3

Matthew Parker and the Practice of Church History

MADELINE MCMAHON*

'[M]ANY AUTHENTIC and valuable monuments of our history were lost in the disso-lution of religious houses by Henry the Eighth. The protestant and the patriot must applaud our deliverance; but the critic may deplore the rude havoc that was made in the libraries of churches and monasteries, by the zeal, the avarice, and the neglect, of unworthy reformers', lamented Edward Gibbon. Yet '[f]ar different from such reformers was the learned and pious Matthew Parker, the first protestant Archbishop of Canterbury, in the reign of Queen Elizabeth'. Gibbon found Parker both exceptional and exemplary. This 'respectable prelate' was above the common run 'of unworthy reformers', who either actively destroyed or merely neglected monastic libraries: 'while he exercised the arduous office, not of governing, but of founding the Church of England, he strenuously applied himself to revive the study of the Saxon tongue, and of English antiquities'. More specifically of interest to Gibbon, he had also published 'four of our ancient historians'.[1] Gibbon hoped both to imitate and to surpass Parker's example, as well as the more recent but foreign models of Muratori and the Maurists, by overseeing the publication of a series of English historical works, the *Scriptores rerum anglicarum*.[2] He had at last found an editor for his long-standing ambition: the temperamental historian of Scottish antiquities, John Pinkerton. Gibbon's prospectus, the 'Address', was

[1] Edward Gibbon, 'Address, &c.', in *Miscellaneous Works of Edward Gibbon*, vol. 2, ed. John Baker Holroyd (London, 1796, repr. Cambridge, 2014), p. 710. I am grateful to Frederic Clark for directing me to Gibbon's invocation of Parker.
[2] Gibbon, 'Address, &c.', p. 713.

intended to be published on 20 January 1794—the day he died.[3] As Pinkerton later wrote, Gibbon's ambitious programme of publication 'perished with him'.[4]

In seeking a model for the unrealised *Scriptores rerum anglicarum*, Gibbon recreated Parker in his own image: a rational, national hero who used the powers of the printing press to preserve monuments from the destructive forces of religious zeal and time. But the 'learned and pious' Matthew Parker was not quite the coolly dispassionate editor of ancient historians that Gibbon wanted him to be. Modern accounts of Parker's revival of English antiquities have highlighted Parker's peremptory treatment of his books, from the selectivity of his acquisitions to the censorial nature of his circle's marginalia, designed to make medieval books fit within his Protestant paradigm.[5] Ironically, the Elizabethan archbishop and the Enlightenment historian still had at least one vital point in common: they both knew how to read sources of ecclesiastical history against the grain, to make them yield narratives that would have shocked and horrified their authors.

At the same time, recent scholars' vision of Parker is not unrecognizably distant from Gibbon's. Both before and after Gibbon, scholars have characterised Parker's work as a 'project of nation building', with the aim 'to preserve, as much as could be, the ancient monuments of the learned men of our nation from perishing'.[6] Most accounts have also focused on exactly the elements that Gibbon touched on in his brief portrayal of Parker: his collection of books from 'the libraries of churches and monasteries', his 'study of the Saxon tongue', and his publication (and thereby further preservation) of certain texts.[7]

Recent work on Parker has investigated his reasons for putting together such a collection as well as his initiative for studying and publishing works in Anglo-Saxon. Many modern scholars, like Gibbon, have emphasised the national character of his

---

[3] Hugh Trevor-Roper, 'Historiography I: the other Gibbon' *American Scholar*, 46 (1977), 101.

[4] Quoted in Trevor-Roper, 'Other Gibbon', 101. Gibbon's vision of Parker as a model for a publication series, however, did not perish. Less than fifty years later, the Parker Society would make the archbishop its namesake as well as its inspiration for the publication of Edwardian and Elizabethan Reformation documents. Gibbon's unfinished final project had direct connections to the Rolls Series, several decades later. See Hugh Trevor-Roper, 'Gibbon's last project', in David Womersley (ed.), *Edward Gibbon: Bicentenary Essays* (Oxford, 1997), pp. 405–19.

[5] Jennifer Summit, *Memory's Library: Medieval Books in Early Modern England* (Chicago, 2008); Timothy Graham, 'Matthew Parker's manuscripts: an Elizabethan library and its uses', in G. Mandelbrote and K. Manley (eds), *The Cambridge History of Libraries in Britain and Ireland*, vol. 2 (Cambridge, 2006), pp. 322–41; Benedict Scott Robinson, '"Darke speech": Matthew Parker and the reforming of history', *Sixteenth Century Journal*, 29 (1998), 1061–83.

[6] Summit, *Memory's Library*, p. 103. John Strype, *The Life and Acts of Matthew Parker, the First Archbishop of Canterbury in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth* (London, 1711), p. 528.

[7] Most modern scholars have focused on the Anglo-Saxon publications, while Gibbon named those in Latin (not surprisingly, since he was about to embark on a publication of Latin editions). See, for example: Rosamund Oates, 'Elizabethan histories of English Christian origins', in Katherine Van Liere, Simon Ditchfield, and Howard Louthan (eds), *Sacred History: Uses of the Christian Past in the Renaissance World* (Oxford, 2012), pp. 165–85. John Bromwich, 'The first book printed in Anglo-Saxon types', *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society*, 3 (1962), 265–91. See also F. J. Levy, *Tudor Historical Thought* (San Marino, CA, 1967), pp. 133, 136.

historical project. Even scholars who stress Parker's religious motivation characterise his project as destructive or exploitative and thus at odds with his primary aim of preservation.[8] While Parker has been castigated for destroying books that did not conform to his Protestant paradigm, he has also been celebrated for his efforts to create a library of national monuments and as the founder of modern Anglo-Saxon studies.[9] Yet the archbishop's motives were probably not so mutually antagonistic as these depictions suggest. Parker was faced with the task of establishing and enriching a nascent tradition—he had the arduous office, after all, 'of founding the Church of England'. His efforts to strengthen the historical tradition of that church—the *ecclesia anglicana*—necessarily had both national and ecclesiastical motives, which shaped the framework within which he approached texts. Timothy Graham and others have argued that Parker's library provides 'a unique picture of how medieval books were explored and exploited for the contribution they could make to major issues that confronted the archbishop and his contemporaries'.[10] Parker's motives certainly played out in his use and abuse of his books, but this does not tell the whole story of his historical project.

This chapter aims to show that Parker's historical scholarship was less directed than either Gibbon or more recent historians have suggested, in large part because he so deeply engaged with the learned traditions he encountered. A close inspection of Parker's complete historical practice, from acquisition to publication, in both its verbal and material traces, reveals that his confessional motives did not dictate every aspect of his scholarship. Nor was Parker's ecclesiastically motivated scholarship as uniformly destructive of physical texts or their meaning as has been supposed. The process of researching and preparing medieval texts for the press led him down intellectual paths very different than those he had first imagined himself following. In other words, Parker's practices produced knowledge, which simultaneously shaped his practices. Scholars often state, without arguing the point, that Parker worked as he did because no philological method had been developed.[11] In fact, some of Parker's predecessors—especially William of Malmesbury and Matthew Paris—were clearly self-conscious about methods, as were some of his contemporaries.[12] Focusing on Parker's methods is not anachronistic: we shall see

---

[8] Summit, *Memory's Library*; Graham, 'Matthew Parker's manuscripts'.

[9] C. E. Wright, 'The dispersal of the monastic libraries and the beginnings of Anglo-Saxon studies: Matthew Parker and his circle', *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society*, 1 (1951), 208–37; R. I. Page, *Matthew Parker and his Books* (Kalamazoo, MI, 1993); Timothy Graham, 'The beginnings of Old English studies: evidence from the manuscripts of Matthew Parker', in Shuji Sato, *Back to the Manuscripts* (Tokyo, 1997), pp. 29–30.

[10] Graham, 'Matthew Parker's manuscripts', p. 323. See also Summit, *Memory's Library* and Robinson, '"Darke speech"'.

[11] E.g. Page, *Parker and his Books*, p. 60: 'Inevitably much of what I have said sounds very critical. I have accused Parker of mutilating books, destroying textual material, scribbling in precious and artistically important manuscripts, and putting them at risk in various ways. This is only to say that Parker's attitude to conservation is not ours. He did not seek to preserve the same sort of evidence.'

[12] Rodney M. Thomson characterises much of what set William apart from his contemporaries as an 'awareness' of his sources and how histories were constructed, which meant that, in a self-consciously

that Parker himself was very interested in the ways in which historians interacted with their sources. In fact, Parker's imitation of both ancient and contemporary historical methodologies means we can consider the way in which his project was carried out as *part* of that project. Every stage of the process can be considered as one of the Parkerian enterprise's productions, and not as merely subservient to them. Parker's project was comprehensive, and we cannot assess any element before taking into account its entire cycle of production.

3.1 Contemporary Influences

We can begin our investigation of Parker's Elizabethan historical research on 14 July 1560, when the new archbishop was summoned to the court at Greenwich. A messenger had arrived there with an unusual request 'from certain learned men of Germany' and Elizabeth wanted Parker 'to consider what may be meet to be answered therein'.[13] These 'learned men' were the Lutheran historians known as the Magdeburg Centuriators. They had been seeking English books and enduring financial strain for several years.[14] When England became Protestant again, they dedicated the newest volume of their church history, on the 4th century, to Elizabeth:

Bedan tradition, William both acknowledged his sources and highlighted their discrepancies: *William of Malmesbury* (Woodbridge, 2003), pp. 14–39. For more on the methods of Matthew Paris, see Hans-Eberhard Hilpert, *Kaiser- und Papstbriefe in den Chronica majora des Matthaeus Paris* (Stuttgart, 1981), and Björn Weiler, 'Matthew Paris on the writing of history', *Journal of Medieval History*, 35 (2009), 254–78. In addition to the contemporaries discussed in Section 3.1 ('Contemporary Influences'), John Caius, a close friend of Parker's, was the best contemporary example of this. Caius annotated the margins of his manuscripts, adding variant readings, but he also made extensive notes on texts that he had seen while abroad in Italy in printed editions of Galen. He paid close attention to the details of individual manuscripts' texts, and was not overly eager to conflate them (at least while researching). He even copied manuscript readings he thought were wrong, which allowed him to reflect on the best possible and purest reading in a more strictly 'philological' way. See Vivian Nutton, *John Caius and the Manuscripts of Galen* (Cambridge, 1987) and Anthony Grafton, 'A medical man among ecclesiastical historians: John Caius, Matthew Parker, and the history of Cambridge University', in G. Manning and C. Klestinec (eds), *Professors, Physicians and Practices in the History of Medicine* (Dordrecht, 2017), pp. 113–27.

[13] *Correspondence of Matthew Parker ... Comprising Letters Written by and to Him, from A.D. 1535, to his Death, A.D. 1575*, ed. John Bruce and Thomas Thomason Perowne (Cambridge, 1853), p. 118.

[14] Alexander Alesius had written to Bale on the subject of English manuscripts on 21 March 1553, BL Cotton MS Titus D X Bl. fols 180r–v. Flacius also wrote to Bale on 1 July 1554, BL Cotton MS Titus D X Bl. fols 180v–181r. Finally, Johannes Wigand wrote to Bale on 2 March 1559, BL Cotton MS Titus D X Bl. fols 179v–180r. For their financial troubles, see Anthony Grafton, 'Where was Salomon's house? Ecclesiastical history and the intellectual origins of Bacon's *New Atlantis*', in Anthony Grafton, *Worlds Made by Words: Scholarship and Community in the Modern West* (Cambridge, MA, 2009), p. 105, and Norman Jones, 'Matthew Parker, John Bale, and the Magdeburg Centuriators', *Sixteenth Century Journal*, 12 (1981), 43. Much of this material is available online, *Historische Methode und Arbeitstechnik der Magdeburger Zenturien. Edition ausgewählter Dokumente*, ed. Harald Bollbuck, with Carsten Nahrendorf and Inga Hanna Ralle (Wolfenbüttel, 2012), http://diglib.hab.de/edoc/ed000086/start.htm.

'we did not doubt that the ecclesiastical affairs of British Constantine would be most pleasant and acceptable to your Majesty, in this time of the restoration of true religion'.[15] In return, they asked the new queen to support their project and their research by loaning them important English manuscripts.

Parker could not yet address their petition. He immediately sought help from the very person the Centuriators had asked years earlier: the former Carmelite monk and vitriolic Protestant bibliographer John Bale.[16] As bishop of Ossory in Ireland, Bale had acquired an impressive collection of medieval manuscripts under Edward. He had lost his library when Mary came to the throne, and spent much of his time during her reign working for the Centuriators' printer, Johannes Oporinus, in Basel. Oporinus also printed Bale's own magnum opus, the *Scriptorum illustrium maioris Brytannie ... catalogus*, a chronological compendium of British authors. If anyone knew the sources of British ecclesiastical history in 1560, it was Bale. On 30 July, less than two weeks after Parker's request, Bale sent the archbishop a lengthy letter, detailing books and their possible locations according to the categories of the Centuriators' list.[17]

Parker presumably replied to the Centuriators then, but the next extant communication between them took place in 1561. In a 22 May letter to the archbishop, the organiser of the Centuriators' enterprise, Matthias Flacius Illyricus, enclosed some selections from the chronicle of the English medieval writer Matthew Paris.[18] Primarily, however, Flacius wanted manuscripts from Parker—he enquired after Bale's lost library, eagerly awaited some 'promised monuments', and even asked the Protestant primate to obtain a description of some books at Rome if at all possible.[19] A few weeks later, Parker sent a frustrated reply to the Centuriators:[20]

> [A]fter having sent numberless messengers to many persons and places to no effect, I was at length stirred up to recover the books of master Bale, which, it was said, there

---

[15] *Quarta centuria ecclesiasticae historiae ... per aliquot studiosos & pios uiros in urbe Magdeburgica*, vol. 4 (Basel, 1562), p. 10: 'non dubitauimus, Constantini Britannici Ecclesiasticas res tuae Maiestati iucundissimas atque acceptissimas fore, hoc ipso restaurationis uerae Religionis tempore'. The text of the letter accompanying the book sent to the queen, in Lambeth Palace Library MS 2010, is available online in *Historische Methode*.

[16] See n. 14 for the Centuriators' correspondence with Bale. Parker's letter reached Bale 'the xviii daye of thys moneth', July 1560: Timothy Graham and Andrew G. Watson (eds), *The Recovery of the Past in Early Elizabethan England: Documents by John Bale and John Joscelyn from the Circle of Matthew Parker* (Cambridge, 1998), p. 17, fol. 1r.

[17] Jones, 'Matthew Parker, John Bale, and the Magdeburg Centuriators', 37–8.

[18] Parker, *Correspondence*, p. 140.

[19] Parker, *Correspondence*, pp. 139–41. For both the excerpts of Matthew Paris and the list of desiderata, see BL MS Egerton 3790. On which see Nicholas Popper, *Walter Ralegh's 'History of the World' and the Historical Culture of the Late Renaissance* (Chicago, 2012), p. 59, and Anthony Grafton, 'Flacius and Parker', in *Matthew Parker*, ed. Scott Mandelbrote, Anthony Grafton, and William Sherman (forthcoming).

