities of the realm . . . Writers of history provide little enough about the man, beyond the fact that he was a philosopher and a distinguished physician, skilled in every kind of good learning. He had a happy talent, a native disposition towards learning, as appears from his works. He has left us many and outstanding tokens of his unusual learning, though these are the only works I have seen in libraries:

De origine deorum, 1 book *Fuit vir in Aegypto ditissimus*
De ratione veneni 1 book *Ratio veneno potissime convenit*
Virtutes antiquorum, 1 book *Quoniam misericordia & veritas*
Canones speculativos 1 book

In the fields of medicine and philosophy he is known to have published many works, which can be found here and there in English libraries. In the last treatise but one . . . He is said to have flourished in the year of salvation 1090, during the reign of William Rufus.

Some of this must be mere guesswork: the whole notion of Alberic's medical interest may derive merely from the title *De ratione veneni*, though the work, nowhere ascribed to Alberic, was in fact concerned with sins and their moral remedies.⁹⁶ The title *Virtutes antiquorum* similarly can have nothing to do with Alberic: the incipit shows it to be the *Breviloquium de virtutibus antiquorum principum* by John Waleys.

When Bale came across the work of Henry de Kirkestede, during the year following the publication of the *Summarium*, he might have noted the reference to a work attributed to Alberic under the title *Poetarium*, but without an incipit there he had not the means to recognize this as the text listed by him under the title *De origine deorum*.⁹⁷

Express contact with Leland's *Viri illustres* comes later. In the prologue to Bale's reworked transcript, composed in 1553, he refers to the draft, 'mutilum, vagum, ac undique indigestum opus (nam primum eius collectaneum erat)' ('an incomplete, formless, and altogether unrevised work (for it was his initial draft)'), saying that he excerpted it, not having the time to assimilate it all. He goes on to affirm that Leland had revised the whole work in four books; he had not himself seen the finished work, but (if Bale can be believed) there were trustworthy men alive who had seen and handled

95. Bale, *Summarium*, fols 74^v–75^r.

96. For a detailed account of the circulation of this work, Malachias, *De veneno*, under several authors and various titles, see R. Sharpe, *Titulus: Identifying Medieval Latin Texts*, Turnhout, 2003, pp. 218–45.

97. Henry's source was Vincent of Beauvais, who provides no more than the name 'Albericus' and the title, so that Henry himself had no means of matching the work under its different titles nor of inferring that the writer was English; Rouse and Rouse, *Henry of Kirkestede* (n. 25 above), p. 146 (K73).

THE ENGLISH BIBLIOGRAPHICAL TRADITION

it.⁹⁸ Bale's personalized transcript of *Viri illustres* adds one significant gloss to Leland's words concerning Alberic. I quote Leland with Bale's additions in angle-brackets:

Albricius <seu Albericus Londinensis> merito inter eruditos collocandus, sed eius tenuis ad meas pervenit aures cognitio. Constat interim ex veteris codicis inscriptione fuisse eum urbis Londinensis alumnum. Diverterat amicus quidem in meam gratiam <Ioannes Balaeus> Ventam Icenorum seu Nordovicum, excussurus bibliothecas ibidem bonis libris refertas: hoc nomine ut mihi eo paulo post venturo labor in eadem parte tum expeditior, tum gratior esset. Multos ille autores a me non ante aut visos aut lectos exquisivit, inter quos et Albricius de origine Deorum comparuit. Coniecturis tantum ducor eum fuisse, temporibus Ioannis et Henrici tercii regum Anglicorum, celebrem.⁹⁹

Albricius <or Alberic of London> deserves his place among the learned, though only the merest whisper of him has reached my ears. It is evident, none the less, from the *titulus* of an old manuscript that he was brought up in the city of London. Indeed a dear friend <John Bale> went out of his way for my sake to Venta Icenorum (Norwich) to riffle through the libraries there stuffed with good books: he did this so that, when I came there a little later, my own work would go more quickly and pleasantly. He sought out many authors, whom I had not previously seen or read, among whom Albricius's work *De origine Deorum* appeared. I am led by no more than guesswork to say that his career was at its peak in the reigns of the English kings John and Henry III.

Bale memorializes his own contribution by identifying himself as the friend who visited Norwich, and it appears that Leland had nothing to go on but what Bale had found. Unlike Bale, however, Leland spells out that the association with London derived from the inscription accompanying the text. If he had truly seen such an inscription, it is strange that he does not say so when he copied out the title in his notes on books seen around the country. Here he wrote simply, 'Albricius de origine deorum, furto sublatus'. This is one of fifteen titles noted by Leland at the Norwich Carmel, the very convent where Bale had entered the order. Perhaps the theft occurred between Bale's visit and Leland's.¹⁰⁰ Even allowing that Leland was aware of a copy at Norwich, this

98. MS Cambridge, Trinity College R. 7. 15, fol. 2^r: 'Aliud longe praeclarium ac ingens eiusdem tituli opus Lelandus adhuc edidit, in quatuor distinctum libros [*whose scope is taken from A newe yeares gyfte: see above, n. 56*] . . . Nonnulli adhuc supersunt eruditi ac fide digni homines, qui mihi iuramento saepius affirmarunt, se non solum vidisse hoc elegantissimum Lelandi nostri consummatum opus, sed et tetigisse, manu vertisse, atque apud illum ipsum in eo legisse olim. Eam mihi faelicitatem ac pro patriae nostrae commoditate fortunam lucrificam non contigisse vehementer doleo. His nihilominus tanti thesauri minutis fragmentis, laetus repertor effectus, ad posteritatis usum ea servavi' ('Leland yet produced another huge and far more distinguished work of the same title, divided into four books. . . . There are several learned and trustworthy men still living who have often sworn to me that in the past they not only saw this most elegant finished work of our Leland, but touched it, handled it, even read in it in Leland's presence. I doubly regret that I missed that happy experience and our country has missed the benefit of the work. Being made happy none the less by my discovery of these small fragments from such a treasure, I have preserved them for the use of posterity'). See above, nn. 17, 55.

99. MS Bodleian Library, Top. gen. c. 4, p. 229; passages in angle-brackets added from Bale's copy, now MS Cambridge, Trinity College R. 7. 15, fols. 61^v–62^r, were noted by Tanner, *Bibliotheca* (n. 57 above), p. 19 n.

100. No Norfolk section of Leland's *Itinerary* has survived, but we may not conclude that he did not himself visit Norwich. At the cathedral priory there he made a similar note of books, ed. Sharpe, *English*

RICHARD SHARPE

chapter is not part of the primary level in his draft but one of the many later additions. The relationship becomes more perplexing in a paragraph added by Bale at the end of his copy of Leland.¹⁰¹ In it he assumes Leland's voice in writing about himself:

Ecce, quae tibi pie lector sum pollicitus, praestiti, nempe selectiorum quorundam Britannorum atque Anglorum, ab initio ad hanc aetatem, usque et acta et scripta, eaque tanto accuratius praestiti quanto Trithemius eorum causam remissius egit. Baleus vero clarius, lucidius, vigilantius. Diverterat quidem Amiculus ille in meam gratiam Ventam Icenorum atque aliorum, excussurus ibidem Bibliothecas bonis libris refertas, hoc nomine, ut mihi tandem venturo, labor in eadem parte et expeditior et gratior esset. Multos ille Autores a me non ante aut visos aut lectos exquisivit. Inter quos sunt Nennius rerum Britannicarum antiquissimus scriptor, Albritius de origine Deorum, Athelardus de rerum naturis, Lechbertus Theologus, Alexander Essebius, Rogerus Houedenus, Thomas Wiccicus, Radulphus Marham, et alii plerique consimiles. Hic ille Joannes Baleus Covensis est, homo Anglus in Sudovolgia natus, qui collectaneum quoddam de eruditis scriptoribus, sed tumultuaria opera, aetate hac nostra fecit, quo illustria Carmelitarum et Augustinianorum facta abunde depraedicat, atque multa edidit.

