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Introduction
Edward Jones

A Concise Companion to Manuscripts, Printed Books, and the Production of Early Modern Texts complements two other Wiley publications (Donna Hamilton’s Concise Companion to English Renaissance Literature from 2006 and Mark Bland’s A Guide to Early Printed Books and Manuscripts from 2010) while expanding the scope beyond England of the study of the relationship between unpublished and published writing in the aftermath of the invention of the printing press found in last year’s A Companion to the Early Printed Book in Britain 1476–1558, edited by Vincent Gillespie and Susan Powell. Over time attitudes about writing and publishing have undoubtedly changed, but it would be oversimple to conclude that such change has been wholesale. The existence of present-day journals, diaries, and handwritten lists and catalogues of personal libraries reminds us that a preference for unprinted materials remains despite the multiple options modern technology offers writers of any kind to see their work in print. Subjects from the sixteenth and seventeenth century found in this Companion call attention to the special challenges the production of books introduced to scribes and authors whose orientation was accustomed if not predisposed to record thoughts and mathematical sums on vellum. For scholars and students interested in such subjects, this volume, in the words of one of its contributors, relies upon 'worked examples' to illuminate how manuscripts and published books reflect concerns with literacy, social class, the world of scholarship and scholars, theatrical performances, economic success, and perhaps most of all, literary art. Its tripartite division into studies of manuscripts, printed
books, and production, the last of which includes both a work’s immediate dissemination and its appropriation in later centuries, features essays on a wide range of subjects: from Shakespeare, Milton, Baxter, and Jonson to biography, painting, and seventeenth-century printing and reading practices; from reception history and the compiling of parish records and book lists to royal visits to universities and Latin letter writing among friends. The contributors to this Companion illustrate general tendencies by focusing on a specific example or case study.

Distinctive about this volume is its original impetus: a collection of essays and one poem designed as a tribute to Gordon Campbell – a scholar whose work has influenced all contributors in different ways. His scholarship insists upon a familiarity with historical details, an ability to read and write in at least a half dozen languages (preferably more), and a willingness to explore how discrete disciplines (music, sculpture, architecture, literature, and painting) unite rather than remain apart. Synthesis runs through Campbell’s work not as some grand gesture but instead as a hard-won conviction borne from voracious reading, study, correspondence, and conversation with established experts, academic stars, and (probably his favourite) obscure men and women in charge of archives, museums, and exhibits in out-of-the-way places. That he has found much to quench his thirst for knowledge is apparent. Multi-volume reference works on art and architecture, editions of poetry and plays, dictionaries on Renaissance Art, monographs on Milton’s *De Doctrina Christiana*, the King James Bible, and the figure of the garden Hermit capture his interests in the colossal figures of an age and the minutiae of everyday and scholarly life. It has all inspired this group of scholar friends to express their appreciation through the very medium to which he has contributed so much to present-day and future Renaissance studies.
Part I

Manuscript Studies
Chapter 1

Stanford University’s Cavendish Manuscript: Wolsey, Elizabeth I, Shakespeare, and Milton

Elaine Treharne

Despite the emergence of print in the fifteenth century, and its rapid adoption throughout western Europe, manuscript culture remained, and still remains, just as significant a means of recording and transmitting texts and documents. In the social, cultural, and religious turmoil of the Tudor and Stuart periods, the production and reception of manuscripts often ensured some degree of permanence of important material, while maintaining privacy for the producers and owners of politically charged texts. Stanford University Libraries Manuscript M0385 CB is a late sixteenth-century manuscript containing a version of one such politically problematic work: George Cavendish’s *Life and Death of Cardinal Wolsey.* The manuscript also contains one other politically motivated text that has not been recognized at all to date, as well as later additions to blank pages in the codex that illustrate the financial affairs of the Harbord family in Worcestershire. The volume was acquired for Stanford’s collection in 1938 from David Magee, an antiquarian book-dealer in San Francisco. Described in the transaction paperwork as 'An original manuscript of Cavendish’s Life of Wolsey', the book had been purchased by Magee in 1937 at
Elaine Treharne

an unspecified auction, when he 'bid on it by mail', paying only $30 (Magee 1973, 129–31).² Magee goes on:

I planned to ask $200.00 for the whole … I listed it in my next catalogue, giving it a full page description in the very front. I waited for the rush of orders. The first came the day after I mailed the catalogue. It was from Nathan van Patten, the librarian of Stanford University. I envisaged other librarians all over the country gnashing their teeth at missing my treasure. But there was very little gnashing – in fact there was none. I never got another order for it. Not one.