[20] I follow Norman Jones, 'Matthew Parker, John Bale, and the Magdeburg Centuriators', 40, in dating this letter to 18 July 1561, rather than to 1566 (which John Bruce assigned it in the Parker Society edition of the correspondence).

would be some prospect of obtaining, if I chose to make the attempt. I ascertained therefore, upon inquiry, into whose hands they fell after his flight from Ireland; and when a great heap of them was brought to me, I discovered clearly that none of them were, in my opinion, either valuable for their antiquity, or written on any subject useful and [appropriate] to your purpose. When however your friend Niger [Bernard Schwartz] saw them, together with mine[,] and some others, he said that many of them [c]ould be of much use. He has them therefore, upon the condition of returning them within a year. But if you are in possession of so rich a collection and apparatus of the writers of our nation, as is mentioned in your catalogue, I think you must have a far greater number than is left in all England, of which I have any certain knowledge and information … This then is the state of the case, that I am unable to satisfy your request, as I could wish; although, before I had been taught by experience, I confidently believed that I could assist you to a greater extent.[21]

For all the failures he reported, Parker's quest to assist the Centuriators set a new project in motion. The Centuriators' petition for books sparked Parker's own search for the monuments of English church history. It also provided a model for researching church history.

While Flacius himself was the chief Gnesio-Lutheran, the *Centuries* dramatised the foundational Lutheran premise that the church had declined over the centuries until the Reformation by depicting deviations from earlier practice and belief. Whereas late antique ecclesiastical history had been, to a large extent, hagiographical, Flacius wanted this history to reconstruct the condition of the church.[22] The Centuriators did their research by copying relevant passages from each source onto folio sheets, each of them labelled with a distinct *locus communis* or commonplace (a theme or argument of general application), and divided into chronological columns.[23] They had sixteen *loci communes*, ranging from heresies to the state of other religions. This research was carried out by a group of scholars whose tasks were determined by their status within the hierarchy of the Institutum Historicum founded by Flacius.[24] Although Flacius was quick to deny it, both the research team

[21] Parker, *Correspondence*, pp. 287–8, English translation from *The Zurich Letters*, vol. 2, ed. Hastings Robinson (Cambridge, 1842), pp. 78–9 except within parentheses: 'Atqui posteaquam plurimos plurimis, et locis et viris, frustra misissem nuntios, tandem animarer ad recuperandum D. Balei libros, quos (ut dicebatur) spes esset acquirendi, si periculum ipse facerem: didici igitur tandem, inquisitione facta, ad cujus manus post ejus fugam ex Hybernia hi pervenere. Quorum cum ingens acervus ad me perferebatur, reperi haud dubie nullos, mea sententia, vel dignos vetustate vel argumenti ad vestrum institutum commodi ac utilis. Quos tamen cum vidisset vester Nigerus, una cum meis et aliorum complures, multum juvare posse dicebat. Habet igitur, hac conditione, ut intra annum transmittantur. Quod si sit apud vos nostrae nationis scriptorum tam locuples quasi instrumentum et apparatus quam mentio fit in vestro catalogo, arbitror superesse vobis multo plures de nostris quam sint rursus in toto Angliae regno, quorum sit apud nos certa intelligentia atque cognitio… Atque ita se res habet ut vestrae petitioni, sicuti vellem, non satisfaciam, licet (priusquam experientia eram edoctus) certo credidi me vestram causam plus juvare potuisse.'
[22] Grafton, 'Where was Salomon's house?', p. 105.
[23] Gregory B. Lyon, 'Baudouin, Flacius, and the plan for the Magdeburg Centuries', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 64 (2003), 263.
[24] Grafton, 'Where was Salomon's house?', p. 106.

and its attention to gathering quotations had their origins in the practices of the 4th-century Greek father, Eusebius of Caesarea, whose *Church History* was one of the many sources they deconstructed into *loci*.[25] The Centuriators arranged each century of the church's history (which was also a volume) into sixteen chapters, organised by the same *loci communes* they had used to carry out their research. They called their work a *historia integra*, a complete history, but the *Centuries* was necessarily compartmentalised by its chronological approach. Nonetheless, their aim to be exhaustive, especially their decision to include the late medieval church in their work, would prove important for Parker.[26]

Like the Centuriators, Parker assembled a research team for his project. He was most dependent upon a circle of scholars whom he employed, which included Stephen Batman, Alexander Neville, Thomas Yale, George Acworth, Parker's son John, and, most importantly, John Joscelyn, Parker's Latin secretary.[27] The archbishop also relied on binders, illuminators, a number of well-known Elizabethan printers, and a person to whom Parker referred as an 'artificer'—essentially an expert calligrapher who was very handy whenever the archbishop wanted to have a text 'counterfeited in antiquity'.[28] The martyrologist John Foxe and, as we have already seen, John Bale, made important guest appearances in Parker's circle, while English bishops, such as John Jewel, were sent on the hunt for books in cathedral libraries.[29] It is often difficult to determine who did what within Parker's circle—they themselves could not always distinguish the handwriting of different members within it.[30] Nor is it easy to tell where the circle ended, as Parker's enquiries may have at least inspired those of others.[31] Thus Parker's name often serves as a metonym for his scholarly group in this chapter. Parker's project to collect, publish, and preserve the monuments of antiquity was a massive, collaborative undertaking, comprised of multiple smaller projects.

While the Centuriators offered an inexact model for Parker's team, Parker's publications differed greatly from their methodical enquiries into practice and doctrine in the Christian world since Christ. Even in 1561, Parker expressed some

---

[25] Arnaldo Momigliano, 'Pagan and Christian historiography in the fourth century', in Arnaldo Momigliano, *The Conflict between Paganism and Christianity in the Fourth Century* (Oxford, 1963), p. 92.

[26] Lyon, 'Baudouin, Flacius, and the plan', 264.

[27] Levy, *Tudor Historical Thought*, pp. 116–17.

[28] Parker, *Correspondence*, pp. 253–4.

[29] Wright, 'Dispersal', 223. Jewel's letters to Parker concerning one manuscript are pasted at the back of it: CUL MS Ii.2.4, fol. 149 bis recto.

[30] Lambeth Palace Library MS 959, fol. 132r, a Parkerian hand comments on another Parkerian marginal note: 'manus Domini Yale, ni fallor. autographum Yalei iam prae manibus habeo'; 'valde dubito. Manus enim Johannis Parker est perquam similis.'

[31] For example, Parker's work may have inspired the Corpus Christi College arts student Christopher Watson, whose work on the history of Durham, from its Roman and British origins to the history of its bishops, and whose friendship with Joscelyn shows that he was at the very least tangential to Parker's circle. See Warren Boutcher, 'Polybius speaks British: a case study in mid-Tudor humanism and historiography', in Fred Schurink (ed.), *Tudor Translation* (London, 2011), pp. 113–16.

dissatisfaction to Flacius with the consequences of such a grandiose approach: 'There are those who miss in your history the very words of those authors whom you only mention. Even if this is laborious in such a great work and does not benefit men of much reading, nevertheless it would provide clarification for beginners, and would also be important against slanderers.'[32] In essence, Parker wanted the Centuriators to be more like Eusebius of Caesarea, who had studded the text of his ecclesiastical history with lengthy quotations from his sources. Perhaps Parker's preference for the authors' *ipsa verba* helps to explain why so many of his own publications would be editions.[33]

Parker, however, did not begin publishing his editions until after another continental group provided him with two different, and rival, models. In 1565, Thomas Stapleton, an exiled English Catholic, published a translation of Bede's *Historia ecclesiastica gentis anglorum* in Antwerp. Stapleton's translation was itself partly a response to Bale's *Actes of the Englysh votaryes* and John Foxe's *Acts and Monuments*—whereas Bale and Foxe 'are knowen to maintaine a faction and singular opinion lately spronge vp', Stapleton argued that '[n]o such suspicion can be made of S. Bede, who lyued aboue eight hundred yeares paste, and reporteth the planting of Christen religion among vs englishmen'.[34] On Bede's authority, Stapleton intended to demonstrate unambiguously that 'the pretended refourmers of the church … haue departed from the patern of that sounde and catholike faith planted first among Englishemen by holy S. Augustin our Apostle'.[35] Augustine of Canterbury's mission to the English was central to Stapleton's thesis that English Christianity was Roman and papal. Bale had interpreted Bede's account of Pope Gregory's inspiration for Augustine's mission in the angelic appearance of the *Angli* in implicitly sexual terms. Stapleton roundly dismissed 'baudy' Bale's slander.[36]

In the same year, Robert Poyntz, a fellow English Catholic living in exile with Stapleton, published *Testimonies for the Real Presence of Christes body and blood*

---

[32] Parker, *Correspondence*, p. 288. 'Sunt qui in historia vestra authorum quorum vos nudam tantum commemorationem facitis, ipsa verba recitata esse desiderant. Quod etsi in historia tam grandi sit laboriosum, et viris multae lectionis usum non praebet; tamen initiatis non nihil lucis sit allaturum, et contra maledicos magni etiam futurum momenti.'

[33] Flacius, too, published editions, including the text of the Latin Mass before 700 CE (*Missa latina, quae olim ante Romanam circa 700*, 1557) and, two years after Parker's edition of the Anglo-Saxon Gospels, a 9th-century rhyming compilation of Old High German Gospels, Otfried of Weissenburg's *Evangelienbuch* (1573). See Oliver K. Olson, *Matthias Flacius and the Survival of Luther's Reform* (Wiesbaden, 2002), pp. 275, 344. It is possible that Parker had a hand in the English translation of the decrees of the Council of Trent with Flacius' commentary, *A godly and necessarye admonition of the decrees and canons of the Counsel of Trent* (London, 1564). The original was in Latin: *Pia et Necessaria Admonitio de Decretis et Canonibus Concilii Tridentini* (Frankfurt, 1563).

[34] Thomas Stapleton, 'Preface to the reader', in *The History of the Church of Englande: Compiled by Venerable Bede, Englishman* (Antwerp, 1565), fol. 3r.

[35] Stapleton, 'To the Right Excellent and Most Gratiovse Princesse, Elizabeth …', in *The History of the Church of Englande*, sig. *3r.

[36] Stapleton, 'Preface to the reader', fol. 3v.

in the blessed Sacrament.[37] Poyntz's book was a translation of passages from the church fathers—Augustine, Cyril, Chrysostom, Hilary, Cyprian, and Ambrose—intended to prove that the real presence was patristic doctrine. Poyntz joined forces with Thomas Harding in writing against John Jewel, whose 1562 *Apologia ecclesiae anglicanae* had occasioned a bitter war, in which minutely detailed treatises served as weapons. Parker, for his part, helped publish and disseminate Jewel's writings in this controversy.[38] Poyntz took exacting aim at passages in Jewel's most recent foray, *A Replie vnto M. Hardinges Answeare*: 'S. Chrysostoms Masse or liturgie defended against M. Juels false surmises in the tenth page of his Replye to D. Harding.'[39] Stapleton had used early English history to make claims about the religious identity of the English Church; Poyntz sought to demonstrate 'the consent of the auncient fathers of the Church in this chief matter of religion', the doctrine of the real presence.[40]

In late 1566, Parker would obliquely reply to both in his first edition: *A Testimonie of Antiquitie*, with Anglo-Saxon sermons by Aelfric.[41] While the book included other Old English texts, including the 'Our Father' prayer, Parker enlisted Aelfric's 'testimonie' 'in thys controuersie' to prove that there was no real presence, and that this doctrine 'was the common receaued doctrine herein of the whole church of England, as well when Ælfricke hym self lyued, as before hys tyme, and also after his time, euen from him to the conquest'.[42] Yet Aelfric also served as Parker's spokesman in another, more local debate. In the winter of 1566, Parker and twenty other bishops tried to pass legislation restoring Article 29 of the 39 Articles, that the wicked, 'although they doe carnally, and uisibly presse with their teeth … the Sacrament of the body, & blood of Christ: yet in no wise are they partakers of Christe'.[43] The doctrinal implication behind the Article, which Elizabeth vetoed just before the publication of the original thirty-nine in 1564, was that those who

---

[37] Robert Poyntz (or Pointz), *Testimonies for the Real Presence of Christes body and blood in the blessed Sacrament* (Louvain, 1566).

[38] Parker had a hand in the publication of Jewel's initial *Apologia*—see Parker, *Correspondence*, pp. 161–2 (I follow John Booty's dating of this letter to 1 January 1562, in his *John Jewel as Apologist of the Church of England* (London, 1963), p. 52). Parker also wrote the preface to the 1562 English translation of Jewel's *Apologie* by Lady Anne Bacon. To help disseminate Jewel's work, he wrote to Bishop John Parkhurst of Norwich in 1572, recommending that a copy of Jewel's *Reply* be placed in every parish church (E. Evenden and T. Freeman, 'Print, profit and propaganda: the Elizabethan Privy Council and the 1570 edition of Foxe's "Book of Martyrs"', *English Historical Review*, 119 (2004), 1303).

[39] Poyntz, *Testimonies*, sig. [A 1]v.

[40] Poyntz, *Testimonies*, sig. A iijr.

[41] For evidence of the late 1566, or possibly early 1567, dating and further details about the context of the *Testimonie*'s publication, see Erick Kelemen, 'More evidence for the date of A Testimonie of Antiquitie', *The Library*, 7 (2006), 361–76.

[42] Parker, 'Preface', in *A Testimonie of Antiquitie* (London, 1566), fols 16r–v.

[43] Elizabeth restored the Article in the Parliament of 1571 (Kelemen, 'More evidence', 376), but the bishops' petition in 1566 was unsuccessful—the queen dissolved Parliament on 2 January 1567 (Kelemen, 'More evidence', 373). This quotation of the Article is from Thomas Rogers, *The faith, doctrine, religion, professed & protected in the realme of England ... Expressed in 39 Articles* (Cambridge, 1607), p. 178. See also Kelemen, 'More evidence', 374.

did not have true belief could not in any way partake of Christ's flesh and blood in the sacrament, as Christ was not really present in the elements. As Erick Kelemen has shown, the publication of *A Testimonie* was 'timed to appear during this Parliament', and was signed by many of the same bishops who supported the petition to the queen about Article 29.[44] Parker wanted to make a case to Elizabeth that the doctrine of the real presence was fundamentally unEnglish as well as untrue— this was a (failed) attempt to use ecclesiastical scholarship to support a confessional alignment with Reformed Eucharistic dogma. At the same time, he also had the wider world of Protestant and Catholic polemic in mind, and wished to show that Catholics such as Stapleton 'dissent in doctrine … from that age of their churche whiche they haue thought moste holy, and iudged a most excellent paterne to be folowed'.[45] To do both, he laid claim to the Anglo-Saxon Church as a source of authority, much as Poyntz had turned to the early church fathers.

The authority of Anglo-Saxon texts and, in particular, Augustine's role as either a villain or a hero in the history of the English Church, long continued to be crucial to Protestants' rejoinders to English Catholics. In 1571, John Jewel, probably relying on information relayed to him by Parker's team, took an example in his ongoing debate with Harding from 'the true Beda in deede, translated aboue seuen hundred yeeres agoe into the olde Englishe, or Saxon tongue, by Alfredus', instead of Bede's Latin *Historia*, to prove Augustine was complicit in the slaughter of British clergy.[46] Someone in Parker's circle, in turn, noted Jewel's use of the *locus* in Parker's copy of the Anglo-Saxon Bede: 'you will see more about that matter in the *Defense* of John Jewel, bishop of Salisbury, printed in 1571. pag. 520 etc.'.[47] While Catholic uses of the past and the ever-unsettled Elizabethan settlement helped to provoke Parker's publications, it was the Centuriators' request five years earlier that gave Parker the means and the manuscripts to publish a text such as Aelfric in response.