See, I have provided what I promised you, loyal reader, namely the deeds and writings of the more select British and English writers from the beginning to our own time, and I have provided all this as accurately as Trithemius had sloppily conducted their case. Bale, however, has done it better, more clearly, and more carefully. Indeed that dear Friend went out of his way for my sake to Norwich (among other places) to riffle through the libraries there stuffed with good books: he did this so that, when I came there a little later, my own work would go more quickly and pleasantly. He sought out many authors, whom I had not previously seen or read, among whom are Nennius the most ancient writer of British matters, Albritius on the origin of the Gods, Adelard on the natures of things, Lethbert the theologian, Alexander of Ashby, Roger of Howden, Thomas Wykes, Ralph Marham, and others of similar kind. This John Bale was from Cove, an Englishman born in Suffolk, who in our time put together a compilation on learned writers, working in haste, in which he demonstrates in full the deeds of Carmelites and Augustinians, and published many things.

Here Bale borrows words from more than one passage in Leland, including that in which Leland is disparaging about Bale's work on Carmelites,¹⁰² and yet he also puts into Leland's mouth praise of Bale's perspicuity. We can be sure that Bale was not Leland's primary source of information on Nennius, whose work Leland himself discovered at Jervaulx.¹⁰³ Alberic and Adelard both appear in Leland's list of titles at the Norwich Carmel, which may have been selected for him by Bale. There is no evidence that Bale was Leland's source of information on Alexander of Ashby or Roger of Howden, while Thomas Wykes and Ralph Marham are not mentioned by Leland in the draft as we know it. They appear to be introduced to the bibliographical tradition by Bale.

Benedictine Libraries (n. 23 above), pp. 306–8; referring to one of these titles in his *Scriptores*, p. 247, he specifically says that he had visited two years earlier.

101. Headed 'Conclusio totius operis', MS Cambridge, Trinity College R. 7. 15, fol. 159^v. There is a second version of the same paragraph, headed 'Totius operis conclusio', on fol. 160^{r-v}.

102. Above, p. 103 and n. 66.

103. Above, pp. 98–9.

THE ENGLISH BIBLIOGRAPHICAL TRADITION

If Bale was here claiming credit that he felt Leland had not given him, it must seem perverse that, in his *Catalogus* written later in the 1550s, he chose explicitly to follow Leland on Alberic, though he had claimed to be Leland's source. Yet he did not, perhaps could not, direct the reader to where he might read Leland for himself.¹⁰⁴ Elsewhere Bale was open about his substantial use of Leland in the *Catalogus* as a whole.¹⁰⁵ His second account of Alberic, with his transcript of Leland's draft now to hand, is a confection of his own first attempt and Leland's words:

Albricius Londinensis (sunt qui Albericum potius dici putent) merito inter eruditos collocandus accedit: sed eius, inquit Lelandus, tenuis admodum ad nostras pervenit aures cognitio. Interim tamen constat, ex veteris codicis inscriptione, fuisse eum urbis Londinensis alumnum. Est Londinum amplissima civitas, urbium Anglici regni caput, . . . Chronographi haec pauca de Albricio tradunt, quod philosophus et historicus fuerit, omnisque bonarum disciplinarum generis peritus. Quod prima in Anglorum academiis literarum rudimenta didicerit, et severiora dogmata in aliis postmodum perquisiverit regionibus. Ingenium foelix, ut ex scriptis apparet, et ad scientias natum habebat. Unde nobis haec reliquit rarissimae suae doctrinae pignora, scilicet,

<i>De origine deorum,</i>	Lib. 1	<i>Fuit in Aegypto ditissimus</i>
<i>Virtutes antiquorum,</i>	Lib. 1	<i>Quoniam misericordia & veritas</i>
<i>Canones speculativas,</i>	Lib. 1	

Atque alia plura. In penultimo tractatu, antiquos philosophos ac provinciarum principes per multifarias eorum depinxit virtutes. Coniecturis Lelandus ducitur, hunc fuisse celebrem anno Christi 1217, sub Ioanne et Henrico filio regibus.¹⁰⁶

Albricius of London (there are those who think he should rather be called Alberic) deservedly takes his place among the learned, though, as Leland says, only a little whisper of him has reached our ears. None the less, it is evident from the *titulus* of an old manuscript that he was brought up in the city of London. London is a large city, chief of the cities of the English realm . . . Annalists provide these few facts about Albricius, that he was a philosopher and a historian, skilled in every kind of good learning. He learnt the basics of scholarship in the universities of the English, and afterwards he sought out harder learning in other countries . . . He had a happy talent, as is clear from his writings, an inborn disposition towards study. He has left us these tokens of his exceptional learning:

<i>De origine deorum,</i>	1 book	<i>Fuit in Aegypto ditissimus</i>
<i>Virtutes antiquorum,</i>	1 book	<i>Quoniam misericordia & veritas</i>
<i>Canones speculativas,</i>	1 book	

And much else. In the last treatise but one he portrayed philosophers and rulers of antiquity through their manifold merits. Leland was led by guesswork to say that his career was at its peak around 1217 in the reigns of King John and his son King Henry.

104. Bale did sometimes refer to the work by its title, e.g. in a note on the *vates* of ancient Britain: 'qui de his plura adhuc scire desiderat, Lelandum nostrum quaerat de Viris illustribus' (*Catalogus*, I, p. 5).

105. In his entry on Leland, *Catalogus*, I, p. 672, he concludes with these words: 'Non modicam huius operis partem ex hoc autore desumpsi' ('I have drawn no small part of this work from this author'), adding a quotation from Leland's verses.

106. Bale, *Catalogus*, I, p. 267.

RICHARD SHARPE

Bale openly states his reliance on Leland here, and takes over much of his wording, though it is little more than padding. He now chose also to follow Leland's conjecture on Alberic's date, where in the earlier work Bale had dated him to c.1090. It seems that respect for Leland was stronger than resentment that Leland may not have given him his due credit, but by now Leland was dead and Bale could take his place, for he was the only published English bibliographer. It is true that neither had a remotely complete perception of the work they refer to as *De origine deorum*, which was usually entitled *Poetarius* or *Scintillarium poetarum* in the Middle Ages.¹⁰⁷ Both were aware of other copies of it, not ascribed to Alberic, but they did not make the connexion.¹⁰⁸ Nor did they know who Alberic of London was: he has been identified in modern times with Master Alberic, canon of St Paul's Cathedral in London, who is documented from 1149 or earlier until 1162.¹⁰⁹ On the question whether he was in reality the author, there is still much uncertainty.¹¹⁰

REPUTATIONS

The next hundred and fifty years – a golden age of English antiquaries – were kinder to the reputations of Henry de Kirkestede and of John Leland than they were to John Bale. Perhaps it helped to be unpublished. In Henry's case the manuscript of his work resurfaced in Ireland, c.1606, in the possession of James Ussher (twenty years before he became archbishop of Armagh). Some scholars were so eager to cite Boston of Bury that they did so even where they had seen only Bale's published *Catalogus* (the case

107. The text was first printed as *Allegoriae poeticae, seu de veritate ac expositione poeticarum fabularum*, Paris: J. de Marnef, 1520; it was reprinted several times in the 16th and 17th centuries. The work has been known as the third Vatican mythographer since the edition by Angelo Mai, *Mythographus tertius de diis gentium et illorum allegoriis*, *Classici auctores e Vaticanis codicibus*, 3, Rome, 1831, pp. 161–277, repr. *Scriptores rerum mythicarum Latini tres Romae nuper reperti*, ed. G. H. Bode, Zelle, 1834, pp. 152–256. The ascription to Alberic is found in a number of continental copies; English copies more commonly ascribe the work to Alexander Nequam.

