

# BIBLIOGRAPHICAL CONTRIBUTIONS

## I

UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS LIBRARIES  
1969

*University of Kansas Publications  
Library Series, 32*

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL  
CONTRIBUTIONS

I

Lawrence, Kansas  
UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS LIBRARIES  
1969

COPYRIGHT 1969 BY THE UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS LIBRARIES  
Library of Congress Catalog Card number: 68-66135  
PRINTED IN LAWRENCE, KANSAS, U.S.A., BY THE  
UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS PRINTING SERVICE

## Contents

A New Source for the Study of the High Court of Chancery: a Manuscript of John Lisle, Lord Commissioner of the Great Seal (1649-1659). By ALLAN J. BUSCH .....	1
“The Stowte Assaillinge of Englande”: a letter of Nicholas Sanders addressed to Antonio Graziani. By BRIAN P. COPENHAVER .....	11
The Authorship of <i>A Letter from a Clergyman</i> (1688). By DAVID W. JOHNSON .....	37
The Identification of Sir James of the Peak: a Corrigendum to the Editions of Swift’s Correspondence. By HENRY L. SNYDER .....	55
P. A. Mattioli: Sixteenth Century Commentator on Dioscorides. By JERRY STANNARD .....	59

# A New Source for the Study of the High Court of Chancery:

*A Manuscript of John Lisle, Lord Commissioner of the Great Seal (1649-1659)*

By ALLAN J. BUSCH

How many students of Stuart England or even of the Civil Wars and Interregnum have ever heard of John Lisle, save those who have read the short references reporting his status as a regicide? Although he was a commissioner of the great seal for the whole of the Interregnum, his career is known only to a few. And yet Lisle was a judge in Chancery at a momentous time in the history of that court. Historians such as Elton, Richardson, and Jones have examined the court institutions of the Tudor period; relatively little has been accomplished in the seventeenth century. The Chancery of the Interregnum, for example, remains relatively untouched. Perhaps the reason for this is the lack of materials for such an investigation. This paucity is quickly demonstrated when one realizes that the memoirs of Bulstrode Whitelocke must be counted as a prime source. Yet they consist primarily of a narrative of his diplomatic career and a justification of his political activities. The latest work by Stuart Prall on the legal reforms of the Civil Wars and Interregnum only reiterates information already known from the pamphlets of the period. At no other time in its history (until perhaps the nineteenth century) did Chancery receive so much criticism as it did during the Interregnum. Indeed its very existence was threatened, and the abolition of the prerogative courts in 1641 served as an ominous warning to this very vulnerable institution. Why then did Chancery remain in existence and even increase in power during the next fifty years? Until now historians have not been able to provide a satisfactory answer to this question. But the solution may be at hand. With the discovery of John Lisle's personal record of his work in Chancery,<sup>1</sup> vital new evidence is finally available for a study of this court in the most critical period of its existence.

Unlike those of Oliver Cromwell, Edmund Ludlow, Henry Ireton, or even Bulstrode Whitelocke, the name of John Lisle does not immediately suggest the Interregnum. However, my investigation reveals that Lisle was, indeed, one of the most prominent men of the time, a member of the Short and Long Parliaments and the Councils of State, president of the High

Court of Justice and a commissioner of the great seal. The Lisle family was one of the oldest in Hampshire and the Isle of Wight where Lisle's father, Sir William, was well established at Wotton.<sup>2</sup> Despite his prominent part in the Rebellion, Lisle's family, including his father, brother, and son, were Royalists. The son even aided in the king's attempted escape from the Isle of Wight in 1647.<sup>3</sup> Lisle married twice, the first time in 1631 to Elizabeth Hobart, daughter of Sir Henry Hobart, Chief Justice of the Common Pleas. After her death the following year, Lisle married Alice, the daughter of Sir White Beckenshaw. In both marriages Lisle did quite well for himself, for the two ladies brought considerable wealth and estates with them.<sup>4</sup>