3.2 Acquisitions

Parker used the network he commanded as archbishop and took advantage of every form of official endorsement to build his collection. But his collection methods also illuminate the way in which he built on the models and practices Bale had already created. His assistants relied heavily on Bale's local knowledge, even to frame their own quest for books. Parker's team of scholars began their search for books with Bale's 1560 letter to Parker, which they read a number of times, word for word and work for work. If a text had been printed, Bale did not mention the locations of its

[44] Kelemen, 'More evidence', 375.
[45] Parker, 'Preface', *A Testimonie*, fols 17v–18r.
[46] John Jewel, *A defense of the Apologie of the Churche of Englande* (London, 1571), p. 520.
[47] CUL Kk.3.18, fol. 19v: 'De ista re plura videbis apud John. Juell. Episcopum Sarisburiensem in defensione Apologiae Ecclesiae Anglicanae impress. A[nno] 1571. pag. 520 etc.'

manuscript copies in his letter: '*Ecclesiasticam historiam gentis Anglorum* wrote Beda, lyke as did other for the other nacyons: And hys wurke hath bene in dyuerse places printed.'[48] Occasionally he supplied details of an edition: 'If ye couete the lyues of our Englysh sanctes, seke *Noua legenda Angliae* … It was printed in Flete strete by Winkyne de Worde, *anno Domini* 1516.'[49] Otherwise, however, he included his best approximations of manuscripts' locations. He probably consulted his notes on manuscript owners and library collections in the *Index*, his alphabetical notebook of authors.[50] But he also relied on his memory:

> Johan Rufus a black fryre in Englande, wrote a lyttle boke, *de vitis Romanorum pontificum*, I haue seane an olde coppye therof at Norwich, full of newly deuysed lyes and fables. So did Sicardus Cremonensis, whose coppye I sawe in Johan Laylandes studye, and as I remembre, maistre Johan Cheke had it at the lattre.[51]

Parker and his circle paid close attention to what Bale said about the ownership or whereabouts of each manuscript 'coppye', even of histories like John Rufus' collection of 'lyes and fables'. They underlined parts of this passage in Bale's letter with pen and pencil.[52] On the previous page, 'en', or 'behold, look' has been scrawled in Joscelyn's small, cramped hand in ink.[53] It seems likely that Joscelyn was the first annotator. Graham and Andrew Watson suggest that Parker made the underlinings in pencil.[54] Both forms of annotation would appear again and again in the circle's work. Once Parker and Joscelyn had mined the letter for this information, they could start chasing Bale's leads.

Within the next few years, Parker's men found a large number of the books Bale mentioned. At some point before 1567, Joscelyn compiled a list of English history writers. Next to many authors' works, Joscelyn wrote: 'Habet archiepiscopus Cant.'—'the archbishop of Canterbury has this'.[55] Occasionally, if Joscelyn had not discovered the owner of a manuscript that Bale listed, he rewrote Bale's comments in the letter. Parker's circle still did not know where 'Sicardus Cremonensis' was, for example, and so he repeated Bale's comment about seeing it in Leland's study

---

[48] Graham and Watson (eds), *Recovery*, p. 18, fol. 1r. The manuscript that contains Bale's letter is CUL MS Add. 7489.

[49] Graham and Watson (eds), *Recovery*, p. 21, fol. 2r. Bale's reference was to *Nova legenda Anglie* (London, 1516).

[50] Bale's *Index Britanniae scriptorium* is Bodl. MS Selden supra 64. Bale alphabetically recorded books' titles, *incipit*s, and whereabouts in this notebook.

[51] Graham and Watson (eds), *Recovery*, p. 19, fol. 1v.

[52] Graham and Watson (eds), *Recovery*, p. 19, fol. 1v, editors' notes f–h.

[53] Graham and Watson (eds), *Recovery*, p. 18, fol. 1r, note d. Graham and Watson describe this 'mark … of a type frequently used by John Joscelyn when annotating' as a sort of 'epsilon' with 'a sinuous line which descends lower than the left-hand' epsilon on the right, but I read it as 'en'. John Jewel also wrote 'En' in the margins of his books, including in bibliographical works such as Flacius' *Catalogus testium veritatis* (see Oxford, Magdalen College Library, L.15.3).

[54] Graham and Watson (eds), *Recovery*, p. 4.

[55] Graham and Watson (eds), *Recovery*, p. 61, fol. 208v. The manuscript with Joscelyn's catalogue is BL Cotton MS Nero C III.

and remembering Cheke's possession.[56] After the first folio, the source for his list changed: he shifted from using Bale's letter to making more intensive use of Bale's other materials. In his letter, Bale had directed Parker to bibliographical works for further reference, including those of Flacius, since Bale did not know who had instigated Parker's request.[57] He also frequently referenced his own work—as when he noted that to list 'all works written by those who have dissented from the Roman church either altogether or in part' would 'axe muche tyme … Wherfor I leaue yow in thys point, to the Appendices of my xiiii Centuryes *de scriptoribus Britanniae*, for therin haue I laboured in that kynde of studye, to my vttermost power.'[58] Although little attention has been paid to them, the 'Appendices' of Bale's *Catalogus* were as essential as the material in Bale's letter for directing Parker's search for manuscripts.

Since the archbishop must have intimated that he was in a hurry to find books, Bale enclosed two quires of his work, the *Catalogus*, with his letter. When writing about 'all histories, chronicles, and annals, even if they were of individual places, not yet published', Bale noted, 'Of these I haue had an excedynge great nombre, as your grace shall wele perceyue in the ii printed quayers, which I haue here sent vnto yow.'[59] Bale clearly sent a list of the books he had once owned in Ireland: 'a regestre of their tyttles, inprented at the requeste of Gesnerus, Lycosthenes, Simlerus and other learned men at Zuryck and Basyll. I desyre your grace at your layser, to sende it me agayne, least I lose the whole volume by the want therof'.[60] But in the *Catalogus*, this list of Bale's manuscripts takes up only one quire.[61] If we look closely at Joscelyn's lists made using Bale's letter, it becomes clear that Bale enclosed the next consecutive quire with the one listing his lost library.

Joscelyn's bibliographical information for the first page of his list clearly derived from Bale's letter, but the source as well as the title of Joscelyn's list changed after the first folio. Bookbinders inadvertently cut off part of this title, yet the top of the page still reads: 'desiring perhaps to put together a history, I have thought it very useful to indicate here the names of writers of history and what each of them

[56] Graham and Watson (eds), *Recovery*, p. 62, fol. 208v.

[57] Graham and Watson (eds), *Recovery*, p. 27, fol. 3v, and p. 22, fol. 2v where Bale says that the *Catalogus testium veritatis* is 'lately set fourth by me and Illyricus'.

[58] Graham and Watson (eds), *Recovery*, p. 22, fol. 2v. 'Omnia scripta ab his, qui a Romana ecclesia vel in toto vel in parte dissenserunt, conscripta.' Since the fourteenth and final *centuria* has no appendices, I suspect Bale meant 'xiii' instead of 'xiiii'. Bale addressed the thirteenth *centuria*'s appendices to Gesner, Lycosthenes, and Simlerus—the three men he mentioned as those who requested these lists' inclusion in his *Catalogus*. Bale, *Scriptorum illustrium maioris Brytanniae … catalogus*, 2 vols (Basel, 1557–9) II, p. 170: 'Alij adhuc sunt, uenerabiles domini Gesnere, Lycosthenes, ac Simlere, & non inferioris notae, Brytannorum chronographi, ut in nostris Centurijs atque Appendicibus uidere poteritis: sed isti tanquam magis a nostris Anglis cogniti, ad praesens sufficient. Hos atque alios adhuc ualde plures, uidi, manibus contrectaui, ac legi, paucissimis exceptis, & typis excudi libens cuperem.'

[59] Graham and Watson (eds), *Recovery*, p. 24, fol. 3r.

[60] Graham and Watson (eds), *Recovery*, p. 17, fol. 1r.

[61] Bale, *Catalogus*, II, pp. 163–7. Bale's list detailing his lost library begins on sig. [u 4]r, one folio before the quire begins on sig. x [1]. Bale probably included that folio as well.

wrote, and at what time'.[62] This echoes an important list in Bale's *Catalogus*, which makes up the second quire of the thirteenth *centuria*'s appendix: 'For the forming of history: for some consolation of those who after my times will perhaps still wish to put together a history from the aforesaid and other labours of antique writers, I decided that it would be very helpful to place this list here that they might know the coverage and chronology of the works of those writers.'[63] In the same quire, immediately following that list, is a table of commentators on the Book of Revelation—it is indicative of the differences between Bale's interests and Parker's that Joscelyn did not use this list to create his acquisition list.[64]

Joscelyn's list then loosely models itself on Bale's short chronological list of British historians in the *Catalogus*, beginning with Gildas. Instead of quoting Bale's English letter, Joscelyn writes in Latin: 'see in Bale'.[65] For the ownership of some of these works, Joscelyn clearly must have drawn on the information Bale provided in his letter, as the location of particular manuscripts is not in the *Catalogus*. But throughout the small catalogue Joscelyn recorded even these details in Latin, the language of the *Catalogus*, rather than copying the English of Bale's letter. For instance, Bale told Parker in 1560 that the chronicle of Matthew Paris 'remayneth in the custodye of my lorde of Arundell'.[66] In 1561, Parker presumably had yet to obtain a copy, since Flacius sent him transcripts from the chronicle. But by the time Joscelyn compiled his list, Parker also had a manuscript.[67] In fact, in this part of his catalogue, Joscelyn often literally copied Bale. His entry on Henry of Huntingdon repeated word for word the first half of Bale's sentence on the medieval historian in his list of British writers: 'Henry of Huntingdon archdeacon gathered the origins of British history from his contemporary, the writer Geoffrey of Monmouth.'[68]

---

[62] Graham and Watson (eds), *Recovery*, p. 65. BL Cotton MS Nero C III, fol. 209r: 'historiam fortassis contexere cupiens valde commo<dum> duxi, nomina historicorum et quid vnusquisque quauis aetate scripsit, hic indicare'. Graham and Watson do not mention this section of Bale's *Catalogus*, nor do they note the shift in which source of Bale's Joscelyn is taking from within his list. They believe that Joscelyn himself desired to write a history (9), but since the list is paraphrasing Bale, Joscelyn probably meant it for the use of anyone desiring to write such a history.

[63] Bale, *Catalogus*, II, p. 168: 'Pro historia formanda. Pro aliquanto eorum levamine, qui post mea tempora ex praedictis & alijs antiquorum scriptorum laboribus historiam conflare fortassis adhuc cupient, hunc ordinem hoc loco ponere ualde commodum duxi, ut illorum operum durationes ac tempora scirent.' This list actually begins on the back of the last folio of the first quire Bale sent to Parker, sig. [x 4]v, and ends on sig. y [1]v.

[64] Bale, *Catalogus*, II, pp. 171–4: 'Catalogus eruditorum virorum, veterum ac recentiorum, qui … in Apocalypsim…commentarios ediderunt.' This is sig. y 2r in the same quire.

[65] Graham and Watson (eds), *Recovery*, p. 65, fol. 209r: 'Gildas Sapiens … Vide in Bale'.

[66] Graham and Watson (eds), *Recovery*, p. 29, fol. 4v.

[67] Graham and Watson (eds), *Recovery*, p. 89, fol. 210v: 'Habet Comes Arundel et archiepiscopus Cant.'

[68] Graham and Watson (eds), *Recovery*, p. 74, fol. 209r. Bale, *Catalogus*, II, p. 169. Latin of both: 'Henricus Huntingtonensis archidiaconus primordia rerum Britannicarum ex Galfrido Monemuthensi sui temporis scriptore collegit …' Graham and Watson suggest that, since Joscelyn's source is not *Catalogus*, I, pp. 192–3, 'the entry may reflect his own knowledge of Henry's text' (p. 74, note [a]). Clearly this is not the case: Joscelyn had the list in front of him and did not deviate from Bale's information. It should also be noted that Bale's *Catalogus* served as a more general guide to books for Parker's

'Marke my ii printed quayers', Bale wrote to Parker in 1560.[69] Joscelyn, it seems, did just that.

Joscelyn's catalogue, informed almost entirely by Bale, probably functioned as a guide for Parker's acquisitions.[70] Joscelyn updated the list as he gained new information or as owners changed. Frequently, Parker is listed as the new owner: 'the archbishop of Canterbury has this by gift of Mr Wutton'.[71] The fact that Parker received manuscripts, as well as printed books, as gifts probably reflects the fact that he worked hard to publicise his efforts at research, at least within the network that the hierarchy of the Church of England provided. John Scory, bishop of Hereford, apologised to him for the delay in sending 'iij saxon bokes. found in the churche of heref.[ord]' and begged the archbishop 'not to thinke me to haue ben forgetful or negligent in this yor busines'.[72] We can reconstruct Parker's directions for this 'busines' only from the books that members of this ecclesiastical network deemed worthy of his purpose and the letters that accompanied them. John Aylmer, archdeacon of Lincoln, could not find 'old wrytten ecclesiasticall histo-ryes', and mostly found the works of the 'scholemen'.[73] The only book he thought fitted Parker's parameters was a 13th-century manuscript of Archbishop Stephen Langton's Old Testament commentary, 'the archbishop of Canterbury's booke upon thold testament'.[74]

Despite the bishops' limited success, Parker's position as archbishop of Canterbury was critical for procuring and assembling local manuscripts. In addi-tion to mustering episcopal support, Parker obtained the aid of the Privy Council in acquiring manuscripts from private owners. Most famously, in 1568, the Privy Council decreed that manuscript owners, once solicited, had to lend 'any such auncient recordes or monumentes written' to Parker for 'a tyme of perusyng of the same'.[75] Parker had also procured the council's help in acquiring the 'notable written books of my predecessor Dr Cranmer' in 1563.[76] He already had Martin Bucer's papers, and it is important to remember that he sought the manuscripts of Thomas Cranmer just as eagerly as he tracked down those relating to earlier church history. As he told Cecil, he would rejoice at the recovery of Cranmer's books as much as he 'would to restore an old chancel to reparation'.[77] He even paginated his

---

circle. They frequently entered the bio-bibliographical information provided by Bale in the front of Parker's manuscripts, even in a transcript such as BL Harley MS 3634, fol. 2v, where the information provided about Thomas Walsingham comes word for word from Bale's entry in the *Catalogus*, I, p. 573.

[69] Graham and Watson (eds), *Recovery*, p. 25, fol. 3r.

[70] Graham, 'Matthew Parker's manuscripts', p. 326.

[71] Graham and Watson (eds), *Recovery*, p. 76, fol. 209v: 'Habet archiepiscopus Cant. ex dono Mri Wutton.'

[72] The date given is 3 March, no year. Quoted in Wright, 'Dispersal', 222.

[73] Quoted in Wright, 'Dispersal', 222.

[74] Quoted in Wright, 'Dispersal', 222.

[75] CCCC MS 114A, p. 49.

[76] Parker, *Correspondence*, p. 186.

[77] Parker, *Correspondence*, p. 186.

predecessor's commonplace books with the same red chalk that covers his copies of Bede and William of Malmesbury.[78] Parker's vision of English church history extended from Gildas into living memory.