108. Leland had noted copies of the text at Plympton Priory ('Alexfacius de diis gentibus') and in the Franciscan convent at Reading ('Alexandri \Necham/ mythologicon'). The latter copy was also noted by Bale, 'Mithologian, alio nomine Sintillarium', who also recorded the incipit (Bale, *Index Britanniae scriptorum* [n. 23 above], p. 27). Bale also saw the entry for 'Scintillarium poetarum vel methodogias' among Nequam's works in Henry de Kirkestede (Rouse and Rouse, *Henry of Kirkestede* [n. 25 above], p. 103 [K4. 21]; Bale, *Index Britanniae scriptorum*, p. 25, where he turned the title into two works).

109. E. Rathbone, 'Master Alberic and Alberic of London: Mythographus Tertius Vaticanus', *Mediaeval & Renaissance Studies*, 1, 1941–3, pp. 35–8, showed that the work was already cited as 'Magister Albericus Londoniensis in suo Poetario' by Helinand of Froidmont at the beginning of the 13th century (MS BL Cotton Claudius B. ix, fol. 103^v); she drew attention to the canon of St Paul's in charters then recently published by M. Gibbs, *Early Charters of the Cathedral Church of St Paul, London*, Camden 3rd ser., 58, London, 1939; D. E. Greenway, *Fasti ecclesiae Anglicanae 1066–1300*, I: *St Paul's, London*, London, 1968, p. 86. Froidmont is a few miles south-east of Beauvais, where Helinand was taught by the English master Ralph of Beauvais; set alongside Vincent of Beauvais, who was Henry de Kirkestede's source (above, n. 97), have we here a focus of early dissemination of the text?

110. C. S. F. Burnett, 'A Note on the Origins of the Third Vatican Mythographer', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 44, 1981, pp. 160–66, shows that it is quoted in a source which he dates to a point in the 12th century earlier than the period when Alberic was a canon of London.

THE ENGLISH BIBLIOGRAPHICAL TRADITION

with Vossius).¹¹¹ Thomas Fuller referred to it as ‘esteemed the *Rarity of Rarities* by the Lovers of Antiquity’s; he had never seen a copy, and he overstated Boston’s influence on the English tradition.¹¹² Leland’s reputation as an antiquary grew with time, though few can have seen his manuscripts.

Bale, on the other hand, was familiar, because he was in print; the others possessed mystique. In England a century after his own time he was given the epithet ‘bilious Bale’ by Fuller, often repeated.¹¹³ Bale’s manuscripts seem to have been little regarded. I know no evidence that Selden made use of the notebook, and it was not used by Thomas Tanner, though it should certainly have been accessible to him in the Bodleian Library. The Oxford antiquary Thomas Hearne makes no reference to it, though he was glad enough to acquire two volumes of Bale’s collections for the Bodleian from Hans Sloane in 1710, and Humfrey Wanley surely knew what he was acquiring for Robert Harley when he obtained one of Bale’s notebooks and his fair copy of *Anglorum Heliades*.¹¹⁴

From the 1550s to the 1690s, however, English antiquaries were in truth not much concerned with literary antiquities, except in so far as medieval manuscripts were obviously antiquities. There was little interest in bibliography of the kind that had interested Leland and Bale. During Queen Elizabeth’s reign, the long tradition of the past was contrasted with the lack of scholars of international repute in contemporary England. The Cambridge classicist Nicholas Carr (1524–1568) delivered an address, *De scriptorum Britannicorum paucitate, et studiorum impedimentis, oratio*, still unpublished when he died. It was edited in 1576 by Thomas Hatcher (? 1539–1583). The blame was attached to the want of a learned, Latin press in England. In a letter attached to the edition Hatcher reveals that he had himself planned a work for which Tanner made up the fitting title *De viris illustribus Academiae Cantabrig(iensis)*, describing it as composed ‘iuxta methodum J. Balei in centuriis suis’ (‘along the lines of J. Bale’s centuries’).¹¹⁵ In 1581 Hatcher urged upon the London antiquary John Stow, among other things, the idea of publishing Leland’s ‘bookes De viris illustribus’.¹¹⁶ The suggestion was not acted upon.

111. Rouse and Rouse, *Henry of Kirkestede* (n. 25 above), p. ccii.

112. Thomas Fuller [1608–1661], *The History of the Worthies of England*, 3 vols, London, 1662, II, p. 166 (under Lincolnshire writers, as coming from Boston), ‘John Leland oweth as much to this John Boston as John Bale doth to him, and John Pits to them both’. Leland, in fact, never saw Boston’s compilation.

113. Fuller, *Worthies* (above, n. 112), III, p. 61.

114. MS BL Harley 1819 was obtained by Wanley himself (Wright, *Fontes Harleiani* [above, n. 76], p. 344); MS BL Harley 3838 came to Harley through Edward Kelsall and Thomas Baker, both of St John’s College, Cambridge (*ibid.*, pp. 60, 208), and Baker’s transcript was eventually acquired too, now MS BL Harley 7031, pp. 247–355.

115. Tanner, *Bibliotheca* (n. 57 above), p. 384. Anthony Wood’s copy of Carr, specifically cited by Tanner, *Bibliotheca*, p. 155, is now in the Bodleian, Wood 710. Hatcher prefixed a dedication to Thomas Wilson (1525–1581), educated like himself at Eton and King’s, at that date the queen’s ambassador to the Spanish Netherlands. He refers to his own work in a letter at the end of the edition, addressed to Jakob Middelndorp (1537–1611), in Cologne, whose work on universities was then between its second (1572) and third (1582) editions: ‘Qua de re alius nobis dicendi locus est propositus, qui Cantabrigiensium nostrorum diligenter excussis et eventilatis monumentis, duos libros ad Io. Balei centurias adicere olim statuimus’ (‘For this reason we have determined to discuss this matter in another place, who, after searching thoroughly through our records in Cambridge, at one time intended to add two books to the centuries of John Bale’).

116. Hatcher to Stow, 18 January 1580/81, MS BL Harley 374, fol. 14.

RICHARD SHARPE

Stow did, however, play his part in expanding the list of Chaucer's known works. From the early editions by Caxton and Pynson there was widespread interest in Chaucer as an English poet. Leland was certainly interested in Chaucer's work, and he was most likely acquainted personally with the royal clerk William Thynne (d. 1546), who in 1532 brought out a new collected edition of Chaucer's works. In the new edition that appeared in 1561, under the editorial direction of John Stow, twenty-three further works were added – most of them, it must be said, not authentic – and Stow continued to take an interest in Chaucer's life and works, influencing the later edition by Thomas Speight.¹¹⁷ This interest in the bibliography of one major figure does not compare with the work of Leland and Bale, but it shows that interest in collecting a medieval author's works had not entirely lapsed.

There were, it cannot be denied, others who did work in the tradition of Leland and Bale. The one whose work is most widely known was John Pits (1560–1616), an Englishman but for most of his life a Roman Catholic exiled on the Continent, who recast the published *Catalogus* of John Bale and continued it, mainly with the addition of Roman Catholic writers after the Reformation.¹¹⁸ For medieval Latin writers, Pits very rarely has any first-hand contribution to make, though he did make use of the *Ecloga Oxonio-Cantabrigiensis*, in which Thomas James (? 1573–1629) catalogued the works found in manuscript in the libraries of the English universities.¹¹⁹ Work by Henry Wharton (1664–1695) following the older English bibliographers was included as an appendix to William Cave's Anglican account of the long tradition of Christian authors, a book which appeared just in time to be of use to Thomas Tanner, who cites it very frequently.¹²⁰ From Ireland, Sir James Ware (1594–1666), an Anglican, drew up his own *De scriptoribus Hiberniae* (Dublin, 1639); Ware had access to the only known medieval

117. There are separate essays on these editions in *Editing Chaucer*, ed. P. G. Ruggiers, Norman, Okla., 1984; of particular relevance is A. M. Hudson on John Stow (pp. 53–70).