Lisle's public career began with his education at Christ Church, Oxford, and at the Middle Temple where he eventually became a bencher.<sup>5</sup> When the borough of Winchester returned Lisle to both the Short and Long Parliaments, he devoted all his energies to affairs of state. To mention a few of his activities: Lisle reported on the treason charges against the Earl of Manchester and against Bulstrode Whitelocke, who later became Lisle's colleague at the seals.<sup>6</sup> The Long Parliament thought enough of Lisle's ability to name him as one of the parliamentary peace commissioners to Charles I in 1647 and as one of the commissioners to try the King for treason in 1649.<sup>7</sup> At the trial of the King, Lisle took a leading role as special assistant to the president of the High Court of Justice.<sup>8</sup> It was participation in this affair, of course, which proved his undoing at the Restoration when he was exempted from a pardon for taking the King's life.<sup>9</sup> After January 1649, Lisle advanced rapidly; he became a member of the Council of State, and on February 7, 1649, the Parliament named him a commissioner of the great seal, a position of the utmost trust. These two positions Lisle retained throughout the Interregnum.<sup>10</sup>

When Cromwell came to full power in the state in 1653, Lisle became one of the Protector's most ardent supporters, even going so far as to agitate for Cromwell's kingship.<sup>11</sup> Because of Lisle's presidency of the High Court of Justice under Cromwell, his associate Bulstrode Whitelocke became quite critical of Lisle's judicial career. Whitelocke portrayed Lisle as a mere creature of Cromwell without a mind of his own.<sup>12</sup> Since the procedures in the High Court of Justice were similar to those of the Star Chamber, anyone who presided there might be viewed as a dupe and an instrument of another, namely Cromwell. The view and practice of law outlined in the Lisle MS. do not support Whitelocke's opinion of Lisle.

The fall of the Protectorate in 1659 made Lisle's continued presence in England extremely hazardous, and as he was ineligible for a pardon, he fled the country. On April 11, 1664, while leaving a church in Lausanne,

Switzerland, Lisle received a mortal wound in the back from the hired assassin of the king; he was the only regicide to suffer that fate.<sup>13</sup>

This brief sketch of Lisle's political career during the Interregnum demonstrates several points of importance about the author of the manuscript. From his election to Parliament in 1640 until his flight in 1659, Lisle served continuously in the highest councils of the state. Only the most important of his positions have been mentioned, and they by no means represent a complete enumeration. Lisle's numerous posts reveal that he had some ability in law and public affairs to justify all the trusts placed in him, Bulstrode Whitelocke's statements notwithstanding. When Cromwell assumed complete control, Lisle adjusted to the subsequent changes in government, and when Cromwell proposed alterations in Chancery procedures in 1655, Lisle acquiesced but the other two commissioners, Thomas Widdrington and Whitelocke, did not. One is tempted to believe that Lisle retained his position as a commissioner of the seal throughout the Interregnum only because of his willingness to cooperate. This was the accusation of Bulstrode Whitelocke and has become embedded in the works of modern authors. The Lisle MS. presents a contrary view: it reveals a man who had definite legal ability. Lisle's position as the only continuous commissioner of the seal and his cooperative stand on Cromwell's suggested Chancery reforms give Lisle increased significance. Lisle's Chancery book must be, therefore, of considerable value for any study of the Commonwealth Chancery.

Although it is not possible by a superficial examination of the manuscript to determine the author, deeper research has served to establish that it is definitely the work of John Lisle. In passing, mention may be made of the bookplate of one "Thomas Kyfinn, Esq., of Maenan, Carnarvonshire, North Wales." This, however, is of an early eighteenth century type and does not at all correspond with the dating of the handwriting.<sup>14</sup>

One finds two styles of handwriting in the Lisle MS. The writer used the "secretary" and the "italic" hands interchangeably. The secretary hand was the dominant style of the entries, all of them written by one person over a ten year period. Most were made in a hurried manner—scrawled and irregular—with no consistency in abbreviation or spelling. Because the handwriting of the seventeenth century in England was changing from secretary to a mixture of secretary and italic, one cannot accurately date the manuscript by a strict handwriting analysis; the only gauge is the amount of italic influence on the secretary. The most that one can say is that a comparison of the Lisle MS. with examples of mid-seventeenth century handwriting indicates a close resemblance.<sup>15</sup> However, when the Lisle MS. is placed side by side with a known holograph of Lisle's in the Public



Record Office, such striking similarities are disclosed that one cannot doubt the authorship.<sup>16</sup> Nevertheless, the inherent inadequacies of a handwriting analysis for the purpose of establishing dates or authorship require one to rely upon the manuscript's internal evidence for positive identification.