3.3 Categorising and Periodising

In fact, once Parker obtained books, he bound them in such a way to reflect the continuity of English history. While it was common practice for early modern book owners to have the individual texts they bought bound as anthologies, Parker streamlined that process. Most of his printed books were kept 'in parchment closures as the[y] lye on heapes' and were repaginated as they were placed in various limp vellum bindings.[79] In addition to using easily removable 'parchment closures', by 1570 he maintained a bindery in Lambeth Palace itself, to compile and arrange texts as he saw fit.[80] Jean de Planche constructed matching luxury bindings for presentation copies of the publications he sponsored.[81] Parker possibly compiled new assortments as he embarked on or planned various projects. His bindings may reflect not only how he categorised texts but also the beginning stages of his research.

Parker thus bound texts topically, as in SP 193, a collection of humanist treatises on Mary Magdalene.[82] These groupings no doubt made it easier to trawl through numerous texts for *loci* relevant to that topic. He also bound books with chronology in mind. One book, which never made it into the Parker Library, comprised Dares Phrygius' supposed eyewitness account of the fall of Troy; Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Historia regum Britanniae*, which told the story of the British from their Trojan founder Brutus to the Saxon conquest; William of Malmesbury's *Gesta regum anglorum*, which covered English history from the Saxons to the early 12th

[78] The commonplace books are now BL Royal MSS 7 B XI and XII. See Pamela M. Black, 'Matthew Parker's search for Cranmer's "great notable written books"', *The Library*, 5th ser., 29 (1974), 313. See also D. G. Selwyn and Paul Ayris, 'Appendix III: Cranmer's commonplace books', in D. G. Selwyn and Paul Ayris (eds), *Thomas Cranmer: Churchman and Scholar* (Woodbridge, 1999), pp. 312–15, and Ashley Null, *Thomas Cranmer's Doctrine of Repentance: Renewing the Power to Love* (Oxford, 2000), appendix, pp. 254–78.

[79] Quoted in Jeffrey Todd Knight, *Bound to Read: Compilations, Collections, and the Making of Renaissance Literature* (Philadelphia, PA, 2013), p. 44. It is also possible, as Elizabeth Evenden suggests, that some of these basic board bindings were either bound according to priority ('texts identified as crucial to Parker's immediate work were identified and kept safe between boards as soon as possible') or that such texts 'suggest the proximity of their binding to the demise of the archbishop's health and his ultimate death' (E. Evenden, 'Agendas and aesthetics in the transformations of the Codex in early modern England', in Sas Mays (ed.), *Libraries, Literatures, and Archives* (New York, 2013), p. 103).

[80] Evenden, 'Agendas and aesthetics', p. 104.

[81] E. Evenden, *Patents, Pictures and Patronage: John Day and the Tudor Book Trade* (Aldershot, 2008), pp. 109–10. In addition to presentation copies, Parker also had some of his own books bound beautifully. See, for example, the binding of his copy of the Bishops' Bible, Houghton Library, Harvard University, WKR 15.2.2, *The holi Bible* (London, 1569).

[82] Knight, *Bound to Read*, p. 46.

century; Giraldus Cambrensis' *Topographia Hibernica* and *Descriptio Cambriae*, histories of Ireland and Wales; and Edmund Campion's *Histories of Ireland* (1571).[83] This volume recounted the history of Britain and Ireland, in chronological order starting from Britons' Trojan origins. The three main manuscripts—the works of Geoffrey, William, and Giraldus—all came from the same Cistercian abbey in Sussex.[84] But it was Parker's team who added relevant (and recent) texts such as Campion's *Histories* and numbered the pages in red chalk after having bound the books in this order.

Clearly, chronology and nation mattered. So did language. Parker's printed edition of Aelfric's sermons, *A Testimonie of Antiquitie*, and Joscelyn's edition of Gildas' *De excidio & conquestu Britanniae*, are bound together, along with an Armenian lexicon compiled by a member of Parker's circle.[85] While undeniably a patchwork, this volume shows that the early church, as well as its languages, went together in Parker's scheme. In fact, for Parker, language itself came to signify period: one of Joscelyn's lists entitled 'Books written in the Saxon tongue' itemises seven works written in Latin after the Saxon but before the Norman conquest.[86] Manuscript and print, on the other hand, did not correspond to antiquity and modernity in the way we might expect. Parker did not distinguish between the two as he assembled print and manuscript miscellanies and paginated them in his famous red chalk.[87]

Parker bound and re-bound books as he added further materials. In the volume John Parker referred to as the '*Historia Daretis*', as it began with the history of Dares Phrygius, the pages were numbered before transcripts were added to fill in missing portions of the text in William of Malmesbury's *Gesta regum anglorum*.[88] In order to bind works topically or chronologically, Parker needed to categorise them before necessarily having read them. Here again, Bale helped. In some of his manuscripts, Parker would copy Bale's *Catalogus* entry on the work's particular author, including the short biography and list of writings with *incipits*.[89]

---

[83] C. T. Berkhout, 'The Parkerian legacy of a Scheide manuscript: William of Malmesbury's *Gesta Regum Anglorum*', *Princeton University Library Chronicle*, 55 (1994), 278. Presumably the Campion is in manuscript.

[84] Berkhout, 'Parkerian legacy', 279.

[85] Knight, *Bound to Read*, p. 46.

[86] Graham and Watson (eds), *Recovery*, pp. 5–6, 55–9: 'Libri Saxonica lingua conscripti'. This list is BL Cotton MS Nero C III, fol. 208r. In addition, Parker had Asser's *Ælfridi regis res gestae* (1574) printed in Anglo-Saxon type, even though the work was written in Latin. For more on Parker's use of Saxon script, see Anthony Grafton, 'Matthew Parker: the book as archive', *History of Humanities*, 2 (2017), appendix A, 'Latin in Saxon script', pp. 42–4.

[87] Knight, *Bound to Read*, pp. 43–4.

[88] See, e.g., Scheide Library, Princeton University, MS 159, after p. 168; Berkhout, 'Parkerian legacy', 286.

[89] Some manuscripts in which Parker's group either copied Bale's entry or referenced it include: CCCC MS 5, fol. ixv; CCCC MS 88, fol. iiv; CCCC MS 152, fol. 108v; CCCC MS 175, fol. viv; CCCC MS 195, p. 24; CCCC MS 259, fol. iv; CCCC MS 277 fol. iv; CCCC MS 339, fol. 1r; CCCC MS 427, p. 62; CCCC MS 460, fol. iv; CCCC MS 476, fol. iiiv; BL Harley MS 3634, fol. 1r.

The *Catalogus* also provided a larger providential framework for approaching and classifying authors. Bale sought to show that 'the deeds, sayings, judgments, writings, deaths and other things worth knowing of each writer … correspond historically and properly to the mysteries described in the Apocalypse of St. John … through the individual ages of the church'.[90] Bale saw both ecclesiastical and literary history as divided into the book of Revelation's 'seauen ages of the world … from Christes death to the latter end of the world'.[91] Parker never adopted Bale's precise equation between human history and Revelation, but on the whole, Parker's periodisation of church history, especially in Britain, clearly derived from Bale's. He, too, reiterated the myth of Joseph of Arimathea's conversion of the Britons, renewed by Timothy's baptism of the British King Lucius.[92]

Like Bale, Parker saw the British Church as distinctively pure.[93] He pointed out that the British Church had long had bishops and cited Bede to show that Scottish followers of Columba converted the English before Augustine's arrival in the island.[94] Parker also followed Bale in his belief that the ecclesiastical history of Saxon England was especially worth salvaging, since 'the aduersaryes of the truth haue iudged of thys time … that there is no age of the church of England, which they haue more reuerenced, and thought more holy then thys. For of what age haue they canonized vnto vs more sainctes and to their lyking more notable?'[95] Parker's access to texts in Anglo-Saxon enabled him to differentiate more sharply than Bale did between the Anglo-Saxon and Norman Churches on linguistic grounds. Bale had listed Bede as the only source for Anglo-Saxon history in his list 'pro historia formanda', in the second quire he sent to Parker.[96] Parker's team would have had many more sources for that period, including the Anglo-Saxon translation of Bede's history.

Although Bale characterised British church history as a story of corruption, his periodisation allowed those who adopted it, including Parker and John Foxe, to salvage as well as condemn writers in ages 'reuerenced' by 'the aduersaryes

---

[90] Bale, *Catalogus*, I, title page: 'In quo antiquitates, origines, annales, loca, successus, celebrioraque cuiusque scriptoris facta, dicta, consilia, scripta, obitus, & alia scitu non indigna recensentur, recta ubique annorum supputatione seruata: ut inde tam reproborum, quam electorum Ecclesiae ministrorum facta, mysterijs in S. Ioannis Apocalypsi descriptis, … per aetates eiusdem Ecclesiae singulas, historice & apte respondeant.'

[91] Bale, *The Image of both Churches*, in *Select Works of John Bale*, ed. Henry Christmas (Cambridge, 1849), p. 312. Bale, *The Image of both Churches* (London, *c*.1580), fol. 68v.

[92] Parker, *De antiquitate Britannicae ecclesiae et Privilegiis Ecclesiae Cantuariensis, cum Archiepiscopis eiusdem* (London, 1572), pp. 4–5. See also preface to Bishops' Bible (London, 1568), ii, v. Bale, *The vocacyon of Johan Bale*, ed. Peter Happé and John N. King (Binghamton, NY, 1990), p. 45; Bale, *The vocacyon of Johan Bale to the bishoprick of Ossorie* (1553), fols 12v–13v. Parker was eager to track down medieval sources for Lucius' conversion—see his *Correspondence* from Bishop Davies and Richard Grafton, pp. 265–6, 295.

[93] Parker, *De antiquitate*, pp. 8–9. Bale, *The vocacyon*, ed. Happé and King, pp. 46–7, 91.

[94] Parker, *De antiquitate*, p. 11.

[95] Parker, 'Preface', *A Testimonie*, fols 16v–17r.

[96] Bale, *Catalogus*, II, p. 168.

of the truth'. There were still 'some godly men' in the period between Augustine of Canterbury and the Reformation, 'though they than erred in many thinges'.[97] Bale thus praised Bede but also blamed him for being 'excessively credulous'—the historian's ability was innate, but his corruption was incidental to his times:

> If he had flourished in the times of Augustine, Jerome, or Chrysostom, I do not doubt that he could have contended even with them as an equal, since he brought forth so many pious offspring among so many delusions of superstition. Consider just Lot among Sodomites, the three boys who did not burn in the furnace's flame, and the faithful Philippians in the middle of the depraved nation.[98]

Bede's inferiority to the greatest church fathers was due to his place in time 'among so many delusions'. Bale was seldom so complimentary to other medieval writers, but he employed similar techniques when he wanted to signal that an author was useful for the Protestant cause, even if a champion of the papacy and monasticism. For Bale, William of Malmesbury was thus both typical and extraordinary for his time:

> He was the most energetic illustrator of our English nation … except that from a lack of Christian prudence, he immoderately praised certain accursed superstitions. To be sure, it was in a sense inevitable that that age was very corrupt, with Satan reigning so rashly and churlishly over the popish clergy after his release from the abyss. Nevertheless he is believed to have served us very well along with many others, because he painted the nature and sinful habits of his age so graphically and authentically.[99]

William was less valuable than Bede, whom Bale treated as a member of the true church as well as a good historian, but his works were still worth reading as a record of a corrupt age.

While Parker certainly began research with Bale's opinions on medieval figures, his findings did not always uphold them. Where Parker's circle departed from Bale most obviously was in the scale of their collection of documents and the systematic care with which they scrutinised that collection for evidence. As they read through medieval texts, comparing manuscripts and sometimes reading with printed editions at their side, they noted where books were missing pages ('hic desunt quaedam') or even entire texts ('hic deest noua historia').[100] Then they would add transcripts of what was missing and presumably rebind the entire volume. Depending upon

---

[97] Bale, *The vocacyon*, ed. Happé and King, p. 47.

[98] Bale, *Catalogus*, I, p. 94: 'Si Augustini, Hieronymi, aut Chrysostomi temporibus claruisset, non dubito quin potuisset de paritate cum ipsis contendere: quod inter tot superstitionum praestigia, tam castos ediderit foetus. Considera Lothum inter Sodomos iustum, tres pueros in fornacis flamma non laesos, ac Philippios in medio nationis pravae fideles.'

[99] Bale, *Catalogus*, I, pp. 186–7: 'Anglicae nostrae nationis studiosissimus illustrator … nisi quod ex Christianae prudentiae defectu, immoderate extulerit quasdam superstitiones. Enimvero corruptissimum esse illud seculum, inevitabile quodammodo fuit, Satana post solutionem ex abysso tam impetuose atque importune in clero Papistico regnante. Veruntamen in hoc nobis plurimum profuisse cum alijs multis creditur, quod eius aetatis naturam et iniquos mores tam graphice ac genuine nobis depinxerit.'

[100] Scheide MS 159, pp. 294 and 365: 'hic deest noua historia ad rob[er]tu[m] comit[um] gloucestris. W. Malmesbury.'

the book, the transcripts could be copied in a secretary hand or in such a way as to camouflage the addition within the medieval text. Some of these ancient-looking transcripts were necessitated by Parker's decisions to move illustrations within his books.[101] When Parker returned a borrowed medieval book—the Cotton Vespasian Psalter—to William Cecil in early 1565/6, he wrote:

> I had thought to have made up the want of the begynnyng of the psalter … and me thought the leafe goyng before the XXVI psalme wold have ben a mete begynnyng before the holl psaltery. having david sitting with his harpe or psaltery … and then the first psalme wryten on the backe side; which I was in mynd to have caused Lylye to have counterfeted in antiquitie etc but that I called to remembrance that ye have a synguler artificer to adorne the same.[102]

While Parker refrained from setting his artificer to work on Cecil's magnificent 8th-century book, he had no qualms about having other volumes 'counterfeted in antiquitie' or merely adorned for aesthetic purposes. At the front of William of Malmesbury's *Gesta pontificum anglorum*, Parker had his men write the title into the space left in the medieval text for the rubric, leaving out the initial 'D' (*De pontificum gestis libri*) in the hopes of creating a more artful letter. But Parker apparently decided the space left for the initial was not enough, since his team inserted a small piece of vellum over the space of the rubric and wrote it all out again, with an illuminated 'D' bearing Parker's personal and archiepiscopal arms in red and blue.[103] Ultimately, when Parker 'fynyshed' his books, they were completed rather than perfected.[104] In a copy of the Anglo-Saxon Gospels that passed through his hands, he had multiple missing portions added, mimicking the 11th-century manuscript's script and use of red ink.[105] While aesthetically pleasing, these pages were not good 'fakes', at least by 21st-century standards. Yet, whether precisely articulated or not, decisions that assumed deep knowledge of medieval books and an approach that sought to evoke an appropriate historical moment—decisions about how the 'antiquitie' of manuscripts *looked*—underpinned each of these seemingly superficial bibliographical practices.

Parker's less elaborate transcripts in secretary hand also served to complete certain manuscripts, so that a single volume would contain the entire text. This

---

[101] For example, Parker moved the folio once facing John's Gospel in CCCC MS 197B so that its illuminated eagle would serve as the beginning of the book (fragments of the Gospels of John and Luke), and may even have moved the text of John's Gospel before Luke's so that the book would have this decorated frontispiece (Page, *Parker and his Books*, p. 8).