(1973, 131)

Why an experienced book-dealer like Magee should have been so excited about the manuscript has nothing to do with the Life of Wolsey per se. His enthusiasm was entirely bound up with the many pages of seventeenth-century accounts attributable to the Worcestershire Harbords. Among these are memoranda that mention not only a certain 'William Shakespeare', but also, and most fittingly for the honoree of this volume,³ one 'John Milton' dated to the year 1636: 'For account of John Milton the 24th Aprille, half years rent due at Lady Day last, £8.10.0.'

Perhaps unsurprisingly, Magee’s imagination ran amok on discovering these connections, particularly since the Harbords themselves lived 'near Stratford-on Avon' and:

Scholars acknowledge that it is more than likely Shakespeare had access to a manuscript copy of The Life and Death of Cardinal Wolsey when writing Henry VIII … Was I being absurd in imagining I might have the very copy of the Wolsey life that Shakespeare had borrowed from his neighbors, the Hardbords?

(1973, 130)

Whether or not this manuscript could be directly linked to Shakespeare is, as yet, unprovable,⁴ but that the key features associated with the volume were considered to be these famous names cited in the added accounts is evident from the Stanford University Libraries Catalogue entry for MS M0385 CB. It rather pre-emptively reads:

This copy is of particular interest on account of the family financial records (17th century) of the Harbords who originally owned the manuscript and which are to be found in the front and back of the volume. These records give values of commodities, rents, land holdings, wages of servants, labourers, etc. Also because the Harbords lived near Stratford-on-Avon and because one of the receipts is to a William
Shakespeare, it is remotely possible that this was the copy Shakespeare used when writing Henry VIII. There is also a receipt to a John Milton. (Stanford University Libraries Catalogue)

Quite how the Harbords acquired this manuscript is unclear, and it is doubtful they were the 'original' owners, but they certainly owned it by 1627, the year that the sequence of their accounts begins. After 1647, there are no further accounting items and the history of the manuscript is unknown until the nineteenth century, when it is apparent from both an ex libris and a small sticker at the bottom of the volume's spine that the book had come into the hands of the famous book collector, Sir Thomas Phillipps (1792–1872), where it was numbered 'Phillipps MS 22392'.

While the history of the manuscript can be partially reconstructed, then, and its misleadingly famous-name connections are of obvious interest, the manuscript's real significance comes from elsewhere, both in terms of its original contents and in terms of the contents of the accounts: namely, included after the Life of Wolsey in the same hand is a text that seems unique, detailing the need for Elizabeth I to intervene in the Revolt of the Netherlands, possibly around the time of the Treaty of Nonsuch in 1585 (transcribed below); and included among the later Harbord accounts of amounts paid and owing is information about the quartering of soldiers during the English Civil War, not recorded in scholarship to date, a sample of which is partially transcribed below. All of these texts combine to form a manuscript volume that is of considerable importance from the perspective of early modern political and social history. While it comes to us incomplete, it is nevertheless, like so many of these early volumes in university libraries across the world, worthy of sustained scholarly attention, attention that this chapter seeks to encourage.