The thousands of entries contain ample evidence to demonstrate authorship and dates of composition. Two examples will suffice. In several entries the author gives the Synopsis of Council of State meetings wherein he refers to himself in the first person. In March 1655, Lord Protector Cromwell and the Council of State issued an order for the engraving of new seals.<sup>17</sup> Pursuant to the engraving of a new great seal, the author entered in his manuscript book under the date of June 15, 1655, that one could find in the "Miscellany Concerning the Chancery," an order reported by him as follows:

. . . [An order was] (sent to the Lord Fiennes and myselfe) of the Lord Protector and his Councill, with a memorandum how the great scale was delivered to us by his Highnesse today. 15 June 1655. in [the] presence of his council, to be made use of by us or either of us. and of our taking the oath.<sup>18</sup>

Identification of the author is now merely a matter of determining who the two commissioners of the seal were in 1655. They were Nathaniel Fiennes and John Lisle. When the protector ordered the formation of a new Council of State in 1657, Lisle described the swearing-in ceremony as follows:

The Lorde Fiennes and I were sent for to attend the protector with the great seale, and it was to such a commission to this effect . . . : To give power to my Lord Fiennes and myselfe. to sweare the Lord President Luarence, and major General Desborough, 2 of his highnesses councill, and to give them power after they were so powered to swear the rest that shall be chosen by his Highnesse to be councillors. as soone as this commission was sealed we did in the presence of his Highnesse, swear the Lord Luarence, and Gen: Desborough in the Councill Chamber. a Bible lying upon the table, and they taking the oath one after the other, with right hands held up.<sup>19</sup>

Lisle's description, although more detailed, is a duplication of that found in the *State Papers Domestic* under the same date, July 13, 1657. In place of the personal pronouns used by Lisle, the *State Papers* names Fiennes and Lisle as those administering the oath to Lawrence and Desborough.<sup>20</sup> To these examples one may add the numerous references of the author to himself in conjunction with associates such as Richard Keeble, Thomas Widdrington,

Bulstrode Whitelocke, and Nathaniel Fiennes, all commissioners of the great seal with Lisle at some time. There is even the citation of a case in Chancery against Lisle, which reportedly caused some consternation among the commissioners.<sup>21</sup> These examples of internal evidence are only a few of the many that might be presented, but they demonstrate conclusively that John Lisle was the author.

Although identification of the manuscript is important and necessary, the primary purpose of this paper is to establish the significance of the Lisle MS. as a source for Chancery studies during the most critical period of its existence, entailing a consideration of the manuscript and its contents. The collecting of cases and precedents in a manuscript book such as Lisle's was not unusual for the lawyers of the seventeenth century. Other judges, such as Sir Henry Rolle, Chief Justice of the Upper Bench, kept a commonplace book for their own use. Rolle's work was similar to an encyclopedia, organized "historically," each topic being composed of summaries from year-books, parliaments, and statutes. Many collections, including some on Chancery cases, appeared during the years 1640 to 1660; the collection of Chancery causes made by Sir Heneage Finch, the Earl of Nottingham and Lord Chancellor (1673-1682) is much like that of Lisle's MS.<sup>22</sup> Therefore, the Lisle MS. is in the traditional method of commonplacing cases and precedents for one's own use; furthermore, it demonstrates the "historical attitude" of the seventeenth century lawyers, an attitude that will become more obvious when one examines Lisle's sources.

There is considerable diversity in the topics of the Lisle MS. The majority of the entries are quite naturally concerned with equity and common law in Chancery. There are also cases which could have come under the Chancery jurisdiction since the Civil War. Some of these are cases arising under the Law Merchant, legacies, appeals, and ecclesiastical jurisdictions. Another type of entry in Lisle's book is that concerning organization and procedures in Chancery. On this topic one finds entries on examination of witnesses, habeas corpus, appeals, the master of the rolls, the six clerks, the serjeants at law, the attorneys, the cursitors, the supreme magistrate, the Council of State, Ireland, and reforms in Chancery. A complete list would be too lengthy, but these illustrate the manuscript's importance for the mechanics of Chancery.