[102] Quoted in Page, *Parker and his Books*, p. 52. Parker, *Correspondence*, pp. 253–4. 'Counterfeit' could mean specifically to depict or imitate through drawing or handwriting (*OED*, definitions 7, 8, 9) as well as to forge. The manuscript in question is BL Cotton MS Vespasian A I; the image of David with his harp is on fol. 30v.

[103] CUL Ff.1.25.1 fols 3r and 3ar: 'De pontificum gestis libri quinque p[er] m[agist]r[u]m Guilhelmu[m] Malmesburie[n]sis (sic) Benedictin[a]e sodalitatis monachu[m] q[ui] Somerset p[ro]p[ri]e cogno[m]i[n] e dictus est. Liber primus.'

[104] Quoted in Page, *Parker and his Books*, p. 52. Parker, *Correspondence*, pp. 253–4.

[105] MS Bodl. 441, fol. 194v.

method had obvious uses when Parker borrowed manuscripts from private owners for 'a tyme of perusyng of the same'.[106] Parker could use his borrowing privileges after 1568 to create a complete reference work. The fifth and final book of the *Gesta pontificum* survived in only one medieval manuscript, but Parker had his men draw up three transcripts of it to append to different copies of the text that passed through his hands.[107] But he also added transcripts of missing portions even when he owned multiple copies of the same text, as in Scheide MS 159, one of the four manuscripts of William of Malmesbury's *Gesta regum anglorum* that Parker at some point owned.[108] There, Parker's group filled in the major gaps and then reread and corrected their transcripts, as when someone in Parker's circle realised that the sentence, 'They cast lots for a fair division, with the result that Æthelred took his stand against the kings and Alfred against the magnates', lacked the name of the West Saxon king, and inserted *Ethelredus* in the margin.[109]

Many of these corrections attest to the fact that Parker and his associates collated their texts with other manuscripts. They studied medieval manuscripts that had been altered and updated by those who had owned or copied them through the Middle Ages. What made the situation more complicated was that medieval authors such as William or Aelfric had sometimes issued authentic but revised versions of their books.[110] When presented with multiple versions of what they considered a single text, Parker's circle sought to conflate them. In the lengthiest transcript in Scheide MS 159, the transcriber had worked from a version of the *Gesta regum* that could only have come from two surviving manuscripts, and was substantially different from all other variants.[111] Parker's assistants integrated the text from the majority of the manuscripts into the transcript using carets, without effacing the other version.[112] A kind of textual completeness—or at least a text that made sense throughout and included all relevant materials—could be achieved in this process, merely by delineating other possible versions of the text in the margin.

---

[106] CCCC MS 114A, p. 49.

[107] These are CUL Ff.1.25.2, CCCC 43, and Trinity Coll. MS R.5.34. Suzanne Paul, catalogue record for CUL Ff.1.25.

[108] Graham and Watson (eds), *Recovery*, p. 72. These were: CUL MS Ii.2.3 (s. xii); Trinity Coll., Cambridge MS R.5.34 (s. xv); Trinity Coll., Cambridge MS R.7.10 (s. xii), and Scheide MS 159.

[109] William of Malmesbury, *Gesta Regum Anglorum: The History of the English Kings*, ed. R. A. B. Mynors, R. M. Thomson, and M. Wintterbottom (Oxford, 1998), ii.119.1. Scheide MS 159, fol. 12r of first transcription. 'Itaque sortito par pari retulere ut [Ethelredus] contra reges Elfredus contra duces consisteret.'

[110] Malcolm Godden, 'Introduction', in *Aelfric's Catholic Homilies*, vol 2, ed. Malcolm Godden (Oxford, 2000), p. xx.

[111] MSS Aac or Aa2, according to the appellations in the edition of Mynors, Thomson, and Winterbottom. William of Malmesbury, *Gesta Regum Anglorum*, appendix II, 'Additions of the Aa group', I, pp. 835–6.

[112] Scheide MS 159, fol. 15r in first transcript. William of Malmesbury, appendix II, 'Additions of the Aa group', I, pp. 835–6: 'intimum vero Grimbaldum sanctissimum monachum et cantorem et hoste-larium ecclesiae sancti Bertini, qui, se evocante et archiespiscopo Remensi Fulcone mittente Angliam venerate…in famosa ciuitate Wenta sibi gratissima … collocauit.' William of Malmesbury, *Gesta Regum Anglorum*, ii.122.2: 'alterum in Wintonia quod dicitur Novum Monasterium ubi Grimbaldum abbatem constituit qui se euocante et archiespiscopo Remensi mittente Angliam venerat'.

Parker's scholars had internalised the idea that older was better, purer, and more correct with regard to manuscripts as well as religion. When adding a phrase left out in a 12th-century manuscript of Osbern's 11th-century *Vita Sancti Dunstani*, the annotator wrote 'thus in the older books' next to his emendation.[113] But the extent to which they could accurately determine which books were older should be doubted, given their frequent confusion when dating manuscripts.[114] Sometimes the argument went in a circle: they decided that the text that was more in line with their doctrinal beliefs was older. Timothy Graham notes one instance in which cross-referencing various texts written by Aelfric enabled Parkerian scholars to discover a particularly helpful *locus*. Someone in Parker's group underlined in red in an Exeter manuscript Aelfric's statement that Christ gave only the *figure* of his body and blood.[115] When Joscelyn came across the same passage in another manuscript, he saw that text had been erased and written over. He noted, 'Some papist had scratched out three lines here but they will be restored from an old book of the Exeter library which also contains this treatise.'[116] Collating manuscripts could also be of use to Parker's men for their larger purposes. In his preface to *A Testimonie of Antiquitie*, Joscelyn dramatised this moment of comparing texts:

> [T]here will hardlye be found of them any Lattyne bookes being (I feare me) vtterlye peryshed & made out of the waye since the conquest by some which coulde not well broke thys doctrine. And that such hath bene the dealing of some partiall readers, may partlye hereof appeare. There is yet a very auncient boke of Cannons of Worceter librarye, and is for the most parte all in Latyne, but yet intermyngled in certayne places, even thre or foure leaues together with the olde Saxon tounge: and one place of this booke handleth thys matter of the sacrament: but a fewe lynes, wherin dyd consiste the chiefe poynte of the controuersie, be rased out by some reader: yet consider how the corruption of hym, whosoeuer he was, is bewrayed. This part of the Lattyne booke was taken out of ij epistles of Ælfrike before named, & were written of hym aswell in the Saxon tounge, as the Lattyne. The Saxon epistles be yet wholie to be had in the librarye of the same church, in a boke written all in Saxon, and is intit-uled, a boke of Cannons, & shrift boke. But in the Church of Exeter, these epistles be seene both in the Saxon tounge, and also in the Lattyne. By the which it shall be easie for any to restore agayne, not onely the sense of the place rased in Worceter booke, but also the very same Lattyn wordes.[117]

---

[113] CCCC MS 42, fol. 77v. By 'Œthelredus (^ here) frater eius regnandi sceptra obtinuit' is the marginal annotation 'Quem fama fratrem eius loquebatur' with a further note, 'Sic in antiquioribus libris', under the first.

[114] Graham, 'Matthew Parker's manuscripts', p. 333. See also Christopher de Hamel, 'Archbishop Matthew Parker and his imaginary library of Archbishop Theodore of Canterbury', *Lambeth Palace Library Annual Review* (2002), 52–68, and Patricia Easterling, 'Before palaeography: notes on early descriptions and datings of Greek manuscripts', *Studia Codicologica*, 124 (1977), 179–88.

[115] CCCC MS 190, p. 151.

[116] CCCC MS 265, p. 177: 'quidam papista hic abraserat tres lineas sed restituentur a veteri libro Exoniensis bibliothecae in quo etiam hic habetur tractatus'.

[117] Parker, 'Preface', in *A Testimonie*, fols 4v–5v. See also Robinson, '"Darke speech"', 1062.

In the libraries of Worcester and Exeter, Joscelyn found the perfect case study to prove his conspiracy theory. The loss of books testifying to ancient doctrine 'since the conquest' was not an accident, but 'the dealing of some partiall readers'. The silence of the Worcester Latin canon book spoke volumes. Just as Joscelyn worked comparatively from Saxon-Latin dictionaries and grammars to learn Old English, he could also 'restore agayne' from the Saxon and Latin versions of the text at Exeter 'not onely the sense of the place rased in Worceter booke, but also the very same Lattyn wordes'.[118]

Parker's research unearthed useful *loci* as well as entire texts for his publications, though not always in a straightforward way. One of the elements that struck Parker's group most forcefully when reading William of Malmesbury was the 12th-century historian's treatment of Bede, whom he saw as a predecessor to emulate and surpass. William presented himself as a 'rival of [Bede's] fame'.[119] Someone in Parker's circle excerpted passages relating to Bede in William's *Gesta regum* and *Historia novella*. Parker had these excerpts bound at the back of CCCC MS 43, a manuscript of William's other work, the *Gesta pontificum*. These quotations have little to say about religious precedent, although they include Bede's account of Pope Gregory and the angel-faced *Angli*. The extractor underlined a few of William's comments on Bede's exceptional status as a historian, such as, 'almost all knowledge of history was buried with Bede until our times'.[120] Parker's circle grappled, as William had done, with Bede's and William's places in an English historical tradition. Yet the most insistent annotation on the page is a large red manicule pointing at the bracketed and underlined phrase about Bede: 'He also translated into English the Gospel of John, which taxes the minds of its readers with its difficulty.'[121] This quotation found a purpose in Parker's preface to the New Testament in the 1568 edition of the Bishops' Bible—the translation which he commissioned and directed:

> [B]e not offended (good English reader) to see the holy scriptures in thyne own language as a matter newly seene: seeing that our own countryman that venerable priest Bede, many years agone did translate saint Iohns Gospel into the vulgar tongue … The rather he so did, saith William Malmesberi,: *Quia hoc evangelium difficultate sui, mentes legentium exercet.* Because this gospell, by the difficultie that is in it,

doth so much exercise the wittes of the readers, therfore he did interprete it into the englishe tongue: and so did condiscende (saith he) to them which were not skilfull in the latin tongue. God graunt that all readers may take so much profite thereby, as the good translatours ment vnto them. Amen.[122]

The Parkerian practice of turning some medieval manuscripts into commonplace books helped the group assemble their publications. The excerpts compiled in Parker's copy of the *Gesta pontificum* supplied him with just the quotation he needed to end a preface justifying the translation of the Gospels and exhorting his readers to exert their minds. What's more, this paragraph found new life in the preface to Parker's edition of the Anglo-Saxon Gospels (1571), written by John Foxe, although the particular quotation highlighting the difficulty of John's Gospel was cut.[123] Parker recycled his presentation of authoritative passages, subtracting or adding material even as his collection of *loci* for various topics grew.

Copying could be highly goal-oriented. In two lengthy notebooks, Cotton MSS Vitellius D VII and E XIV, Joscelyn and a few other members of Parker's circle transcribed passages from medieval chronicles and then added marginal summaries. These notebooks also include drafts for Parker's most ambitious publication, the collective biography of bishops and church history entitled *De antiquitate Britannicae ecclesiae* (1572), of which Joscelyn claimed primary authorship after Parker's death.[124]

In fact, many of the sources in Vitellius E XIV are medieval chronicles relating to St Augustine's Abbey in Canterbury—appropriately enough for a manuscript that includes the first draft of much of Parker's history of the archbishops of Canterbury.[125] Joscelyn took notes on two continuators of the Abbey's historical tradition, William Thorne and Thomas Sprott, as well as on Gervase of Canterbury and the deeds of Lanfranc, archbishop of Canterbury. But the notes also covered the history of other monasteries, such as Glastonbury. Furthermore, he copied

---

[122] *The holie Bible* (London, 1568), New Testament preface.

[123] John Foxe, preface, in *The Gospels of the fower Euangelistes*, sigs A iijr–v. Foxe's knowledge of Anglo-Saxon is doubtful—he was perhaps tapped to write the preface to help popularise the work. See Michael Murphy, 'John Foxe, martyrologist and "editor" of Old English', *English Studies*, 49 (1968), 516–23. Since the preface cribs from Parker's other prefaces, as seen here, it seems likely that Foxe did not write much of the *Gospels*' preface, if any of it.

[124] Lambeth MS 959, fol. 36r: 'This Historie was collected & penned by John Joscelyn …'

[125] It should be noted, however, that not every item in the volume is Parkerian. Arthur Agard's excerpts come from the single manuscript of Thomas Elmham's history of St Augustine's Abbey sometime after the recusant collector Robert Hare gifted it to Trinity Hall, Cambridge (the transcript is in Vitellius E XIV, fols 170r ff. and the manuscript of Elmham is Trinity Hall MS 1). There are some connections between Agard, Hare, and Parker—CCCC MS 467, a *vita* of Thomas Becket, was owned by Hare at one point yet made it into Parker's bequest to Corpus Christi. But I have not yet discovered direct evidence that Parker's group knew Elmham's manuscript, despite its relevance to Parker's interest in the history of Canterbury and St Augustine (not to mention his interest in authorial illumination). Hare and John Caius, however, were close. The binding and first table of contents (which includes Agard's transcript, fol. 2r) in Vitellius E XIV are probably Cottonian. (The Parkerian tables of contents are on fols 3r–v.) Even after Parker's death, his interests continued to shape collection practices.

the records of anonymous monks of St Albans who documented John Wycliffe's life.[126] Monastic histories were particularly helpful in reconstructing, in detail and often with full documentation, the ecclesiastical politics that followed the Norman Conquest, or, as the manuscript's table of contents put it, 'from 1067 to 1387'.[127] As we shall see, their historical traditions provided a striking model for the Parkerian project.

Yet Joscelyn did not merely treat medieval texts as authoritative sources of useful quotations, facts, or methods. He tried to keep track not only of which manuscript he copied from, but also where other manuscripts were located—'this copie I had owt of the original in wirreton churche wch is to be seane also amonge the kinges recordes in the towre'.[128] Occasionally, he probed into medieval texts' composition and authorship. For example, he recognised that the *Historia Roffensis* (or *Annales ecclesiae Roffensis*)[129] was a composite text. Because of the text's lack of a single *sonus* or *stilus*, he hypothesised that the chronicle was written by three different monastic authors:

> All of the above text was taken out of the *Historia Roff.*, which was likely composed by three monks of the same church giving way to each other in order in the work. For there is neither one tone nor the same style throughout the whole work. Instead there is a threefold method of construction. The first of these monks took the history from the beginning of the world to the death of Henry III, namely to the year 1273, when it is evident that monk flourished. The second added the history of Edward III, the son of the aforementioned Henry, who died in 1307. The third monk recounted the remainder.[130]

Joscelyn's observation accompanied the text of the *Historia Roffensis*, whether it was merely excerpted as in his notebook, written just before the manuscript of the *Historia*, BL Cotton MS Nero D II, or at the end of a Parkerian transcript of the history, CCCC MS 342.[131] In CCCC MS 342, however, Joscelyn further observed,

---

[126] Lambeth MS 959, fol. 36r. These notes are listed in the contents lists by Joscelyn on fols 3r–v, and also on fol. 2r. The notes are on modern fols 131r–147r.

[127] Lambeth MS 959, fol. 3v: 'Ab anno Christi 1067 ad Annu[m] 1387 Johō Joscelino Esseriano collectore authore. Et manu propria scripta.'