118. John Pits, *Relationum historicarum de rebus Anglicis tomus I*, Paris, 1619, repr. Farnborough, 1969. Pits claims Leland as his prototype, though he had no access to Leland's manuscripts; he reviled Bale as 'haereticus Anglus, ab ordine Carmelitarum apostata Monachus, et Sacerdos (salva lectoris reverentia) maritatus' ('an English heretic, an apostate monk from the order of Carmelites, and (saving the reader's piety) a married priest': p. 53), and his editor William Bishop even puns on Bale and Baal, 'infernus nobis evomuit Apostatam quendam nomine Balaenum (ut idoli Bal ministrum facile dignoscas)' ('Hell has spewed up an apostate named Bale (so you may easily recognize him as a servant of the idol Baal)': p. 9).

119. Pits, *Relationes* (n. 118 above), p. 60, explains his frequent references to copies in the libraries of Oxford and Cambridge, 'non quod dum haec scriberem illas bibliothecas consuluerim, sed quod Eglogam . . . perlegerim et inde quae mihi erant usui decerpserim' ('not because I consulted those libraries while writing this book but because . . . I had thoroughly read the *Ecloga* and extracted what was of use to me'). James's work was not on the face of it bibliographical, but it put into print a valuable quarry for future bibliographical work, as the title-page indicates: *Ecloga Oxonio-Cantabrigiensis, tributa in libros duos; quorum Prior continet catalogum confusum librorum manuscriptorum in illustrissimis bibliothecis duarum florentissimarum Academiarum Oxoniae et Cantabrigiae; Posterior catalogum eorundem distinctum et dispositum secundum quatuor facultates observato tam in nominibus quam in operibus ipsis alphabetico literarum ordine; ostensum est praeterea in hoc secundo libro quid a quoquo viro scriptum sit*, London, 1600.

120. William Cave [1637–1713], *Scriptorum ecclesiasticorum historia literaria a Christo nato usque ad saeculum XIV facili methodo digesta. Accedit ab alia manu [Henry Wharton, 1664–1695] appendix ab ineunte saeculo XIV ad annum usque MDXVII*, 2 vols, London, 1688–98.

THE ENGLISH BIBLIOGRAPHICAL TRADITION

copy of Henry de Kirkestede's work,¹²¹ and his own catalogue was used by Tanner as his main source for Irish writers. From Scotland Thomas Dempster (?1579–1625) was a Roman Catholic exile, who sought to present early and medieval Scotland as a home of learning, sometimes falsely appropriating writers who were not Scots, sometimes creating fictitious writers and works.¹²² His writings produced a storm of hostility from Irish Catholic scholars of his own and the next generation, since he claimed all medieval *Scoti* for Scotland in spite of the fact that the word more often signified someone from Ireland.¹²³ Irish scholars devoted their patriotic energy to national hagiography for the country which Marianus Scotus had called *Insula Sanctorum*.¹²⁴ Dempster's catalogue of writers was used by Tanner, but it is seriously unreliable and its claims often appear to be unfounded. The work attributed to his younger contemporary from Scotland, David Buchanan (?1595–1648/53), another controversialist, *De scriptoribus Scotis*, remained unpublished until 1837 and has exerted little or no influence.¹²⁵ Apart from Dempster, Tanner had another Scottish source, still untraced, which he cites as 'MS. Scriptorum Scotic(orum) penes dom(inum) Car(olum) Hatton'; in the 1690s Capt. Charles Hatton would encourage Tanner in other ways and played a part also in the publication of John Leland's manuscripts.¹²⁶

Yet even so, towards the end of the century there was a desire to get Henry de Kirkestede and Leland into public circulation.

It appears that an edition of Leland's *Scriptores* was contemplated by James Harrington (1664–1693) in the 1680s, but he died young. His papers, such as they were, passed to Thomas Tanner, who was at that time no more than about twenty years old.¹²⁷

121. He made a few excerpts, now MS BL Add. 4787 (s. XVII), fols 132^r–133^v, from the medieval copy, then in the possession of his patron and friend Archbishop James Ussher (1581–1656), whose library was housed at Drogheda until after 1641: Rouse and Rouse, *Henry of Kirkestede* (n. 25 above), p. cxcii.

122. Thomas Dempster, *Historia ecclesiastica gentis Scotorum; Qua viri sanctitate, literis, dignitatibus toto orbe illustres recensentur*, Bologna, 1627; 2nd edn, *Historia ecclesiastica gentis Scotorum; sive, De scriptoribus Scotis*, ed. David Irving [1778–1860], Bannatyne Club, 34, Edinburgh, 1829. Two recent studies are U. Morét, 'An Early Scottish National Biography: Thomas Dempster's *Historia ecclesiastica gentis Scotorum* (1627)', in *A Palace in the Wild: Essays on Vernacular Culture and Humanism in Late Medieval and Renaissance Scotland*, ed. L. A. J. R. Houwen, A. A. MacDonald, and S. L. Mapstone, Leuven, 2000, pp. 249–69 (which takes a generous view of this work), and J. Durkan, 'Thomas Dempster: A Scottish Baronius', *Innes Review*, 54, 2003, pp. 63–78 (for his career).

123. P. Grosjean, 'Un soldat de fortune au service des *Acta Sanctorum*: Philippe O'Sullivan Beare et Jean Bolland (1634)', *Analecta Bollandiana*, 81, 1963, pp. 418–46 (440–42); the replies his work generated by such scholars as David Rothe and Thomas Messingham are briefly noted by J. T. Leerssen, *Mere Irish and Fíor-Ghael: Studies in the Idea of Irish Nationality*, 2nd edn, Cork, 1996, pp. 264–74.

124. R. Sharpe, *Medieval Irish Saints' Lives*, Oxford, 1991, pp. 1–3, 39–61.

125. Edited from MS Edinburgh, University Library Dc 6. 49 (AD 1627), and MSS National Library of Scotland Adv. 33. 7. 17–18, by D. Irving, *Davidis Buchanani De scriptoribus Scotis libri duo*, Bannatyne Club, 55, Edinburgh, 1837. This includes some far-from-Scottish authors, such as William of Lanthony (taken from Leland's *Scriptores*); the latest part extends into the 17th century.

126. Cited, for example, in *Bibliotheca* (n. 57 above), p. 7, under 'Adam senior ordinis Cisterciensis', for the 16th-century writer Adam Elder OCist, monk of Kinloss.

127. MS Bodleian Library, Tanner 420 is Harrington's interleaved but sparsely annotated copy of 'Centuria Quinta' (fols 200–299) from Bale's *Summarium*, perhaps the copy referred to by Anthony Wood in a note added to his journal in or after May 1691, 'Mr Ja. Harrington hath notes of him in his quarto Baleus interleaved, quare' (*The Life and Times of Anthony Wood*, ed. A. Clark, Oxford Historical Society,

RICHARD SHARPE

Among them are two volumes of sparse notes, based principally on Wood's *Athenae Oxonienses*, toward a work entitled *De re Anglorum literaria dissertatio*.¹²⁸ Many years later Tanner paid tribute to Harrington's fitness for the task.¹²⁹

Tanner would become over the next few years the best informed of all the older English bibliographers, though the delay in publishing his work deprived him of full recognition. In the 1690s the tradition established by just two scholars, Leland and Bale, one hundred and fifty years before, now inspired emulation. Some of their manuscript drafts and notebooks, as well as their published work, passed through Tanner's hands, and he was the last person to have left any witness to the medieval copy of Henry de Kirkestede's *Catalogus*. Tanner's first steps in bibliography coincided with a newly systematic interest in cataloguing the medieval books that had survived through the destruction Leland and Bale had witnessed. And through the years when the drafts for Tanner's *Bibliotheca Britannica* lay in his study, the last great collections of medieval manuscripts in England were formed. The time was ripe for a great book.