One will recall from the earlier discussion of the internal evidence for authorship that the manuscript contains numerous references directed to the author himself. There are several varieties of these personal reminders. They may be references to a Council of State meeting, to a committee meeting on the reformation of the Chancery, or to an order from the Protector

to the Chancery; they may even be reminders for Lisle's own conduct in Chancery, for example, the following entry entitled, "My selfe. How it is fitt to carry my selfe on motions or Hearings, etc.:"<sup>23</sup> Personal memoranda of a commissioner of the great seal will be useful in discovering the motivation behind decisions and in determining the inner workings of the Chancery. These entries contain information on important personages and incidents unavailable elsewhere. Because the notations were made by an officer of high rank, closely associated with other leaders, the Lisle MS. becomes even more relevant for the study of the history of Chancery.

The careful study of Lisle's entries show that he has suffered unjustly by the characterization of him fostered by his colleague Bulstrode Whitelocke, who exhibited him as an incompetent. Nineteenth century historians such as Lord Campbell, Edward Foss, and recent authors such as Stuart Prall, have preserved this view intact.<sup>24</sup> Since the Lisle MS. suggests anything but incompetence, perhaps it will produce a more balanced view of Lisle in the future. Moreover, the sources Lisle used in compiling his work are also a testimonial to his legal ability.

An evaluation of the manuscript's significance must, therefore, contain an examination of Lisle's source materials. There are four general sources from which Lisle drew the information supplied in his book. They are (1) the legal authorities of the past, (2) the records of the Chancery and other courts, (3) the oral proceedings in the Chancery, and (4) the printed works referred to by Lisle as "my book." The frequent references to the legal authorities such as William West, Sir Henry Hobart (Lisle's father-in-law), Sir George Croke, Sir Edward Coke, John Rushworth, Francis Bacon, Sir James Dyer, William Shepard, Christopher St. Germain, Edmund Wingate, Edward Bulstrode, Thomas Ashe, Sir Anthony Fitzherbert, and Sir Robert Brook place Lisle in the group known as the "historically minded" common-lawyers of the seventeenth century. And Lisle's reliance upon historical precedents as a basis for decisions and opinions in Chancery demonstrates the growing tendency of equity decisions to be bound by a definite body of precedent, a development not in keeping with the traditional method of that court.

The second source of Lisle's information is the records of the courts. Most of the cases cited are from an official collection entitled, "Chancery Books." This record of Chancery cases is cited frequently by Lisle under nearly every heading. Several possibilities for identification of this particular reference present themselves. It may have been the cause books kept by the Six Clerks, or the Three Clerks, the equivalent of the Six Clerks during the Commonwealth.<sup>25</sup> On the other hand, it may have been the reports of the

masters in Chancery or possibly the registrars' entry books. The latter appears to be the most likely because they were books in which were kept a record of all the cases heard by the masters in Chancery.<sup>26</sup> The "Chancery Books" range from book I through book VII.<sup>27</sup>

Causes in the High Court of Star Chamber are often cited by Lisle, under the title, "Camera Stellata."<sup>28</sup> Because the Star Chamber was one of those prerogative courts dissolved in 1641, it would be interesting to determine the points of law made in the Star Chamber that were used as precedents in the Commonwealth Chancery. Another source occasionally cited is entitled "Orders Made by the Commissioners of the Great Seale, 1649." Lisle generally referred to this work when he sought authority for decisions turning upon disputes between "law and equity" jurisdictions in Chancery.<sup>29</sup>

Lisle's third major source for his manuscript is the oral proceedings before the commissioners in Chancery. These entries are documented by the date and by the names of plaintiff and defendant. Since the entries found under reference to the "Chancery Books" are contemporary cases also, I have assumed that those cited only by date are cases heard by the commissioners themselves instead of the Master of the Rolls. Three brief examples are as follows:

By order of the Chancery of the 13th of October, 1653: It was referred to . . . one of the masters to consider & certify the cause of the court concerning affidavits. whereupon he certified. . . .<sup>30</sup>

April 14th. 1657. a prohibition moved for in Chancery to the prerogative court, for going about then to prove a will . . . & the prohibition granted upon the suggestion. . . .<sup>31</sup>

and

March. 4th. 1653. There was a motion made in Chancery for an extension upon this case. . . .<sup>32</sup>