[128] BL Cotton MS Vitellius D VII, fol. 28v. Parker's researchers frequently gleaned material from the Tower of London, copying material not only in notebooks but also, occasionally, on broadsheets such as Parker's 1571 'An admonition to all such as shall intende hereafter to enter the state of Matrimony'. See Bodl. MS Rolls 8, which has Parkerian notes from Walter of Coventry, 'ex turre londinense' on the back.

[129] Not to be confused with the *Historia Roffensis* that focuses on the life of Hamo Hythe, bishop of Rochester 1315–50, BL Cotton MS Faustina B V. The text now more commonly known as the *Annales ecclesiae Roffensis*, that Joscelyn called the *Historia Roffensis*, is BL Cotton MS Nero D II.

[130] Cotton MS Vitellius E XIV, fol. 129v: 'Praescripta omnia desumpta sunt ex Historia Roff. Quam ut verisimile est tres monachi eiusdem ecclesiae sese ordine in opera succidentes, composuere. Non enim est unus sonus totius orationis non idem stilus. Quin etiam triplex constructionis ratio. Horum monachorum primus deduxit historiam ab mundi initio ad obitum Henrici 3. ad annum videlicet domini 1273. Quando apparet monachum claruisse. Alter adiecit historiam Edwardi 3. filii praefati Henrici qui obijt anno domini 1307. Reliquam persecutus est monachus tertius.'

[131] CCCC MS 342, fols 129v–130r. Joscelyn's note in Cotton MS Nero D II precedes the text.

'The above mentioned history of Rochester, except when it deals with matters in the church of Rochester, is entirely the same history which is called the *flores historiarum*.'[132] Parker had the *Flores historiarum* published in 1567 (by Richard Jugge) and 1570 and 1573 (by Thomas Marsh), and, following John Bale, attributed it to Matthew of Westminster. No such Matthew existed, although Bale's error, thanks to Parker, would be repeated into the 19th century.[133] Yet Joscelyn, likely at a later date than the publication of the *Flores*, possibly realised that chronicle's complicated tradition precluded single, identifiable authorship. He perceived, at least, that the *Historia Roffensis* was a localised version of the *Flores*, and that the *Historia* was written by three monks, 'whose names are hidden from me'.[134] What he concluded about Matthew of Westminster's supposed authorship is hard to say, but his remarks in his notebooks and manuscripts show him grappling with the incestuous and derivative nature of medieval chronicle composition.[135]

Excerpts that later helped tell a fuller story of church practice and doctrine were, of course, the element of the circle's research methods most similar to those of the Centuriators. Excerpting provided Parker's group with the material for their longest continuous work, *De antiquitate*, which, like the *Magdeburg Centuries*, drew heavily on quotations to construct a narrative but did not necessarily reproduce them.[136] Joscelyn began drafting *De antiquitate* in the same notebooks in which he assembled passages and notes. From a comparison of these preliminary versions, it becomes clear that Cotton MS Vitellius E XIV contains the earlier draft of the two, although even the more developed text in D VII is still substantially different from the final published version. In particular, Joscelyn reworked his presentation of the evidence for the antiquity of the British Church. Many of these changes were minor: while E XIV read, for example, 'Origen testifies in his fourth homily on Ezekiel that Britain embarked (*conscensisse*) on the Christian religion

---

[132] CCCC MS 342, fol. 130r: 'Prefata historia Roffensis nisi cum agat de rebus ecclesiae Roffensis est omnino eadem cum historia quae dicitur flores historiarum.'

[133] 'Matthew of Westminster' was not debunked until 1890. Robinson, '"Darke speech"', 1078–9.

[134] CCCC MS 342, fol. 129v: 'Quibus autem appellationibus fuere hij monachi me latet'.

[135] See also BL Harley MS 3634, fol. 124v, 'Hec que sequu[n]tur in veteri scripto sunt continuat[i]o historie Polichronicon. sed possunt esse de historia magna Thomę Walsingham.' They also follow that medieval manuscript ('in old script') of Ranulph Higden's *Polychronicon* with further text from Thomas Walsingham's *Chronica majora* beginning on fol. 195r, which they note: 'Ista que sequu[n]tur sunt ex n[ost]ra magna historia T. Walsingham desumpta.'

[136] For more on excerpting, see Ann Blair, *Too Much to Know: Managing Scholarly Information before the Modern Age* (New Haven, CT, 2010). Whereas many of the printed productions Blair focuses on could be criticised by contemporaries for fragmentation and taking *loci* out of context (see pp. 251–6), Parker's *De antiquitate* and editions created new contexts or reconstructed old frameworks for the group's excerpts. Cotton MSS Vitellius E XIV and D VII were also conceived and constructed differently to commonplace notebooks created for wide and varied reading. As Anthony Grafton and Joanna Weinberg point out, 'early modern notebooks belonged to a number of distinct epistemic genres, which served different ends' ('Johann Buxtorf makes a notebook', in Anthony Grafton and Glenn Most (eds), *Canonical Texts and Scholarly Practices: A Global Comparative Approach* (Cambridge, 2016), pp. 495–6). Like Buxtorf's notebooks, Joscelyn's were meant to produce knowledge of a particular kind, through the constant accumulation and critical comparison of materials for a set project.

in its own time', in D VII Joscelyn changed the verb: 'Origen testifies in his fourth homily on Ezekiel that Britain consented (*consentire*) to the Christian religion.'[137] The actual text of *De antiquitate* also used 'consented', but added further detail in the text to attest to Origen's reliability while consigning the actual citation to the margin: 'Then Origen, who lived in the centuries next after the Apostles, testifies that Britain consented to the Christian religion.'[138] In general, Joscelyn highlighted the age and quality of his sources more emphatically in the printed text. In both notebook drafts, for example, he introduced Gildas with some qualification: 'Gildas therefore—if we believe Polydore in his Gildas—tells us that the British already from the rise of the gospel took the Christian faith.'[139] In the printed text, on the other hand, Gildas is introduced as 'the most ancient writer of British history among those who are credible', without mentioning his Catholic Italian editor, Polydore Vergil.[140] Joscelyn's own 1567 edition of the British cleric Gildas' *De excidio & conquestu Britanniae* sought to appropriate the text from Polydore's 1525 edition. The fact that Joscelyn felt the need to cite Gildas through Polydore's version in his draft raises the possibility that Joscelyn began work on *De antiquitate* long before his edition of Gildas. The beginning of *De antiquitate* argues that Christianity was brought to Britain by the apostles and 'not by the Roman see, as the Papists contend'.[141] Parker was still arguing against the Catholic vision of the early British Church in 1572, but his group now had more ownership over the sources they relied upon to construct their own vision of the primitive church.

3.4 Printing and Preserving

From 1566/7 until 1574, the year before his death, Parker published editions of medieval works that ranged from the 6th century to the 15th. He worked closely with some of the greatest masters of the Tudor printing world, especially John Day, to see these texts into print.[142] Parker famously commissioned a new type font from

---

[137] Cotton MS Vitellius E XIV, fol. 270r: 'Testatur Origenes Hom. 4. in Ezechielem Britanniam suo tempore in christianam conscensisse religionem.' Cotton MS Vitellius D VII, fol. 54r: 'Origenes s. Homil. 4. in Ezech testatur: Britanniam in Christianam consentire religionem.'

[138] Parker, *De antiquitate*, sig. A. Ir: 'Tum Origenes, qui proximis fuit post Apostolos saeculis, testatur Britanniam in Christianam consentire religionem.'

[139] Cotton MS Vitellius E XIV, fol. 270r. Cotton MS Vitellius D VII, fol. 54r: 'Tradit itaque Gildas si Polydoro in suo Gilda referenti credimus Britannos iam inde ab ortu evangelii Christianam suscepisse fidem.'

[140] Parker, *De antiquitate*, sig. A. Ir: 'Gyldas enim antiquissimus inter eos, qui fide digni sunt, Britannicarum rerum scriptor, tradit Britannos iam inde ab ortu Evangelii Christianam suscepisse fidem.'

[141] Parker, *De antiquitate*, sig. A. Ir: 'Qua diligentius perpensa & explorata, reperiemus non modo peruetustam eam fuisse, sed etiam ab ipso primum per Apostolos propagato per orbem Euangelio, non a Romana sede, ut Pontificij contendunt …'

[142] On Day's and Parker's relationship, see Evenden, *Patents, Pictures and Patronage*, and also Elizabeth Evenden and Thomas S. Freeman, *Religion and the Book: The Making of Foxe's 'Book of Martyrs'* (Cambridge, 2011), pp. 160–1.

Day for the *Testimonie of Antiquitie*, and these letters were used again in his 1571 publication of the Anglo-Saxon Gospels—visual proof that the British had had an early vernacular scripture. In 1574, Day again used Saxon letters in a more unusual context, to print a Latin work from the Saxon period, Asser's *Alfredi regis res gestae*.[143] Because of their novelty, these Anglo-Saxon works have received much scholarly attention, obscuring the equally prominent role that Parker's other publications played in his broader project.[144] As noted, Joscelyn managed a 1567 edition of the British cleric Gildas.[145] The remainder of Parker's editions were of Norman texts: the *Flores historiarum* of 'Matthew of Westminster', in three editions (1567, 1570, and 1573), the *Historia maior* of Matthew Paris (1571), and both the *Historia brevis*,[146] and the *Ypodigma Neustriae*, of Thomas Walsingham (1574).[147]

   Parker's Norman publications were all interrelated, in that they come from the same family of chronicles written at the monastery of St Albans. Parker knew this, and he also thought that Aelfric had been abbot at St Albans (thus possibly construing a historical tradition before 'Matthew of Westminster').[148] Parker decided to publish these three major chronicles of St Albans early on, as a kind of continuous history of late medieval England's church and state. In the preface of his edition of Matthew Paris, Parker looked ahead to his edition of Thomas Walsingham:

> This tradition [of chronicling] was continued, and zealously kept up by many monks, but above all by that monk of St Albans Thomas Walsingham, who had gathered everything worthy of memory into an epitome and compendium [that is, the *Ypodigma Neustriae* and *Historia brevis*] … whose history (if this our labour, which we hope, will seem satisfactory to you, friendly Reader) we will perhaps produce once it has been brought into better order …[149]

---

[143] Bromwich, 'The first book printed', 271.

[144] See e.g. Oates, 'Elizabethan histories', pp. 176–8, where she focuses exclusively on Parker's 'celebration of the Anglo-Saxon Church', without noting his Norman publications.

[145] *Gildae cui cognomentum est sapientis, de excidio & conquestu Britanniae, ac flebili castigatione in reges, principes, & sacerdotes epistola, vetustissimorum exemplariorum auxilio non solum a mendis plurimis vindicata, sed etiam accessione eorum, quae in prima editione a Polydoro Vergilio refecta erant, multipliciter aucta* (London, 1567).

[146] This work is properly known as the *Chronica maiora*. John Taylor, Wendy R. Childs, and Leslie Watkiss, 'Introduction', in *The St Albans Chronicle*, vol. 1 (Oxford, 2011), p. lxiv.

[147] There were also a number of other works by those in his circle that, however, are not editions, such as, *A defence of clerical marriage*, and other works such as *De antiquitate*.

[148] Parker, 'Preface', in *A Testimonie*, fol. 9r.

[149] Preface to Matthew Paris, *Historia maior* (London, 1571), sig. † iiiir: 'Hic mos continuabatur, & studiose obseruabatur a pluribus Coenobitis, sed maxime ab illo Monacho Albanensi, Thoma Walsingham, qui in summam & compendium congesserat omnia memoratu digna…cuius historia (si hic labor noster, quod speramus, satis tibi probabitur, amice Lector) a nobis posthac fortasse in ordinem rectius composita adducetur …'

After publishing one edition of the *Flores historiarum* with the printer Richard Jugge in 1567, he brought out editions with Thomas Marsh in 1570 and 1573.[150] Perhaps this modest success encouraged Parker and his circle to pursue the St Albans project.

But this fact neither fully explains the breadth of his publication programme nor his attention to the St Albans chronicles, some of which in particular say little about those whom Protestants saw as their ancestors. The St Albans chronicles were useful to Parker's purpose because they revealed the corruption of the high medieval church (and because, in the case of Matthew Paris, they were often anti-papal). Figures such as Wycliffe, who made appearances in them, meanwhile represented the true church and its slow dawn. To be sure, there were problematic passages in the chronicles for a Protestant reader. Yet Parker questioned the danger of these elements:

> Let us concede that little or no scandal will be given to papists, and historical credibility will not be called into doubt, if many things are corrected and some not even inserted: what danger ultimately will there be in these clouds and dreams? For if someone is drunken and enchanted by ravings and monastic vanities, he believes them even if he finds nothing like that in our histories.[151]

For believers, reading a history like Walsingham's was about as dangerous as reading Livy. Parker compared the religion of the visible church in the Middle Ages, with its tales of miracles, to ancient Roman religion, asking: 'Who in this age believes that Romulus rose suddenly into the sky? … Who is there today among the English so stupid and insensitive that he believes this [an event like St Dunstan's encounter with the devil], even if it is written by Matthew of Westminster and Matthew Paris?'[152] For, he noted, 'nevertheless all these things [events like Romulus' apotheosis] are written by the most outstanding [classical] historians and orators, and they are read by us everyday without any risk of superstition'.[153] Ultimately, Parker acknowledged, if he were to change all of the papist errors in the texts of the St Albans chroniclers, their works would no longer be 'the histories of these

---

[150] Parker accepted Bale's and Joscelyn's confused reading of a single manuscript of the *Flores*: Robinson, '"Darke speech"', 1078–9.

[151] Parker, preface to Walsingham, *Historia brevis* (London, 1574), sig. ¶ iiiv. 'Sed concedamus paululum [*perhaps* aut] nullum in eo Papistis scandalum dari, nec historiae fidem in dubium vocari posse, si multa corrigantur, multa ne inserantur quidem: quid tandem erit in illis nugis & insomnijs periculi? Certe si delirijs & monasticis vanitatibus quisquam ebriosus & tanquam fascinatus fuerit, is eisdem credit, etiamsi in nostris historijs nihil tale reperiat.'

[152] Parker, preface to Walsingham, *Historia brevis*, sigs ¶ iiiv–iiiir: 'Quis est qui in hoc aeuo Romulum in coelum subdito [(sic) read: subito] emigrasse credat? … Quis est hodie apud Anglos tam stupidus & insensatus vt huic credat, etiamsi a Matthaeis Westmonasteriensi & Parisio scribatur?' For more on English Protestant views of Dunstan, see Helen L. Parish, *Monks, Miracles and Magic: Reformation Representations of the Medieval Church* (New York, 2005), pp. 105–18.

[153] Parker, preface to Walsingham, *Historia brevis*, sig. ¶ iiiv: 'Et haec tamen omnia ab Historicis & Oratoribus praestantissimis scribuntur, & a nobis quotidie sine ullo superstitionis discrimine leguntur.'

men', as Catholic readers would loudly complain.[154] These monastic chroniclers
lived in a time of false religion as much as Roman pagan historians had.[155] The
St Albans history was valuable because it was about these historians' times, and
suspect because it was of those times.