THOMAS TANNER (1674–1735)

The son of another Thomas Tanner, vicar of Market Lavington in Wiltshire, the young Thomas Tanner went up to Queen's College, Oxford, in November 1689. Through a college friend Edmund Gibson (1669–1748), future bishop of London, Tanner was introduced to the London publishers Awnsham and John Churchill at the sign of the Black Swan in Paternoster Row. Among his earliest publications were pages for Wiltshire in Gibson's English edition of *Camden's Britannia*, translated by Tanner in 1693, and published in 1695 by Awnsham and John Churchill. In the spring of 1695 they also published Tanner's own *Notitia monastica*. This work of reference on English monastic archives, later much enlarged, established Tanner's reputation in antiquarian research. It had been first advertised in May 1694, at the very time when Awnsham Churchill came up to Oxford and negotiated terms with Tanner to prepare editions of the bibliographical works of 'Boston of Bury' and John Leland for a consideration of £40. This work was supposed to take a year. It was perhaps delayed by work on *Notitia monastica*, but the scale of the project grew in Tanner's hands. Instead of simply transcribing and printing the works of Henry de Kirkestede and John Leland, adding other names 'by wholesale out of Bale and Pits', he would later reflect that, 'when I enlarged the design and could not be persuaded to take characters of men and notices of books upon trust, there was a necessity of longer time'.¹³⁰ The decision to enlarge the scope of the work may in some

5 vols, 1891–1900, II, p. 488). Wood was probably the intermediary who passed these notes to Tanner after Harrington's death.

128. MSS Bodleian Library, Tanner 402, 403. It is unaccountably catalogued as the work of William Fulman (1632–1688); since it quotes Wharton's *Anglia sacra* (1691), this is impossible.

129. Thomas Tanner to Arthur Charlett, master of University College, 4 February 1708: 'Mr Harrington, you also know, intended great improvements. If it had pleased God to have afforded him life and leisure, his happy pen would have done Leland more honor and the world more service than Mr H[all] or I can pretend to' (MS Bodleian Library, Ballard 4, fol. 92^{r-v}, no. 50).

130. Tanner to Arthur Charlett, 25 June 1707, MS Bodleian Library, Ballard 4, fol. 84 (no. 45)

THE ENGLISH BIBLIOGRAPHICAL TRADITION

measure be attributed to the experience gained by Tanner from his involvement, again with Gibson, in the publication of *Catalogi manuscriptorum Angliae et Hiberniae*, long associated with the name of Edward Bernard but in reality organized by Arthur Charlett and Edmund Gibson.¹³¹ They set out to obtain catalogues of manuscripts in libraries, both public and private, in Britain and Ireland. Tanner himself did some cataloguing and proof-reading for this project, through which he became aware not only of how many works by British authors were unknown to the previous bibliographers but also of the importance of tracing copies of the works they had recorded. These printed *Catalogi* became a major source. For about five years, during 1696 to 1700, Tanner worked very diligently on this task.¹³² His research was mostly carried out in the Bodleian Library, but he also worked in several of the London libraries, including the Royal Library at St James's Palace, the archiepiscopal library at Lambeth Palace, the Cotton Library in Westminster, and Dr Sloane's collection in Chelsea. He visited Cambridge libraries and Lincoln Cathedral library, and he was received in several private libraries. He evidently hoped to finish the work quickly, as he says to friends in his letters during 1698 and 1700, but there is no sign that he ever really began to digest his notes into anything that might resemble a final form. In 1701 he was appointed chancellor of the diocese of Norwich by his patron and father-in-law John Moore, bishop of Norwich, and other preferments followed. He complains frequently about his many duties, while never admitting that progress with his scholarly projects had fallen off. Indeed, work on the *Bibliotheca Britannica* was only ever intermittent after 1701, though the advertisement of Hall's edition of Leland's *Viri illustres* seems to have provoked more activity in 1707–8. The last sign of systematic work was Tanner's comparison of Leland's autograph with Bale's elaborated copy during 1708–11. After that progress appears to have been confined to adding references as they came to him in the course of reading printed materials.

When Thomas Tanner died in 1735, his brother John Tanner transferred the working notes for *Bibliotheca Britannica* to David Wilkins (1685–1745), a scholar of German origin long settled in England. They must have been acquainted with one another, for Tanner was archdeacon of Norfolk (1721–32) at the same time as Wilkins was archdeacon of Suffolk (1724–45), both in the diocese of Norwich. Wilkins transcribed the notes Tanner had made on to loose sheets of paper and then reordered them in his own alphabetical arrangement for typesetting. The work was published under an expanded title in 1748, when both author and editor were already dead.¹³³

Tanner's method of work and how much he had already achieved before 1701 are visible in a volume of his manuscript draft that has survived, now MS Bodleian Library, Tanner 470. We know, first, from Thomas Hearne's account of how Tanner showed him

131. *Catalogi librorum manuscriptorum Angliae et Hiberniae in unum collecti*, Oxford, 1697; R. W. Hunt, 'Historical Introduction', *A Summary Catalogue of Western Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library at Oxford*, vol. I, Oxford, 1953, pp. xxv–xxxv.

132. For a detailed account of Tanner's bibliographical formation and of his work on what became his *Bibliotheca Hiberno-Britannica*, see Sharpe, 'Thomas Tanner' (n. 41 above).

133. Thomas Tanner, *Bibliotheca Britannico-Hibernica; sive, De scriptoribus, qui in Anglia, Scotia, et Hibernia ad saeculi XVII initium floruerunt, commentarius*, ed. D. Wilkins, London: William Bowyer at the expense of the Society for the Encouragement of Learning, 1748.

RICHARD SHARPE

the work in progress in 1725, and second, from what Tanner's editor Wilkins says about the material from which he worked, that Tanner's materials were divided into six volumes. One was the transcript he made from the medieval copy of Henry de Kirkestede in 1694, which survives in Cambridge; this was not annotated and was scarcely used at all in Tanner's own work; Wilkins printed an abstract from it in his preface. Another was his transcript of John Leland's *Viri illustres*, which does not survive; Wilkins says that this was made 'ex autographo', i.e. from the surviving draft in the Bodleian. Between 1708 and 1711 he was allowed to borrow another copy of Leland's work, as reworked by John Bale in an alphabetical arrangement with additional material in Bale's own name. This is frequently cited in Tanner's notes to Leland, and we may infer that it was carefully compared with the transcript from which Tanner worked. Tanner's working transcript of Leland is very frequently referred to by page number in MS Tanner 470, which must be the first of the three volumes of authors not found in Leland, as described by Wilkins. Entries for the numerous authors added by Tanner are arranged alphabetically, under baptismal names, interspersed with cross-references to the separate volume containing Leland; the extant volume covers only A to H. In the first instance an outline list of new authors must have been drawn up, to a considerable extent from reference works, primarily Bale and Pits, supplemented by Cave and Wharton. At this early stage Tanner also worked through Thomas Dempster for Scottish writers and James Ware for Irish writers. Welsh writers too were included, very largely from information provided by Tanner's Oxford acquaintance Edward Lhuyd at Jesus College. In the primary level of work, he copied out skeletal entries on authors and their works, leaving ample space in which to add further entries and further information. It is clear from the manuscript that much was added in the course of work. Mention of manuscript copies is very frequently added, though it is rare in the primary level of copying. Incipits, sometimes dedications, and even the number of chapters in a work were also added when Tanner had the opportunity to examine a copy of works mentioned. He appears to have made a deliberate effort to see copies of the works, whether in manuscript or in printed editions. He was aware of the value of incipits in establishing whether different titles might refer to the same work. He also built up a considerable body of biographical data on many writers, noting not merely evidence for when they lived and died but for degrees or benefices held.