The fourth and final source used by Lisle is perhaps the most intriguing. It comprises references made to works prefaced by the words "my book." There are several of these shadowy authorities. One of the most frequent is "my book entituled Pleas and Demurrers."<sup>33</sup> Others cited in the same manner are: "My Abridgement to Cookes please of the Crowns," "My booke Equitable Actions att Law," "My booke entituled The best Policy," "My booke entituled proceedings forme & presidents in a parliamentary way," "Miscellany Concerning the Chancery," "My white booke of justices de peace," "My paper booke. The Table to Cookes jurisdiction of Courts," "My booke entituled Parlement begun Sept. 3d 1654," "2d Miscellany Con-

cerning the Chancery," and "My booke Temporall Matters debated in Parliament." Two works mentioned often in the manuscript are of special interest. They are "My printed Bundle Concerning the Chancery entituled (Choyce Cases in Chancery)" and "(My printed bundle concerning the Chancery) in title. (The practice of the High Court of Chancery)."<sup>34</sup> Professor Holdsworth discusses these two anonymous treatists, both of which were published in 1652. "*The Practise of the High Court of Chancery*," writes Holdsworth, resembles William West's collection of precedents. It was published together with the other work, "*Choyce Cases in Chancery*," which covered cases 1557 to 1606. "*The Practise of Chancery*," is concerned with procedure, jurisdiction, and practice, but also has other topics such as substantive rules of equity, history, and functions of Chancery.<sup>35</sup> It is possible that these two treatises and the others, apparently unpublished, are the works of John Lisle. Identification, however, will require a comparison with the Lisle manuscript. Lord Chancellor Nottingham, when referring to his own compositions in his *Causes in Chancery* cites them as "my book." This characteristic of Nottingham's suggests that Lisle may have used the same form. Should this contention be true, it would certainly be opposed to the traditional view of Lisle's legal accomplishments.<sup>36</sup>

In order to realize the full significance of the Lisle MS., a transcription and an examination of the law contained in the entries will be necessary. Nevertheless, one must agree now that it is an invaluable source for the Chancery and the Interregnum. As a consequence of his service in Chancery throughout the Interregnum, Lisle acquired an intimate knowledge and understanding of this court which no other commissioner could match. When Lisle's decisions, comments, and opinions are examined, one will understand more fully the reforms in Chancery. There is an apparent dearth of private manuscript sources for the proceedings in Chancery from 1649 to 1660, and Lisle's book provides a means for understanding the intricate procedures of the Commonwealth Chancery. The Lisle MS. will bring a substantial amount of information to bear on the fundamental nature of the High Court of Chancery during the Interregnum.

## Notes

1. "Abridgements of Chancery Causes," MS. D87, Department of Special Collections, University of Kansas Libraries.

2. Francis Bamford, ed., *A Royalist's Notebook; Commonplace Book of Sir John Oglander* (London, 1936), p. 159. Oglander was Lisle's godfather (p. 13n), 123-5). *The Victoria County History: A History of Hampshire and the Isle of Wight* (5 vols.; Westminster 1903-4), IV, 313.

3. Bulstrode Whitelocke, *Memorials of the English Nation*. . . (London, 1682), p. 287. *Oglander Notebook*, pp. 72, 83, 86-7.

4. *Ibid.*, p. 72n. *Vict. Co. Hist.: Hants.*, III, 145; IV, 563-4, 565. Cobbett's *Par-*

*liamentary History*, III, 1601. Mary E. Keller, *The Long Parliament, 1640-1641: A Biographical Study of the Members* (Philadelphia, 1954), p. 252. See also Whitelocke, *Memorials*, p. 54.

5. *Commons Journal*, II, 263. See also Lord Campbell, *The Lives of the Lord Chancellors and Keppers of the Great Seal of England, First Series* (3 vols.; 2nd ed.; London, 1846), III, 42-3. Arthur R. Ingpen, ed., *The Middle Temple Bench Book*. . . . (London, 1912), p. 30.

6. *Commons Journal*, IV, 25. Whitelocke, *Memorials*, p. 148.

7. T. B. Howell, *A Complete Collection of State Trials . . . to the Year 1783*. . . . (21 vols.; London, 1816), IV, 1053.

8. C. H. Firth, ed., *The Memoirs of Edmund Ludlow . . . 1625-1672* (2 vols.; Oxford, 1894), I, 214. *State Trials*, IV, 1067.

9. *Calendar of the State Papers* (Domestic), (1600-1661), I, 41.