    Yet while Parker did not remove miracle stories or accounts of the superstitious
rituals that great English kings had carried out, he did not always print the text as
he found it in manuscripts. Modern editors of Matthew Paris or Asser's *Alfredi
regis res gestae* have frequently criticised him for interpolating material from other
histories.[156] For instance, in his edition of Matthew Paris' *Chronica maiora*, Parker
inserted prose from the Cecil manuscript of the *Flores historiarum* of Roger of
Wendover (thought by Parker to be the *Historia minor* of Matthew of Paris). He
added dramatic passages such as that under the year 1189, when Earl Richard (the
future Richard I) became incensed against Cardinal John of Anagni for threatening
to place France under an interdict.[157] Parker's interpolations were not all religiously
motivated—he incorporated chronicle material 'relating to England during the
period covered by the Life' in his edition of Asser's biography of Alfred from the
Annals of St Neots, which he believed Asser had also composed.[158] And they came
primarily from works that were, he thought, by the same author. As in the case of
his manuscripts, Parker's additions to his printed texts contributed to complete-
ness, though not to historical accuracy in our sense, and Parker himself sometimes
acknowledged as much. In one letter, he described a publication as 'somewhat
more enlarged with such old copies as I had … of my friends'.[159] Parker possibly
thought he was assembling more complete (albeit hypothetical) versions of the text.

    A closer analysis of the printing process of Parker's Saxon and Norman publi-
cations shows that, while Parker's circle blurred the boundaries between manu-
script and print, they distinguished between manuscripts of different periods and
languages. The differences in the preparations for Parker's Saxon monuments and

---

[154] Parker, preface to Walsingham, *Historia brevis*, sig. ¶ iiv: 'Quibus si ad Papisticae disciplinae expug-
nationem mutilato, inuerso, & conciso eorum opere uteremur, illi contra iustissime reclamarent, aut non
esse illorum hominum historias, aut si sint, deletas, corruptas, mutatas, imperfectas, adulteratas esse.'
[155] Parker's implicit disdain for Livy's *Ab urbe condita* reflected a broader European change in attitude
towards the Roman historian in the last half of the 16th century. Justus Lipsius negatively contrasted
Livy with Tacitus in his edition of the latter, noting that Tacitus would instruct the reader, rather than
delight him (see Anthony Grafton, *What Was History?* (Cambridge, 2007), pp. 204–5). The popularity of
Henry Savile's 1591 edition of Tacitus offers a parallel English example. See H. J. Erasmus, *The Origins
of Rome in the Historiography from Petrarch to Perizonius* (Leiden, 1962).
[156] Graham, 'Matthew Parker's manuscripts', pp. 335–6.
[157] *Matthaei Parisiensis, monachi sancti Albani, historia Anglorum, sive, ut vulgo dicitur, historia
minor*, ed. Frederic Madden, 3 vols (London, 1866), I, p. xl. Paris, *Historia maior*, p. 200. Madden and
many scholars after him have lamented that they must 'blame' Archbishop Parker for his 'utter disregard
of the ordinary rules to be observed in publishing an historical work'. But Parker's interest did not lie in
printing exact editions of a work (and the 'ordinary rules' for doing so were quite different in the 19th
century than in the 16th, in any case).
[158] *Asser's Life of King Alfred, together with the Annals of Saint Neots Erroneously Ascribed to Asser*,
ed. W. H. Stevenson (2nd edn, Oxford, 1959), p. xix.
[159] Parker, *Correspondence*, pp. 388–9.

those for the Norman chronicles of St Albans are striking. When John Day was printing *A Testimonie of Antiquitie*, Parker did not allow either of the two original manuscripts to leave his custody. Day had to reproduce a transcript that conflated the texts as his copy.[160] A Parkerian scholar went through one of these manuscripts, CCCC MS 198, lightly separating or joining the Saxon scribe's words in order to facilitate transcription.[161] Some lightly marked changes were necessary in order to prepare the text of Anglo-Saxon manuscripts for the press.[162]

By contrast, Parker's Norman manuscripts of the St Albans chronicles received much harsher treatment. Copies of the histories of Thomas Walsingham and Matthew Paris show signs of sustained use in the printing shop. The *Chronica maiora* of Matthew Paris is highly valued by modern medieval art historians for the author's numerous illustrations and maps.[163] Furthermore, Parker himself praised the original manuscript's beauty, noting Matthew's handsome 'textualis' script, his vivid illuminations and his brilliantly colourful images of noble families' arms.[164] Yet the autograph copy of the work, comprised of CCCC MSS 26 and 16, is smudged with ink in various places. On one page, for example, an ink smudge and pencilled-in '738' and 'Q 6' appear next to a new chapter: 'In that same year, the holy cross, which after the times of Saladin was placed at Damietta …, was carried into the kingdom of the French …'[165] These words also began page 738 in Parker's printed edition.[166] The inky-fingered individual who checked a freshly printed page

---

[160] Bromwich, 'The first book printed', 282.

[161] Bromwich, 'The first book printed', 277. The same phenomenon is visible in MS Bodl. 441, a copy of the Anglo-Saxon Gospels.

[162] Page notes that in two manuscripts of Aelfric's homily, CCCC MS 198 and BL Cotton MS Faustina A ix, a Parkerian assistant 'marked off the equivalents of the printed page by ink slashes and underlinings and added in the margin both possible printed paginations', but that '[i]t is not that he was marking up the copy for the printing press for there is no evidence that either manuscript visited the printer's shop: no sign of heavy handling or of printer's ink'. Rather, someone marked these MSS so that printed copies of *A Testimonie* could be 'checked off from them', possibly by the bishops who signed off on the *Testimonie* (*Matthew Parker and his Books*, pp. 95–6).

[163] See, for example, Suzanne Lewis, *The Art of Matthew Paris in the Chronica Majora* (Berkeley, CA, 1987). See also M. R. James, 'The drawings of Matthew Paris', *The Volume of the Walpole Society*, 14 (1925–6), 1–26.

[164] Parker, 'Preface', in *Historia maior*, sig. † iiir: 'Hic MATTHAEVS PARIS non solum singulari scientia et cognitione praeditus fuit in antiquitatis monumentis eruendis, et historica rerum gestarum serie continuanda, … sed etiam bene exercitatus et expertissimus fuit in pluribus ingenuis … ut in pulcherrima et aptissima scriptione Textuali (ut vocant) manu, in exquisita pictura, et descriptione rerum gestarum, in sua propria forma, et membrorum ac partium omnium iusta proportione, peritissimus fuit, … in eodem opere in margine adiunxerat variorum Principum ac Nobilium stemmata et honoris insignia, propriis suis coloribus et imaginibus expressa: quae omnia adhuc diligentissime reservabuntur, pro maiori authoritate et confirmatione universorum et singulorum quae in hoc opere imprimuntur.'

[165] CCCC MS 16 II, fol. 142v: 'Eodem anno, crux sancta, quae post tempora Saladini reposita fuerat apud Damiatam … est in regnum Francorum delata …'

[166] The printed words are Matthew Paris, *Historia maior*, sig. Qqq iii, not Qqq vi, which shows that the Parkerian scribe or printer's worker counted every side of a leaf of paper (like page numbers) instead of every folio side as the printer Reynold Wolfe did throughout the printed text. This mistake, which was not uncommon, is made throughout the manuscript, whenever the annotator wished to signal a

against the manuscript, perhaps while proofreading in Reynold Wolfe's shop, was none too careful. Other pages in the manuscript also indicate the haphazard perils of the printer's shop. On one folio, it looks as though someone in the shop used an inky wooden block as a paperweight.[167]

Manuscripts of Thomas Walsingham's works also bear extensive annotation and ink stains, as copy for the printing process.[168] In BL Harley MS 3634, the *Ypodigma Neustriae*, and a compilation of similar chronicles, approximated pages were cast off—laid out for use by the compositor—in red chalk, with page and line numbers written in.[169] The use of red chalk may suggest that Parker's circle, not the printer's men, did the casting off.[170] Someone, however, went back to the manuscript after the text was printed and occasionally wrote notes that were not part of the normal copy-making process, but rather of post-publication checking: 'as page 67 in the printed book'.[171] The numbers that Parker's circle or his printers wrote in the manuscript played a direct role in organising the book, while the book's printed page numbers could be reinserted into the manuscript as yet another point of reference.

Parker's periodisation had real implications for the treatment of his collection, at least in the print shop. But this is not to suggest that Parker did not esteem Norman manuscripts. Perhaps more so than any of his books, the same manuscripts of Matthew Paris that his group inked up in the printers' shop inspired Parker to embellish his printed books. Parker imitated their heraldic art in *De antiquitate*. Matthew Paris visually marked the rise and fall of major historical players, including bishops, with their crests. Parker used crests to introduce some of the bishops in

---

new page. See, e.g., CCCC MS 16 II, fol. 124v, where 'kkk6' should be Kkk iii, as in the printed text. Matthew Paris is not as marked up as Thomas Walsingham's *Chronica maiora* (CCCC MS 195) or *Ypodigma Neustriae* (BL Harley MS 3634). Many folios in Matthew Paris do not have printed page or signature numbers.

[167] CCCC MS 16 II, fol. 82v.

[168] In his 1937 edition of *The St. Albans Chronicle*, V. H. Galbraith suggested that Parker printed the *Chronica* using CCCC 195, noting that 'Parker defaced the manuscript by writing over the margins, crossing out words in ink, inserting headings, enclosing passages in brackets, interlining passages for insertion, keying up the manuscript to the pages of the printed version—in a word, treating it like copy for a printer' (p. xi). Robinson suggests, following Bromwich with regard to the manuscripts from which Parker printed *A Testimonie*, that someone 'was casting off copy, or at least indicating how the copy had been cast' ('"Darke speech"', 1077). CCCC MS 195 was either a Parkerian copy or used for proofing (instead of reusing a transcript copy), likewise BL Harley MS 3634 for Parker's *Ypodigma Neustriae* and CCCC MS 16 II for his edition of Matthew Paris (R. I. Page also notes that CCCC MS 16 was used as copy, see 'The research group on manuscript evidence: some approaches and discoveries', in G. Fellows-Jensen and P. Springbord (eds), *Care and Conservation of Manuscripts* (Copenhagen, 1995), pp. 7–22, at 18. Parker undoubtedly drew on other manuscripts, as Galbraith notes (suggesting that Parker also referred to Arundel MS vii), since the Walsingham manuscripts in particular are missing substantial portions of text, which Parkerian scribes replaced with transcripts.

[169] BL Harley MS 3634 also includes works by Ranulph Cestrensis, for example (which Parker's scholars noted, fol. 125r).

[170] Printers' use of red chalk or pencil was common for this purpose, however. See, for example, Blair, *Too Much to Know*, fig. 4.9, the manuscript of Gesner's *Historia animalium* cast off in this way.

[171] BL Harley MS 3634, fol. 42v. 'et ut pag. 67 in libro impresso'.

De antiquitate, and also included a folio with the personal and episcopal crests of all of Elizabeth's bishops. He was apologetic for this page in particular, as he was for the book—when he sent a decorated copy to William Cecil, he told him: 'though ye may rightly blame an ambitious fantasy for setting out our church's arms in colours, yet ye may relinquish the leaf and cast it into the fire, as I have joined it but loose in the book for that purpose, if you so think it meet, and as ye may … cast the whole book the same way'.[172] But Parker employed the same combination of crests over and over in his books. His arms, in an initial, began Joscelyn's manuscript *historiola* of his life, which was clearly a continuation of *De antiquitate*'s lives of the archbishops of Canterbury.[173] And he used it decoratively in manuscripts such as William of Malmesbury's *Gesta pontificum*—a possible model for *De antiquitate*, as it described the dioceses of England, beginning with Canterbury.[174]

Parker's deliberate use of manuscript techniques in print also encompassed larger historical traditions in *A Testimonie*. There, to prevent accusations of textual abuse similar to those which Parker and his team levelled at the Catholic medieval reader who 'rased' parts of Aelfric's sermon, Parker printed the signatures of bishops testifying to the printed edition's textual faithfulness. Yet print was harder to validate than manuscript: while the bishops' names were meant to confirm that Day's printed Aelfric and Latin translation 'doe fullye agree to the olde aucient bookes', these printed names in turn required authentication. At the end of the list, the curious or incredulous reader is told that 'the recorde wherof remains in the hands of the moste reuerend father Matthewe Archbishop of Canterbury'.[175] But even this record did not exactly match the print—the names of two of the bishops who signed in December 1566 were omitted from the edition.[176] The testimonies for *A Testimonie* might have been circuitous and imperfect, but Parker's reliance on his bishops' signatures suggests that he had another authority in mind. Eusebius related and quoted from a letter by Serapion, bishop of Antioch, recommending the writings of Apolinarius against the Phrygian heresy. Other bishops added their subscriptions to this letter, just as the English bishops 'subscribed their names' in Parker's copy of *A Testimonie*, BL Add. MS 18160.[177] Parker adopted this technique from the early church to authenticate a document supporting his own doctrinal

---

[172] Parker, *Correspondence*, p. 425.

[173] CCCC MS 489, p. 105.

[174] It is worth noting, too, that William, as a supporter and friend of Anselm, archbishop of Canterbury, backed Canterbury's primacy among the English sees. This is one of the issues Parker was anxious to track in *De antiquitate*, even though he had no animosity towards Canterbury's traditional rival, the archbishop of York.

[175] Parker, *A Testimonie*, sig. K iiiiv.

[176] Bromwich, 'The first book printed', 268–9. These were the names of William Downham of Chester and Thomas Davies of St Asaph, who signed fifteenth and sixteenth respectively in BL Add. MS 18160.

[177] Parker, *A Testimonie*, sig. K iiiiv. Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica*, 5.19.1–4. In Rufinus' Latin, the word is *subscriptiones*. There were other models of episcopal subscription as well, such as the list of bishops who subscribed to the canons of the Council of Chalcedon ('Et subscripserunt universi episcopi', in *Canones Apostolorum. Veterum Conciliorum Constitutiones. Decreta Pontificum Antiquiora*, ed. Johannes Cochlaeus (Mainz, 1525), sig. [H v]r ff.).

views.[178] His inclusion of signatures also stemmed from his imitation of medieval authentication practices, as in *De antiquitate* when he included the signatures, with their accompanying crosses, from the 1072 Accord of Winchester, which decided the primacy of the English Church in favour of the archbishop of Canterbury.[179]

For select readers, Parker essentially had his team illuminate his publications. As mentioned, he gave a hand-coloured copy of *De antiquitate* to William Cecil. Since *De antiquitate* included a catalogue of Cambridge chancellors and college founders, the work had obvious appeal for Parker's fellow Cambridge man and then chancellor of the university. Small corrections were made by hand throughout the text—Parker's scholars clearly went over the printed book before he gave it to Cecil.[180] Parker also had presentation copies made of the *Flores historiarum* and John Foxe's *Acts and Monuments*,[181] but *De antiquitate* was special. It was printed and decorated not only at Parker's expense, as his other publications were, but in his house. In the letter that accompanied this presentation copy, Parker told Cecil that Lambeth Palace was full of 'drawers and cutters, painters, limners, writers, and bookbinders'.[182] *De antiquitate* was a luxury item, especially when coloured—Parker could transform scholarly publications into precious possessions for statesmen as well as scholars.

When Parker sent Cecil a copy of *De antiquitate*, he mused that the book 'peradventure shall never come to sight abroad, though some men, smelling of the printing of it, seem to be very desirous cravers of the same'. The book's ultimate fate, however, was not bound to its publication: 'To keep it by me I yet purpose, whiles I live, to add and to amend as occasion shall serve me, or utterly to suppress it and to bren it.'[183] *De antiquitate* was an ongoing project—it expanded as Parker's men accumulated further material and he changed his mind about how to interpret it.[184] In many ways, the book was the sum of their findings about the institutions

---

[178] Grafton, 'Book as archive', 29, 37.