**Stanford University Libraries MS M0385 CB: description and textual history**

MS M0385 CB is a quarto-sized volume, covered in tanned brown leather with a gold embossed device on the front and back covers, surrounded by a gold frame with foliate corners. A pair of clasps has now been lost. The spine is labelled in gold tooling with 'Life of Cardinal Wolsey'. Toward the bottom of the spine, the small paper sticker associated with the Phillipps Library notes this is volume '22392' (AMARC Research Collections 2013). This provenance is supported by the Phillipps ex libris on the front pastedown, which is followed by a pencilled note, 'Lionel
Hyatt / I gave him a book in exchange f […]’. The binding at the bottom and outer margins of the book is very worn, suggesting that this is the original sixteenth-century binding. Supporting this is the current state of what is now the whole book: many pages have been removed and reused or lost, including at least ten whole folios whose stubs remain prior to the first surviving leaf of The Life of Cardinal Wolsey, and many more excised from the end of the book. Moreover, individual pages and parts of pages have been torn out throughout the volume. As such, the relative slimness of the book-block in relation to its binding means the covers are now somewhat concave in the middle.

The book is comprised of 125 folios of paper, made up of quires that might have originally contained fourteen folios. The watermark is an elaborate-looking greyhound-type of dog with a single flower or four-leaf clover on a stem on its back; this is reminiscent of watermarks known in the 1570s and 1580s, similar to those of Jean Nivelle listed by Briquet as 3642 (Laboratoire de Médiévistique Occidentale de Paris 2013), and sometimes found in English legal manuscripts (see, for example, the watermarks listed at Warwick Centre for the Study of the Renaissance, LIMA: Watermark Databases).

Within the original sections of text, the leaves measure 167 mm × 216 mm, and the writing grid extends across the page towards the edge of the right margin, with lower margins of 19 mm and left margins of about 25 mm. Upper margins are minimal. There are thirty-six or thirty-seven lines of text per page, each page finishing with a catchword. The whole text is written out as a continuous block of prose with few paragraphs, though occasionally, in the Life of Wolsey, new sections do begin with a line-space and enlarged capital.

The manuscript’s contents are:

Front pastedown 1–21, fols. 1–2v: financial accounts of the Harbord family (1635)
fol. 3v: Cavendish’s Life and Death of Cardinal Wolsey
fols. 99–100: Harbord financial accounts
fol. 101rv: blank
fols. 102r–105r/18: Justification for English Intervention in the Dutch Revolt (1580s?)
fols. 105v–25v: Harbord financial accounts, 1627–47 (fol. 123 blank)
Back pastedown: various notes

The Life of Wolsey and Justification for English Intervention in the Dutch Revolt are written in the same later sixteenth-century accomplished
secretary hand. Both appear to be fair copies of the text, devoid, for the most part, of scribal corrections and other errors. Both texts are damaged: the *Life of Wolsey* is acephalous and without its title, therefore; approximately twenty per cent of the *Justification* text has been carelessly torn out, the most extensive damage being to folio 102, where more than two-thirds of the text is missing, and folio 103, where just less than a quarter is torn off. The *Justification* item opens with a symbol, akin to a modern capital 'H' with a slightly flourished and extended medial bar, and, presumably, it is this omission of a formal title that has led to the text being unnoticed by other users and owners of the book.

The hand of this sixteenth-century scribe can be dated to the 1580s or 1590s, if comparative evidence is taken into account. It is most similar to the hands of court records and official documents dateable to the last two decades of the sixteenth century, and it seems probable that this scribe was legally trained and professional, perhaps a member of the extensive government secretariat. The reason for this assertion is the nature of the *Justification* itself, which cannot be seen as anything other than a conciliar or parliamentary type of work, very much in the mode, for example, of speeches made in defence of Elizabeth's actions in support of the rebellious Netherlands' states in the late 1570s and 1580s (Hartley 1981, 273–310). Moreover, it may be possible to link the text, through the scribe, with the circle of Walsingham's secretariat, which was relatively extensive from the mid-1580s. The Folger Shakespeare Library's collection contains a letter to Thomas Gresley, created by Sir Francis Walsingham in 1588/89 (L.a. 935, fol. 1r) (Folger Shakespeare Library, s.v. Gresley). While this letter is signed by Walsingham himself, it is likely that the main body of text is by one of his clerks, Walsingham's own writing being much more expansively laterally, as seen in plates contained in Hartley (1981, passim). This clerk/scribe writing on Walsingham's behalf produces a hand that is startlingly close to the scribe of MS M0385 CB. Might it thus be that Cavendish's *Life and Death of Cardinal Wolsey* and the text of the *Justification for English Intervention* (perhaps dictated by Walsingham himself?) were written into this manuscript book at Walsingham's request? He was, after all, a famously bookish man (Adams, Bryson, and Leimon 2004) and the nature of his work in seeking out those with Catholic sympathies might have made the ownership of a *Life of Wolsey* obvious, but it is much more likely that he read the *Life* out of interest as a statesman and advisor to the monarch.