The user of Tanner must live with a fundamental difference produced by his method of work. An entry taken from Leland would be verified and footnoted, and Tanner would add additional information about works not known to Leland in a continuation of the footnotes. These could reach prodigious dimensions: Tanner's notes on Leland's entry for John Wyclif stretch to 254 column-centimetres, exactly 100 inches.¹³⁴ Where an entry was created by Tanner, it was not composed in elegant prose like Leland's chapters, but was largely written down in a simple tabular form and then augmented by added notes without syntax. Wilkins copied such entries continuously, usually without distinguishing core text from additions or notes. There is an odd change of gear in moving between Leland's chapters and Tanner's own. The manuscript draft covering letters A–H has

134. Tanner, *Bibliotheca* (n. 133 above), pp. 767–72.

THE ENGLISH BIBLIOGRAPHICAL TRADITION

made it much easier to understand how Tanner's entries were composed; in going from Wilkins's edition to the draft, however, one must remember that Tanner alphabetized by baptismal name, Wilkins reordered many entries by surname. One can only attempt to imagine how his notes on Leland's entries accumulated in a similar manner.

The importance of Tanner's work for modern readers lies in part in the considerable degree to which he was able to add authors and works to those already catalogued by Leland and Bale. His coverage extends down to the end of the Elizabethan era, but his searching of printed and manuscript sources, in the latter case aided by recently published catalogues, enabled him also to add many hitherto unlisted works by medieval writers. His work is different in more than just quantity. While Leland knew how to record *tituli* as evidence of author and title, he only occasionally reports such particulars; he refers to a manuscript source usually only by the place where he found it, and it is most unlikely still to be there. Bale provided such information even more rarely than Leland did. In both cases, their surviving notes are therefore important in elucidating what they actually say. Tanner belongs far more to the modern age. He aimed to quote titles and incipits systematically and to say from where he quoted; with printed books he gives the place and year of printing, usually enough to allow the same edition to be found today, and in entries where MS Tanner 470 can be used, one often finds that he indicates where he saw such books; with manuscripts he indicated the library in which he saw the book, or the private owner to whom it belonged, and he has often also given a shelf mark or catalogue number. Since Tanner worked at a time when the last really important collections of medieval manuscripts in England were formed, and in a period of well-documented antiquarian interest in such books, there is an excellent chance that the book Tanner saw can still be traced from his reference. This may require some knowledge: for example, that the library of Sir Simonds D'Ewes, catalogued in *Catalogi manuscriptorum Angliae*, and visited by Tanner at the D'Ewes family home in Suffolk, was acquired in 1705 by Robert Harley, and came into public ownership along with thousands of other Harleian manuscripts now in the British Library. It may require some trouble: many of the libraries that are still where they were in Tanner's time have changed their shelf marks, so that one must learn how to convert old ones to new ones. But in almost every case it is possible to find exactly what Tanner saw, so that his information can be correlated with modern scholarship.

This is important for students of bibliographical tradition, since Tanner sought to verify and source information he found in Leland's *Viri illustres* and in Bale's *Catalogus*. Where Tanner succeeded in authenticating their statements from a copy of the text concerned – not necessarily from the same copy – he provides a relatively easy route to understanding what text Leland or Bale had seen. Where they had not been able to make important connections, for example, between copies of the same text ascribed to different authors, Tanner was often, though not always, successful at so doing.

The example already used above, Alberic of London, will illustrate some of this, though since the entry was derived from Leland, we have not the opportunity to use

RICHARD SHARPE

Tanner's working notes.¹³⁵ He printed Leland's text, footnoting the two additions from Bale's copy, cited as 'Ms. Lel. Trin.', and adding information from Bale's printed *Catalogus*. Between Leland and Bale, Tanner had three works to authenticate, for two of which Bale had provided incipits. The first, *De origine Deorum*, Tanner sourced to a printed edition from Basel, 1570, adding, 'Hic liber a quibusdam Alexandro Nequamo tribuitur; sed sub nomine Albrici extat Ms. Bodl. Digby 221' (a shelf mark that remains valid today). The second, *Virtutes antiquorum*, he described in words quoted from Bale, and the third, *Canones speculativae*, he was unable to trace at all. He then adds references from printed books to other titles, *Allegoriae poeticae, seu de veritate et expositione poetiarum fabularum* (from the *editio princeps* of 1520); *De imaginibus Deorum seu Poetria* (from editions of Basel, 1570, and Heidelberg, 1599); and a citation of 'Albericus Lunden. de origine Deorum sive in Poetario suo' by Thomas Bradwardine in the fourteenth century; he also cites *De Deorum imaginibus*, printed among other mythographers, Amsterdam, 1681. Two separate texts are here confounded.¹³⁶ He does not explicitly say that the same work travels under many titles, still less what title the most authoritative manuscripts use, but he has gathered together a good deal of information. With a much-printed work such as this, we do not find a great tally of manuscripts, though MS Bodleian Library, Digby 221 does show the reattribution of *Poetarius sive Scintillarium poetarum* from Alexander Nequam to Alberic of London. Tanner noted the same manuscript in his additions to Leland's entry on Alexander Nequam, where he was considerably more successful in tracing English manuscript copies. Here he also refers back, 'Liber eiusdem argumenti et principii ascribitur Albricio Londinensi' ('a book of the same substance and incipit is ascribed to Alberic of London').¹³⁷

From these references one is quickly able to find exactly the editions or manuscripts that Tanner intended one to find. In this way, he is a valuable bridge between the works of Leland and Bale, which truly belong to a different age, and the resources available to a modern investigator. He very often ensures that one is not misled by variant titles. In countless more obscure cases, Tanner really can help the investigator to substantiate what Leland and Bale saw. Yet a particular opportunity to approach their sources was quite lost on him. In the Bodleian Library Tanner could have had access to Leland's notes of books seen in various places, which often help one interpret the basis for statements

135. Tanner, *Bibliotheca* (n. 133 above), 19; compare above, pp. 109–14.

136. No attempt has yet been made to understand the textual tradition in print nor to work out how many different manuscripts lie behind the editions; editions of the two texts are listed by Shaaber, p. 4 (A116–21, A122–31). The text circulating in print under the name Albricus Philosophus, *De imaginibus Deorum*, was first printed at Milan [not after 1478] (Goff F63), and was reprinted several times down to the edition cited by Tanner, 'Albericus philosophus de deorum imaginibus' (ed. T. Muncker, *Mythographi Latini*, 2 vols, Amsterdam, 1681, II, pp. 301–30); it is a shorter derivative, not earlier than the 14th century (Rathbone, 'Master Alberic' [n. 109 above], p. 36).

137. Tanner, *Bibliotheca* (n. 133 above), p. 540 notes m and o. The mention of Alberic is supported by a page-reference, 'p. 288', referring to Tanner's lost transcript of Leland. Tanner noted four manuscript copies of the *Scintillarium poetarum*: Bodl. NE B. 5. 2 (now MS Bodley 571 [s. XV], fols 191^r–(237), anon.), Bodl. sup. A. 1 Art. 86, fol. 139 (now MS Auct. F. 5. 16 [s. XIV] pp. 139–(161), without author or title), Bodl. Digby 221 (shelf mark unchanged), and Cantabr. coll. Trin. class. 1, cod. 18 (now MS Trinity College R. 14. 9 [ss. XIII–XIV], fols 21^r–(38), 'mithologie Alexandri Nequam et alio nomine Sintillarium appellatus').