10. *Ludlow Memoirs*, I, 222. *Parliamentary History*, III, 1287.

11. *Parliamentary History*, III, 1426; Whitelocke, *Memorials*, p. 552. *Monarchy Asserted to be the best . . . Form of Government* (London, 1679), p. 32. C. H. Firth, *The Last Years of the Protectorate, 1656-1658* (2 vols.; New York, 1964), I, 147.

12. Campbell, *Chancellors*, III, 42-3; Edward Foss, *The Judges of England*. . . . (London, 1857), VI, p. 455. *CSPD* (1649-1660), V, 263; *State Trials*, VI, 375-6.

13. *CSPD* (1660-1661), I, 41. *CSPD* (1663-1664), II, 144, 149, 380.

14. Thomas Nicholas, ed., *Annals and Antiquities of the Counties and County Families of Wales* (2 vols.; London, 1872), I, 345; W. R. Williams, *The History of the Great Sessions in Wales, 1542-1830* (Brecknock, 1899), p. 121. Further investigation of the provenance of the manuscript suggests that it may have passed into the possession of William Lenthall, Master of the Rolls and Speaker of the Long Parliament, and the close working associate of Lisle, at the time of the latter's flight from England in 1660. The Lenthall family escaped attainder during the Restoration, and later intermarried with the Kyffin family of Maenan, Caernarvonshire, North Wales.

15. N. Denholm-Young, *Handwriting in England and Wales* (Cardiff, 1954), p. 71; L. C. Hector, *The Handwriting of English Documents* (London, 1958), p. 60; G. E. Dawson and L. Kennedy-Skippon, *Elizabethan Handwriting 1500-1650; A Manual* (New York, 1966), plate #50, p. 127; Lisle MS., fol. 331, 2.

16. *CSPD* (1649-1600), VII, pp. 233-40; a photocopy of the manuscript was supplied by the Public Record Office.

17. *CSPD* (1649-1660), VIII, 83.

18. Lisle MS., fol. 319v, Sect. 3.

19. *Ibid.*, fol. 299v.

20. *CSPD* (1649-1660), XI, 26-7.

21. Lisle MS., fol. 107v.

22. Holdsworth, *Sources of English Law* (London, 1928), pp. 90, 76; *History of English Law* (12 vols.; London, 1945), V, 236.

23. Lisle MS., fol. 226r.

24. Campbell, *Chancellors*, III, 42-3.

25. Holdsworth, *History of English Law*, V, 262, 263n.

26. *Ibid.*, V, 264.

27. *Ibid.*, V, 262; Lisle MS., fol. 152v, 1.

28. Lisle MS., fol. 42r.

29. Lisle MS., fols., 46v, 282r, 284r, 287r.

30. *Ibid.*, fol. 343v.

31. *Ibid.*, fol. 235v.

32. *Ibid.*, fol. 296r.

33. *Ibid.*, fol. 209r.

34. *Ibid.*, fols. 213v and 263r.

35. Holdsworth, *History of English Law*, V, 274, 277. *The Practice of the High Court of Chancery Unfolded* (London, 1652).

36. Campbell, *Chancellors*, III, 42-3; Foss, *Judges*, VI, p. 455.

# “The Stowte Assaillinge of Englande:”

*A Letter of Nicholas Sanders addressed to Antonio Graziani*

By BRIAN P. COPENHAVER

“The state of *Christendome* dependethe upon *the stowte assaillinge of Englande.*”<sup>1</sup> Having written these words in 1577 to Cardinal William Allen, Nicholas Sanders coined the phrase which to the present day has served as a handy key not only to his own thought but also to that of the wing of militant Elizabethan Catholicism of which he was the chief representative. Many students of the Counter-Reformation have felt themselves safe in dismissing Dr. Sanders as a prototype of that sincere but muddleheaded zealotry which cost English Catholicism so dearly by consistently overestimating the strength of the old religion in England. Sanders spent most of his active career away from England as a propagandist for the Papal cause; at Trent, Cracow, Louvain, Rome, and Madrid, he developed the mistaken optimism of the exile. Having neither the advantage of personal contact with his co-religionists in England nor the benefit of Sir Maurice Powicke’s assurance that the English Reformation was “. . . an act of State,” the exiled priest found it easy to involve himself in a long life of plotting and polemicizing, all of which was based on his conviction that the English people would, if properly directed, risk rebellion for the true faith.<sup>2</sup> He firmly believed that papal power could stir Elizabeth’s subjects to put down her heretic regime. He died in Ireland in 1581 serving Gregory XIII in one of the most hopeless attempts ever made at the armed reconversion of England.<sup>3</sup>