[179] Parker, *De antiquitate*, p. 95. On the variant versions of the Accord in *De antiquitate*, see Madeline McMahon, 'Licking the "beare whelpe": William Lambarde and Matthew Parker revise the *Perambulation of Kent', Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 81 (2018), 161, n. 42. The inclusion of the full text of this document was also Eusebian. Thanks to Parker's practice of occasionally including quotations of his sources, Day's Anglo-Saxon font found further use in *De antiquitate*, too—see, for example, p. 63. Yet Parker decided to cut back some of this extensive documentation in his presentation copies—see Grafton, 'Medical man'.

[180] See, e.g., Parker, *De antiquitate*, p. 26 in CUL Sel.3.229, where 'concilium apud Calcuch' has been corrected to 'concilium apud Calcythe'.

[181] CUL Sel.3.95 is a hand-coloured copy of Matthew of Westminster, *Flores historiarum*. For the presentation copies of Foxe's *Acts and Monuments*, see Evenden and Freeman, *Religion and the Book*, pp. 111–12.

[182] Parker, *Correspondence*, p. 426.

[183] Parker, *Correspondence*, pp. 425–6.

[184] Gesner's publications offer a contemporary comparandum, in which books were constantly remade as further information was acquired. See Ann Blair, 'Humanism and printing in the work of Conrad Gessner', *Renaissance Quarterly*, 70 (2017), 1–43.

Parker cared for most: the Church of England, the archbishopric of Canterbury, and the University of Cambridge.

One copy in particular vividly demonstrates the ceaseless modifications made to the book. Lambeth Palace Library MS 959 contains a version of the printed text so overwhelmed with marginalia and other handwritten additions that it is now classified as a manuscript. On its cover, Joscelyn claimed primary authorship: 'This Historie was collected & penned by John Joscelyn … being intertained in ye said Archb: howse, as one of his Antiquaries.'[185] But many hands wrote in the margins of the copy, making typographical as well as factual corrections. In this working copy's pages, Parker's circle knit together research with production, sometimes literally. Parker's associates sewed pages and fragments of medieval manuscripts and seals into the printed text, elaborating in their marginal notes what the document added to their previous account.[186] Manuscripts also provided sources for contemporary history. Parker contemplated including his own *vita* among the biographies of his predecessors. Drafts of his life, lists of the gifts and buildings he made, plus autograph letters from and to Parker, were placed at the back of the section on archbishops.[187] Marginal additions also show that Parker's research methods went beyond reading old books—he also investigated '[t]he nomber of al ye students in ye universitie of Camb. anno domini 1570. & nombered as thei wer by particler names sett down & dentified to Matt. Archb. of Cant.'.[188]

By having Day work in Lambeth, Parker could compare successive drafts of *De antiquitate* in print.[189] One of the lengthiest of these printed drafts is the life of Augustine in Lambeth MS 959, twenty-four pages of rewritten material with a completely different mise-en-page from the rest of the *vitae* of archbishops. At the top of this new life, someone in Parker's circle wrote: 'Thes. 24 pages of Augustins life, were thus begun, by George Acworth.'[190] In most versions of *De antiquitate*, Augustine's life is only seven pages long, although even there the demands of the changing composition trumped the plans of the printer, so that pages 4a, b, c, and d appear between pages 4 and 5 of Augustine's life. In Lambeth MS 959, not only has new material been added, but Augustine's life has been reconceived within a different context, as the page design alone makes clear. By Augustine's name is the year, 596, while the regnal years of the current king of Kent, pope, and Roman

---

[185] Lambeth MS 959, fol. 36r.
[186] Knight, *Bound to Read*, pp. 50–1.
[187] Lambeth MS 959, fol. 296Ar ff.
[188] Lambeth MS 959, fol. 353v.
[189] Day had experience printing malleable, enormous texts, especially after the second edition of Foxe's *Acts and Monuments* in 1570. See Evenden and Freeman, *Religion and the Book*. Also, Parker did this with other editions—he had his bishops sign an rough printed text of *A Testimonie*, and R. I. Page suggested that a rough printed text of *Prosper his meditation with his wife* was never issued, but rather entertained as a possible publication by Parker (Page, 'Matthew Parker's copy of "Prosper his meditation with his wife"', *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society*, 8 (1983), 348).
[190] Lambeth MS 959, fol. 18r.

emperor for that year are below his name.[191] Flanking Augustine's biography are two columns, for *ecclesiastica* and *politica*. There, Acworth added, respectively, details of church councils as well as the many Anglo-Saxon kings, and cited further sources, including 'the prior tract, on the Antiquity of the British church'—the first part of *De antiquitate*.[192] Augustine's life is less insular in this version—he is given an international context, both civil and ecclesiastical. At the top of the page, an annotator remarked that 'the lives of all ye Archb. shold have in this course bene perfected wt a generall storie. but deth prevented it'.[193]

But while Parker's death prevented the 'generall storie' from taking shape, his circle continued to refine his historical legacy, especially the collection that had enabled their research and publications. Parker had planned to bequeath the library to his former college, Corpus Christi, since at least his sixty-fifth birthday, in August of 1569 when the first indenture was drawn up.[194] The terms were rewritten again in 1571,[195] and for the last time in 1574 or 1575.[196] Even within Parker's lifetime, however, the list of books changed to accommodate new printed books, including the three editions he brought forth in 1574.[197] The register of the collection's books, the *Indentura quadrapartita* (CCCC MS 575), stipulated fines for missing folios and quires. Parker provided extra incentive for his college to maintain his library by involving other Cambridge colleges in an annual audit. Nevertheless, books were lost, and many never made it into the Parker Library at Corpus Christi at all. John Parker added 'Wanting at ye first. J. P.' to many places in the register in 1593.[198] He had kept some books, perhaps in order to complete them further. He possibly added transcripts of missing portions to texts such as Scheide MS 159, which was part of the composite volume the Parker register called, 'Tractatus plures historiarum'.[199] It was 'wanted at the first survey', perhaps because John Parker's son, Richard, had pawned it, along with a number of other books.[200]

[191] Lambeth MS 959, fol. 18r. The juxtaposed regnal years for different rulers are akin to ancient and medieval chronicle practices, starting in the Latin world with Jerome's chronicle and its many continuations.

[192] Lambeth MS 959, fol. 18r: 'in superiori tractatu de Antiquitate Britannicae Ecclesiae … dictum est'.

[193] Lambeth MS 959, fol. 18r.

[194] Graham, 'Matthew Parker's manuscripts', p. 338.

[195] For the text of this indenture, see Strype, *The Life and Acts of Matthew Parker*, appendix, pp. 350–5.

[196] R. I. Page, 'The Parker register and Matthew Parker's Anglo-Saxon manuscripts', *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society*, 8 (1981), 2.

[197] Page, 'Parker register', 3.

[198] Page, 'Parker register', 2.

[199] Berkhout, 'Parkerian legacy', 278.

[200] Berkhout, 'Parkerian legacy', 285–6.

3.5 Conclusion

Through his publications and the preservation of manuscripts, including his own, Parker not only disseminated and preserved church history but he also constructed a model of how to do so. In some ways he distinguished between the historical past and the reformed present: thus he did not include continuations in his editions of medieval chronicles.[201] But he also believed that the past was not dead: it was ongoing. Parker's enterprise was, in part, to reinvent monasteries' functions as storehouses of historical documents and cumulative historical traditions in a reformed fashion. Like the scientific virtuosi of the next century, he realised that the work he had set in motion would take generations of collaborative effort to complete, and did his best to create an institution where that work might be done.[202] His library and even his printed books served as an archive of key religious texts.[203] Though much more work remains to be done on the ownership and use of Parker's publications, his editions did make their way into ecclesiastics' personal libraries.[204] His library also provided a potential model for more permanent and public libraries. When his former daughter-in-law Frances, who had married his son Matthew, was widowed once again at the death of her second husband, Tobie Matthew, archbishop of York, she gave the 'library of the deceased archbishop, consisting of above three thousand books … entirely to the publick use of this church' at York 'because she was kin to so much learning'. Perhaps Frances recalled the bequest of the 'archbishop her father-in-law' when she made her own gift of the collection of the 'archbishop her husband'.[205]

---

[201] Parker's editions of chronicles were the first in England not to include continuations: Daniel Woolf, *Reading History in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 2000), p. 55.

[202] Seventeenth-century scientists recognised that scientific discovery could take generations and ensured that their notes 'contributed to a collaborative enterprise and a lasting scientific archive' (Richard Yeo, *Notebooks, English Virtuosi, and Early Modern Science* (Chicago, 2014), p. xvi). Elizabeth Yale has shown how 17th-century naturalists and antiquaries 'searched out and attempted to preserve not only manuscripts, but also the increasingly large volume of handwritten papers they produced in the course of their work', creating archives that preserved their own research as well as the manuscripts of previous centuries (*Sociable Knowledge: Natural History and the Nation in Early Modern Britain* (Philadelphia, PA, 2016), p. 207). Parker and his collaborators, too, preserved their own materials in addition to the manuscripts of the likes of Aelfric and Martin Bucer.

[203] Grafton, 'Book as archive'.

[204] Tobie Matthew, dean of Christ Church and Durham and bishop of Durham under Elizabeth, later archbishop of York under James, owned a copy of *De antiquitate*, now York Minster Old Library III.E.4, as well as the Parkerian editions of the *Flores historiarum* (York Minster Old Library V/1.G.18) and Matthew Paris (York Minster Old Library III.E.20). The *Flores historiarum* is also among the extant books of John Jewel's library, Magdalen College, Oxford N.7.10.

[205] The passages I quote were on the epitaph of Frances Matthew's grave monument in York Minster, transcribed in Francis Drake, *Eboracum: or, the history and antiquities of the City of York* (London, 1736), p. 512. On Tobie Matthew's book collection, which included several of Parker's editions, and his reading practices, see Rosamund Oates, *Moderate Radical: Tobie Matthew and the English Reformation* (Oxford, 2018), pp. 155–92 (for Frances' reading practices, see 181).

Parker was anxious about the future's representation of his present, and he worked to control the future's memory of him and his age. He wrote to Cecil about Elizabeth, 'I fear her Highness shall be strangely chronicled, and I would it were amended.'[206] He also worried about his own reputation, as when he forewarned Elizabeth that certain members of his college would 'say in jest that I am pope of Lambeth and of Benet College'.[207] Sadly, Parker's historical work sometimes exposed him to derision. An anonymous Puritan pamphlet, *The life off the 70 Archbishopp*, railed against the emphasis on archbishops and their privileges in *De antiquitate*, while translating and annotating a leaked life of Parker by Joscelyn as a way to attack his opulence. The book glossed that life's account of the arch-bishop's feasts with sardonic commentary and scripture quotations: 'whose God is ther belly. Phil. 3. 19.'.[208] The materials that Parker's men assembled in the Lambeth manuscript to prove that Parker had not indulged in luxury and extrava-gance would eventually reach print—but only in the 1729 edition prepared by the antiquary Samuel Drake.[209] As the confessional battlefront shifted towards the end of Parker's life to include the urgent polemics of dissenters within the Protestant English Church as well as that of Catholics beyond it, Parker's team moved quickly—but not quickly enough—to address it.

The year 1711 saw the appearance of the next full biography, where Parker was again characterised (although with a more complimentary meaning) as a 'Man of Stomach'.[210] Like Parker, John Strype was a cleric obsessed with printing and thereby preserving documents relating to the Church of England. He had published a biography of Parker's successor, Edmund Grindal, in 1710 to great commercial success, aided by Grindal's resurrection in a current theological controversy.[211] The following year, he brought forth his *Life and Acts of Matthew Parker*, a combi-nation of biography, observations, and primary source documents. In Strype's 'Observations', he commented on Parker's learning. Parker 'retriev[ed] of these antient Treatises and MSS as much as might be', including Anglo-Saxon books. He also published

> [s]ome of these antient Historians of our Nation…In the Year 1570, he published *Flores Historiarum*, written by *Matthew Westminster* … The following year he published *Matthew Paris* his greater History … In the Year 1574, he published *Alfredi*

---

[206] Parker, *Correspondence*, p. 392, 19 May 1572, writing of Elizabeth's reaction to the treason of the duke of Norfolk.

[207] Parker, *Correspondence*, p. 429.

[208] *The life off the 70. Archbishopp off Canterbury presentlye Sitting Englished / and to be added to the 69. lately Sett forth in Latin. This numbre off seuenty is so compleat a number as it is great pitie ther shold be one more: but as Augustin was the first/ so Mathew might be the last* (Zurich, 1574), sig. B [i]v.

[209] *Matthaei Parker Cantuariensis Archiepiscopi de Antiquitate Britannicae Ecclesiae … recensente ad scriptorum veterum, chartarum, ac archivorum Lamethae MSS*, ed. Samuel Drake (London, 1729).

[210] Strype, *The Life and Acts of Matthew Parker*, p. 524. 'He was a Man of Stomach, and in a good Cause feared no body.'

[211] Patrick Collinson, *Archbishop Grindal: The Struggle for a Reformed Church* (Berkeley, CA, 1979), pp. 18–19.

Regis res gestas ab Asserio Shirburnensi Episcopo conscriptas. The short History of *Thomas of Walsingham*, reaching from Edward I. to Henry V. *cum Hypodigmate Neustria, siue Normannia*.[212]

Whether Gibbon's knowledge came directly from these 'Observations' or not, it is clear that he inherited this vision of Parker, as he, too, discussed Parker's projects in the same order and listed the same four editions. It was Strype's Parker whom Gibbon enlisted, several decades later, in his own quest to publish national monuments. Both men remembered, as more recent scholars have not always done, the full range of his publications.

Of course, both Gibbon's characterisation of Parker as a 'respectable prelate', a moderate who 'found[ed] the Church of England', and Strype's depiction of Parker as 'chief Manager' of 'Elizabeth's Reformation' need to be qualified.[213] Parker's historical project was certainly part of the English Protestant Church's process of confessionalisation. Every decision Parker made, whether about bookbinding or periodisation, was ultimately meant to produce a building block for a particular construction of English Christianity. Parker often envisioned the church and its historiography in ways we might not expect—as in his celebration of the archbishopric of Canterbury and appreciation for Anglo-Norman aesthetics. In fact, Parker's positions on higher clergy, clerical marriage, Eucharistic doctrine, and much else were not necessarily the confessional markers they were in other contexts, or even later on in the English Church. The world he lived in was not confessionalised, but confessionalising. From the very beginning, Parker had to fight his historical campaign on multiple polemical fronts, and his arguments and examples took on new meanings among Catholic or Protestant detractors. As Parker learned all too well from the Vestiarian Controversy and the satirical biography of him, the nature of English Protestantism was in dispute. As the life cycle of his scholarly project shows, Parker's work was not without paradox, even as it was animated by a general desire to ground the English Church in historical precedents. Some of these contradictions—such as his increased reliance on and admiration for the St Albans historical school despite his adoption of Bale's periodisation—point to the development of his thinking. He did not employ research in the service of a clearly defined ideology, but adapted his earlier notions of church history and his methods for it to fit what he found. Parker was ever more aware of the continuity of his practice of church history with earlier traditions of ecclesiastical history, even as he strove to reform them.

[212] Strype, *The Life and Acts of Matthew Parker*, p. 529.
[213] Strype, 'Epistle dedicatory', in *The Life and Acts of Matthew Parker*.