THE ENGLISH BIBLIOGRAPHICAL TRADITION

in his *Scriptores*, but he does not cite this source.¹³⁸ Similarly, with Bale, he used two volumes of Bale's collections lent to him by Dr Hans Sloane, but he did not use Bale's notebook on his bibliographical research during 1548–52, though it was available to him among Selden's manuscripts in the Bodleian.¹³⁹ These notes are a valuable route towards understanding the sources from which Leland and Bale derived their information. Until we have annotated editions of their works, however, Tanner will continue to be a help to understanding the older bibliographical tradition as well as a monument to what an intelligent scholar could find in England at the end of the seventeenth century. The content and quality of Tanner's work ensure that it remains valuable, not merely as a quarry of texts, but as an example of bibliographical scholarship.

Tanner's work was truly a work of antiquarian bibliography. Without the examples of Leland, Bale, and Pits, it is unlikely that Dempster and Ware would have attempted national bibliographies for Scotland and Ireland. And without the continuing interest in Leland, particularly, no one in England in Tanner's time would have created a national bibliography from scratch. Moreover, his *Bibliotheca* should be seen in a narrow time-frame in intellectual history. The interest in publishing for the first time the works of 'Boston' and Leland, which had inspired and shaped Tanner's project in 1694, expired long before the *Bibliotheca* was published. The motivation to compile *Catalogi manuseriptorum Angliae*, in the 1690s, descriptive catalogues that had helped to make the *Bibliotheca* possible, would not be matched for centuries. It was a fortunate intersection.

CONCLUSION

The four bibliographers discussed in this paper provided a remarkable record of English writers of the period before the Reformation and the dissolution of the monasteries. Their building on one another's work, however, may obscure for users the real differences between them.

Henry de Kirkestede, a monk in the fourteenth century, had one main source in *Registrum Angliae*, and at his disposal were a number of other aids ranging from Jerome to the Dominican *tabula* as well as books, in his own abbey at Bury and in other libraries accessible to him, that allowed him to add to and corroborate his bibliographical sources. In a stable monastic environment, almost timeless in its security, he would have regarded his work as entirely within a long-established tradition. What he produced, however, was entirely original, a reflection of the brief flowering of systematic librarianship in England in his day. It was hardly intended for circulation, though it appears that Bale found a second copy in Norwich as well as acquiring one from Ailot Holt, former monk of Bury.

138. MS Bodleian Library, Top. gen. c. 3, on which see above, nn. 46, 91; the book-lists were printed together by Hearne in his edition of Leland's *Collectanea*, Oxford, 1715 (n. 41 above).

139. MS Bodleian Library, Selden Supra 64, on which see above, pp. 107–8, 114. Nor did Tanner use either Bale's *Anglorum Heliades* (which first turns up in the hands of Edward Kelsall in Cambridge soon after 1700), or even the printed *Summarium*. Yet he frequently cited Bale's own manuscript addenda to his *Catalogus*, from Bale's copy, loaned to Tanner by Sir William Glynne, Bt, of Amersden, probably around 1698; see above, n. 76.

RICHARD SHARPE

Leland and Bale had to build up their collections from scratch, since no one before them had focused on English writers. They had models, in particular Trithemius, but the authors and works they sought out were, on the whole, long out of fashion, and the manuscripts in which they found them were in many cases regarded only as obsolete lumber. Even as they worked, countless manuscripts were destroyed for want of interest, while others changed hands, passing out of once relatively secure monastic homes into the possession of laymen who, even if they were themselves interested, could not be sure of preserving such antiquities beyond their own time. Leland's work was cut off early, but Bale lived through the greater insecurities of Edward VI and Mary's reigns, so that far from showing Leland's humanistic interest, Bale became obsessed with polemic.

Both of them became aware of the new development in bibliographical scholarship represented by the *Bibliotheca universalis* (1545), compiled in Zurich by Konrad Gesner (1516–1565), but Leland's work came to an end very shortly after his first sight of that work. Bale, in Basel, could not avoid recognizing that this was very different from the ecclesiastical bibliographers from Jerome to Trithemius; far from just empanelling a continuous tradition, this was a new attempt to make knowledge systematically accessible, and Gesner was himself particularly interested in medicine and science. Bale's *Summarium* and *Catalogus*, both composed during his periods of exile in Germany, might be seen as the issue of a coincidental union between the English antiquarian interests of Leland and a modern German bibliography represented by Trithemius and Gesner. The intellectual heirs of Gesner would cultivate interests in the organization of libraries and of all branches of knowledge. Even ecclesiastical bibliography branched out in new directions, in the work, for example, of Matthias Flacius Illyricus (1520–1575) or Antonio Possevino (1533–1611), which provide a basis for understanding the reception of the Bible through many centuries.¹⁴⁰ More conservative bibliographers sought to print the older works of ecclesiastical bibliography and to continue that tradition. Roberto Bellarmino (1542–1621) was more in the ecclesiastical tradition of Trithemius than in the intellectual tradition of Gesner. Indeed, some scholars self-consciously renewed the *virii illustres* tradition from Jerome onwards, such as Aubert Le Mire (1573–1640), who reprinted the parent texts.¹⁴¹ Printed works of this kind reached England during the generations when there was little interest in national bibliography. Continental bibliographers had access to printed works from England, such as there was. The kind of antiquarian inquiry pursued by Leland and Bale was cultivated chiefly in the religious orders on the Continent, where the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries saw the composition of several notable works, and others less notable, which would bear comparison with those of the English bibliographers.¹⁴²

140. Matthias Flacius Illyricus, *Catalogus testium veritatis qui ante nostram aetatem reclamarunt papae*, Basel, 1556, and Antonio Possevino, *Apparatus sacer ad scriptores Veteris et Novi Testamenti*, Venice, 1603–6.

141. Aubert Le Mire, *Bibliotheca ecclesiastica sive nomenclatores VII veteres*, 2 vols, Antwerp, 1639–49. The first volume provides editions of the bibliographical works of Jerome, Gennadius, Isidore, Ildefonsus of Toledo, Sigebert, Honorius, and Henry of Brussels; the second volume, brought out after Le Mire's death by Aubert van den Eede, was designed as a continuation of the work of Trithemius from 1494 to his own time.

142. Such works are catalogued with some evaluation in Sharpe, *Titulus* (n. 96 above), pp. 281–96.

THE ENGLISH BIBLIOGRAPHICAL TRADITION

When Thomas Tanner started on what was intended to be an edition of Leland, he had available to him for the first time printed catalogues that would significantly help him to trace copies of works referred to in the *Scriptores*, whether those works had been printed or had survived only in manuscripts in public and private collections. Where Leland and Bale had largely disregarded the difference between printed books and manuscripts, for Tanner it was inescapable. He was also concerned to test information and to provide supporting references, signs of the advance in empirical scholarship in the later seventeenth century, but in other respects the only serious modification he introduced to the scope of the work was the systematic inclusion of Ireland, Scotland, and Wales, again a sign of his explicit identification with Great Britain rather than England. In terms of bibliographical scholarship, Tanner was close to the cutting edge, but it was mainly through the application of his own intelligence and effort: his models were still Leland and Bale, but he determined on improving on their results rather than simply editing Leland and quarrying Bale. Beyond the quotation on the title-page of MS Tanner 470, cited at the start of this paper, Tanner shows little sign of using the most recent continental aspirations in the cataloguing of writers.