The *Life* was certainly a text with a history of circulation among members of the Elizabethan intelligentsia. Of the thirty-nine known versions of
the *Life of Wolsey* listed by Sylvester (1959, 278–88) and Edwards (2009, 512–13), three were associated with Sir Roger Manwood and his son, Sir Peter Manwood (Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 966; and Bodleian Library, MS Laud Misc. 591; Lambeth Palace, Lambeth 179); one manuscript was provided with rubrics by Lord Burghley (British Library, Add MS 48066); one was copied by Stephen Batman in a manuscript associated with Sir John Dee (Bodleian Library, MS Douce 363); one was associated with the later scholar, Sir William Dugdale (Bodleian Library, MS Dugdale 28). It is likely that two copies belonged to the Dukes of Norfolk (College of Arms, MS Arundel 51; and Huntington Library, HM 182), and one to the Duke of Northumberland (Alnwick Castle, 466). The existence of so many manuscripts of the *Life of Wolsey*, and its learned and generally politically and professionally active ownership, reflects the nature of the text’s circulation in non-print format. As an overwhelmingly positive, eye-witness account of Wolsey, when Cavendish’s work was written, perhaps between 1554 and 1558, Mary’s restitution of Catholicism must have made it seem an ideal time to rehabilitate its subject. During Elizabeth’s reign, and, indeed, the subsequent Stuart reigns, a work lauding Wolsey could not have been safely printed in and of itself, and it was not published in print until 1641, albeit even then in adapted form (Sylvester 1959, xxvi–xxvii). It was, however, a source for printed works in the later sixteenth century. The *Life* was known, for example, through the version now in the Bodleian Library, Jones 14, which belonged to the printer Thomas Woodcock, who, in 1587, was one of the producers of the continuations to the second edition of Holinshed’s *Chronicle* (Sylvester 1959, 280 [no. 6]), in which Wolsey is presented in a better light than he had been ten years earlier in the 1577 *Chronicle* (Lucas 2013, ch. 12). It is within this context that Stanford MS M0385 CB circulated as an example of a well-known, but unpublished source for historians, statesmen, moralists, and political thinkers, and it is in this light that the other text on the Low Countries can also be read.

**On good and bad rulership**

In his study 'Renaissance Exploitation of Cavendish’s *Life of Wolsey*, Wiley reminds us that Wolsey was often used ‘as an example of bad governance in state and church and assigned a prominent place in the long line of wicked magistrates’ (1946, 122). Wolsey exemplified the
model of the tragic hero with his impressive rise to power and his equally impressive and rapid downfall. Used in the manner of a moral exemplum, Wolsey’s ambition was a focus for those seeking to advise their readers of behaviours to avoid. In his *Golden Grove* in 1600, William Vaughan dedicated his work to his landowner brother, illustrating in his work both the way of the virtuous and the way of the viceful. In Book I, chapter 26, Vaughan uses ‘Cardinal Wolsey here in England’ to ‘serue for a patterne of ambition, who beyng preferred by King Henry the eight her maiesties Father, would notwithstanding haue exalted himselfe aboue the King, for which his intolerable ambition his goods were confiscated and himselfe apprehended’. This use of Wolsey in this didactic fashion was not unusual. However, in this same paragraph, Vaughan provides a prior comparative exemplum of Ambition: Ludovic Sforza, Duke of Milan, one of the most famous over-reachers of the period. In his chapter, Vaughan comments:

Lodowicke Sforcia uncle to John Galeaze Duke of Milan whom he poisioned, was one of the most ambitious men in the world, but yet for all his Italian trickes he was at least in the yeere 1510, taken captiue by the French King, and put in prison, where he continued till hee died.