Modern use of these bibliographers has almost always been to learn from their researches into medieval manuscripts rather than to judge their intellectual achievements. The fact that we have some of their working notes helps us to make the most of their research. Observing how they worked allows the modern user to overcome errors resulting from their following incomplete evidence or making guesses. It is a special good fortune for us that Leland and Bale worked at the time when monastic libraries were dispersed in the 1530s and 1540s, so that they have preserved the names of authors and the titles, sometimes also the incipits, of works that have not survived. Tanner built on their work and added more than two thousand authors to what he found in Leland, including many from the second half of the sixteenth century, but more importantly he was scrupulous in trying to corroborate their statements by reference to surviving manuscripts. It is again fortunate that Tanner worked at a time when the great antiquarian collections of medieval manuscripts in England were beginning to stabilize, so that manuscripts referred to by Tanner can usually be traced today with only a little effort, and his frequent references to printed editions are full enough to allow these too in most cases to be traced. His manuscript searches were not nearly as wide-ranging as those of Leland and Bale, but he recorded more detail of what he saw, and we are in a better position to follow him at work. His net could be cast wider than theirs in part because printing had brought works to his notice that he would not otherwise have known about, in part because the first steps had been taken in cataloguing manuscripts, so that it was easier for him to trace copies of texts than it had been for anyone before his time. If Tanner had not been able to use the sheets of the *Catalogi manuscriptorum Angliae* as he was starting on his work, it is likely that he would have been far less able to corroborate what he found in Leland and Bale by reference to manuscripts and that he would have added far fewer references to unpublished texts. His *Bibliotheca* comes close to providing us with a modern work of reference even though it is so closely tied to the older bibliographical tradition.

There are three reasons why it worthwhile for a modern student of medieval texts to

RICHARD SHARPE

learn how to read these bibliographers. The first is simple: we learn from them about books that no longer exist, so that, like medieval library catalogues, they help us to fill out our picture of the texts written in England during the later Middle Ages. Before we can trust everything they say, however, one must understand their methods and their limitations. It is always necessary to discover as far as possible what they had seen. In this respect, Tanner's work is a great help towards understanding his predecessors. If one can manage this, one can control how far their information may be relied upon; so that the second reason to study these writers is to be able to control the merely cumulative tendency of printed bibliographical tradition since the sixteenth century. The third reason is because they represent an empirical approach to national literary history, a vision of the nation's achievement through its writers, that emerged in England at an early date, long before Camden and other Elizabethan and Jacobean authors developed their idea of England.¹⁴³

At some levels, therefore, there were interactions between the English and continental traditions, but the inconspicuous failures of continuity, of which more later, are perhaps more striking. One of the ironies of this interaction is that the only works that circulated widely in print during the most important period for influencing continental bibliographers were Bale's *Summarium*, his *Catalogus*, and its Catholic counterpart, Pits's *Relationes historicae*. They ensured that many names of English writers were known to continental bibliographers. The second edition of Gesner's work made extensive use of Bale's *Summarium*.¹⁴⁴ His *Catalogus* was a prime source of English writers for the later bibliographers Casimir Oudin (1638–1717) and Johannes Albertus Fabricius (1668–1736), even though the writers' works were unknown on the Continent. A far greater proportion of minor Latin writers from medieval England has been documented in print for a longer time than those of any other country, even Trithemius's Germany, but too often the information rested on the least sure foundation.

Another irony lies in the circumstances that meant that the best bibliographical work in the English tradition existed when the best continental work was in progress, but it was unpublished and inaccessible in Tanner's study. The outstanding Dominican bibliography compiled by Jacques Quétif and Jacques Échard, therefore, and Casimir Oudin in his second, much enlarged, bibliographical work could not benefit from Tanner's research. They sought to give manuscript references for some of the works found in Bale and Pits, and for other works that they had not seen, but their only resources were the published English catalogues, Thomas James's

143. Leland and Bale are much earlier than any of the eight works discussed by R. Helgerson, *Forms of Nationhood: The Elizabethan Writing of England*, Chicago, 1992.

144. It is perhaps surprising that, when Josias Simler (1530–1576) issued a revised text of Gesner's *Bibliotheca instituta et collecta*, Zurich, 1574, he relied on Bale's *Summarium* rather than on the later *Catalogus*; this is clear, for example, from the entries on Albricius Londinensis, *fl.* 1090 (p. 19), and on John Bale (p. 340). Citing the last, King astonishingly claims, 'The Swiss reformer Conrad Gesner called him a writer of great diligence ("vir diligentissimus" [p. 340]) and modeled later editions of his universal bibliography on Bale's catalogues' (*English Reformation Literature* [n. 62 above], p. 60). In fact Gesner was dead, and Simler merely pillaged the *Summarium* for names and titles. Moreover, where in 1545 Gesner had retained the traditional bibliographical layout, Simler abandoned it to save space (as one may see by comparing, for example, the entries for Giovanni Boccaccio, 1545, p. 390, and 1574, p. 346).

THE ENGLISH BIBLIOGRAPHICAL TRADITION

Ecloga (1600) and the *Catalogi manuscriptorum Angliae* (1698). They were unable to use Tanner's work, and he was indifferent to using theirs. When Tanner's *Bibliotheca* was eventually published, it would have appeared parochial to European scholars, not simply because of its national focus but because it had ignored the excellent work done by Tanner's French and German contemporaries. The best of continental bibliography, on the other hand, would have seemed incomplete by comparison with Tanner's work because the catalogues provided so much less information – incipits, for example, or details of dedications – than he had derived from the manuscripts themselves.

The English tradition is most obviously distinctive for its national focus: after Trithemius's work on Germany, no other country produced a national bibliography until modern times.¹⁴⁵ This national interest, however, is in some measure no more than the fossilized consequence of the English sentiments that gripped Leland and Bale in the 1530s. Tanner's widening of his scope to all Britain and Ireland was not premised on any comparable British agenda. Its deeper distinction is that it is more perceptibly based on manuscripts than the work of continental counterparts. In the first place this can be explained by circumstances: the dispersal and loss of so many libraries following the dissolution of the monasteries impelled Leland and Bale to take notes of what they could see before it vanished. The survival of their working papers allows us to see more detail about what manuscripts the English scholars saw than is the case with continental bibliographers. Leland and Bale were not very much more inclined to explain from where they derived their information than was Trithemius, but the preservation of some of their notebooks has allowed us to recover much more of their manuscript sources. It is Tanner who first shows the scholarly desire to authenticate what he reports, and his researches have further guided us to the sources, because he has very often provided already a usable reference that will lead an informed scholar today to the same manuscript. This combination has meant that it is much easier for a modern student to approach the bibliography of medieval Latin writers in Britain than would be the case in other countries.

After the publication of Bale's *Catalogus*, English and continental traditions parted company: Tanner made less use of continental scholarship than he should have done, and his own work never achieved the European circulation enjoyed by Bale and Pits. None the less, the strength of the English tradition, the way in which Leland, Bale,

145. National interest did not disappear. On the one hand, there were attempts to catalogue works written in vernacular languages, Italian (by Anton Francesco Doni [1513–1574], *La libreria del Doni, fiorentino: nella quale sono scritti tutti gl' autori vulgari con cento discorsi sopra quelli, tutte le traduzioni fatte dall'altre lingue, nella nostra*, Venice, 1550) and French (by François Grude, sieur de La Croix du Maine [1552–1592], *Premier volume de la Bibliothèque du Sieur de La Croix-du-Maine. Qui est vn catalogue général de toutes sortes d' auteurs, qui ont escrit en François depuis cinq cents ans et plus, iusques à ce iourd' huy*, Paris, 1584 [no more published]; and Antoine du Verdier [1544–1600], *La Bibliothèque d'Antoine du Verdier. Contenant le catalogue de tous ceux qui ont escrit ou traduit en François, et autres dialectes de ce Royaume*, Lyon, 1585; reprinted together, 6 vols, Paris, 1772–3; Graz, 1969). On the other hand, print assumed its dominant role in bibliographical perceptions, and place of printing took precedence over the nationality of the writer. The dominance of language or place of printing, or a combination, explains the seemingly odd compass of Shaaber, necessary to complement the limits of *STC* for anyone interested in British Latin writers.

RICHARD SHARPE

and Tanner were meshed together, each understanding and building on the work of his predecessors, has given their work a value that has lasted even to the present time. Using them with a similar sympathetic understanding will still help us to improve our perceptions of the legacy of the Latin Middle Ages in Britain.