This combination of Ludovic Sforza and Cardinal Wolsey is seen again in later histories. Joseph Grove’s eighteenth-century *History of the Life and Times of Cardinal Wolsey* (1742), dedicated to the Whig politician Sir Henry Pelham (Prime Minister from 1743), claimed a motive as didactic as Vaughan’s and as publicly moralizing as any mirror for princes. He deliberately juxtaposes Cavendish’s *Life* with long ‘discursions’ from other, contemporary histories, the better to maintain his reader’s attention, the easier to impel the reader to learn (Grove 1742, 4–6). Such a motive might underlie the inclusion in the manuscript being considered here, for Stanford M0385 CB also contains these two famous figures in contiguous and contemporary texts that might be read in a similarly comparative manner, but which can also, significantly, stand alone.

The incomplete text written at fols. 102r to 105r, which I have entitled the *Justification for English Intervention in the Dutch Revolt*, is as much about bad government and the right course of action for a nation as it is about a specific historical moment – in this case, certainly the Revolt in the Netherlands, and probably occasioned particularly by the year leading up to the Treaty of Nonsuch in 1584–85, or a little thereafter. The ability to date the text comes from explicit mention of ‘Her Majestie’,
Elizabeth I obviously, who (at fol. 104v to 105r) is defended by the author for her *present* expence and charges:

[fol. 104v] I think / there is no man ignorant who onely with an ordinary judgement / loketh into the maner of her Maiesties prosecuting the cause of / those afflicted provinces but doth apparantly perceave the / continuall intention of taking their protection in hande, and / the receaving of the strengthes she possesseth, was onely / for her owene safety, and (as I have said) for the / keeping of so violent a mightiness from her estate and kingdom: / neyther desiring to enlarge her dominions, neyther expecting / [fol. 105r] the obedience of the people, nor coveting so much as her present / expence and charges ... .]

This may make direct reference to the issue of sovereignty over the Netherlands during the period in 1584–85 in which the States General in Holland and other provinces were seeking variously to persuade either Henry III of France or Elizabeth, or both in an Anglo-French pact, to take on their governance in the light of the long-standing dispute with Philip II of Spain. Some of this work, especially in the last two folios where the text is complete, is also reminiscent of the *Declaration of the Causes Moving the Queen of England to Give Aid to the Defence of the People Afflicted and Oppressed in the Low Countries* (1585), parts of which were written by Sir Francis Walsingham himself, a figure central to the negotiations and deliberations about the conflict in the Netherlands, in the actions of the Spanish in their efforts to suppress the rebellion, and in the Treaty between England and the United Provinces (see Adams 1998, 1:19–31). The tumultuous nature of the debates held by Elizabeth and her Privy Council in the dangerous years of 1584 and 1585 provides a clear context for this document that seeks to justify Elizabeth’s concluding some kind of treaty with the United Provinces for multiple reasons, many of which are concerned with the morality of a just government, and the rejection by smaller nations of the bullying ruler.

To prove the point that a strong and ethical governor will act in support of those neighbours in need, the author of the *Justification* evokes the tyranny and treachery of Ludovic Sforza, who between 1494 and 1500 usurped the Dukedom of Milan and then betrayed his fellow states in Italy. His ambition and attempts to play one powerful ally off against the other caused his downfall and he died in 1508 after years of imprisonment in the Château de Loches. Similarly, the author is keen to emphasize the 'malices of the Pope', which, while referring to Alexander VI, pope at the end of the fifteenth century, is undoubtedly
part of the general anti-Catholicism evoked throughout this text. Part of the larger historical frame of reference in which this text functions and to which it contributes, though, is the strenuous anti-Spanish sentiment which characterizes most of Elizabeth’s reign (see Sanchez 2004), but here, too, that is placed within the larger context of the complexity of the political environment in Europe in the late fifteenth century, and the entire century following. The wars, both internecine and international, are highlighted briefly through the text’s references to the monarchs of France and Spain; the rulers of the Vatican, Venice, Milan, and Naples; and the use of mercenaries, like the ‘Swizzers’. Set against the even larger historical backdrop of the overthrow of the great city-states of the Spartans, Athenians, and Venetians (fol. 105r), Elizabeth, the audience is told, learned from the errors of these:

and other commonwealthes and kingdoms, who like lofty / buildinges wantinge foundations answereable were overthrownde / with their stone waignt: and covetinge the frute without / consideration of the height whereon it grewe, fell with the / bowis which they did embrace even into the depth of their owne / destenctions.

(fol. 105r)

From this presumably first-hand account of deliberative rulership, the onlooker witnesses the political acuity of the Queen in her arduous and risky decision-making and the document becomes a self-authenticating and perhaps vitally important contemporary validation of Elizabeth I’s prowess in diplomacy and governance. When coupled in this manuscript with The Life and Death of Cardinal Wolsey, the text functions within the larger didactic genre of the Speculum Principis, so popular in the Renaissance.

Adaptive reuse

It is not clear how this manuscript came into the hands of the Harbord (variously Harback and, possibly, Herbert) family, whose name appears in the Worcestershire Victoria County History and who also owned land in Warwickshire and Bedfordshire. It is almost certain that while in their care many pages of the manuscript were ripped out, because accompanying the bound volume are seven slips of paper that contain related accounts. Presumably, many more such slips have been lost.

The Harbords, as a family, are, for a short time, connected directly with the Worcestershire manor of Guarlford or Garleford, which Robert
Harbord owned from 1562, followed by his son, Richard, and his grandson, Rowland Wheeler. The earliest accounts in the Stanford manuscript date from 1627 onward and occur at fol. 105v, adjacent to the Justification. The names of clients concerned are not easily traceable; they include Edward Robinson, Thomas Taylor, 'my brother John' (Harbord), 'my brother Foulkes' (Harbord), George Butler, Margery Jones, 'my servant John Hitchcocke', John Griffin, Francis Mogg, Richard Falckoner, John Harsons, John Johnsons, and William Wheler (perhaps related to the Wheelers of Garleford Manor). Places named in these sets of accounts include (at fol. 99r) Combarton Close, Bricklehampton (in the parish of Elmley Castle, Worcestershire, where a certain 'Sir William Herbert of the Privy Council' was sold the manor in 1544), Henley (as in Henley-in-Arden), and Ickley broke.

At fol. 1r, illustrating that the sequencing of the accounts was not dependent on the sequence of folios, the bookkeeper, one of the Harbords (brother of Foulke), begins the accounts for 1635. At the top of the list (causing such excitement to the antiquarian book-dealer, Magee) is John Milton (mentioned one other time in 1636), followed by Simon Godwin, 'my brother Foulk Harback', John Kithell, William Jones, and John Higges. Each of these figures owes rent, and some are themselves paid for materials delivered or work performed. Together with the accounts written into the body of the book are the separate slips of paper, now loose, and thus perhaps representative of quick notes that were to be written into the book at a later point. Among these is one that contains three references to a 'William Shakespeare' in 1649, which are written in the first person, and which refer to the contentious quartering of soldiers during the latter years of the English Civil War:

Item prime: Receaued by mee William / Shakspeare third the eleventh / of May 1649 towards of having / scole[?] soldiers three dayes at 4d per li’.

Item rec’ by mee William Shakspeare / the 12th of May the some of 5s for 3 monthes contribucio[n] / for the gen[eral’s] army at 3 ob’ q’ per li’.

Item rec’ by mee William Shakspeare / the 29th May the summe / of 7s 4d for the generalles / army at 5d ob’ per li’

This William Shakespeare may have been a distant relative of the playwright, perhaps the William Shakespeare of Rowington in Warwickshire whose family lived at Shakespeare Hall in that village, though quite what his relationship to the Harbords might have been is not