There is some justice in the fact that even his fellow Catholics have tended to judge Sanders rather harshly.<sup>4</sup> By encouraging the forceful re-Catholicization of England, he only gave the Queen good political reasons for setting her face ever more harshly against English Catholics. Pius V’s excommunication of 1570 and the Desmond Rebellion of 1579-1583 in Ireland represent Sanders’ two most significant involvements with the English Counter-Reformation; both these notable failures engendered increments in the severity with which the recusancy legislation was enforced.<sup>5</sup> Sanders was not only a conspirator, he was an inefficient conspirator. This much the historian can say, but he should not make the mistake of judging Sanders’ entire career as another chapter in the black legend of the Counter-Reformation, the legend whose materials include Philip II’s singular smile at the news of St. Bartholemew’s day, the single-minded stupidity of the Gunpowder Plot, and the maniac ravings of Titus Oates. Sanders was capable

of such fanaticism. There is evidence, for instance, that he referred to an outbreak of plague at Oxford as "a miracle," presumably because it would expedite the extermination of heretics.<sup>6</sup> Further, his unsuccessful mission to Philip's court in the 1570's suggests that eventually he might have been forced to accept the re-conversion of his homeland at any price, a price which might well include Spanish domination of England. But Philip's constitutional reluctance to make any irrevocable decision saved Sanders the ultimate choice as to whether the "stowte assaillinge of Englande" must mean the submission of England to Spain. Moreover, there is some new evidence which indicates that Sanders planned to reconcile the needs of the Counter-Reformation with the maintenance of England's national integrity—in so far, at least, as such national integrity allowed the Pope his role of spiritual lord of Europe.<sup>7</sup>

This evidence is a letter, part of the Graziani Manuscripts recently acquired by the Department of Special Collections of the University of Kansas Libraries, dated February 14, 1570, and sent from Louvain by Sanders to Antonio Maria Graziani, secretary to the Cardinal Legate, Giovanni Comendone.<sup>8</sup> The occasion for this letter was Sanders' hope that Graziani and his master might use their influence at the Curia to gain papal approbation for an armed rising of English Catholics. Sanders knew of the recent failure of the Rising of the Northern Earls of 1569-1570, but he was convinced that the Earls would have gained victory if only Pius V had issued a statement formally loosing the bonds of obedience between Elizabeth and her Catholic subjects. Only eleven days after Sanders sent his pleas to Graziani, the Pope did issue such a statement in the famous bull, *Regnans in Excelsis*. Sometime in 1570, Sanders wrote a pamphlet in defense of the bull, *Pro defensione excommunicationis a Pio Quinto latae in Angliae reginam*.<sup>9</sup> Cardinal Allen's *Defense of English Catholics* tells us that this pamphlet was suppressed, and the modern authorities agree that no copy seems to have survived.<sup>10</sup> One significance of the Graziani letter, then, is that it gives us a clue to the contents of the missing pamphlet. Although the tense of the participle *latae* in the pamphlet's title would seem to indicate that it was written after the imposition of the excommunication, the fact that the earlier letter deals generally with the same subject as the pamphlet permits the conjecture that the one can inform us about the other. The Latin original of the letter, written partly in Sanders' own careless hand but mostly by a secretary, covers three and a half folios of the Graziani MS. Besides the Northern Rising, the excommunication, and some incidental personal business, the letter deals with the problems of sequestered Church lands, the



Catholic population of England, the extent of papal power, and the attitude of France and Spain toward England and English Catholics.

What Graziani learned from Sanders about the Northern Rising approached the truth only in its broad outlines; that is, the priest was forced to admit that the Earls were at least temporarily defeated and that they had fled to safety in Scotland. Further, he did not deny that the rebels could find no support at all once they passed south of the North Country, always the stronghold of Papist sentiment. Sanders doubles the numbers of troops which Elizabeth was able to muster against the rebels, however, and he diminishes the "Catholic" forces by about a thousand.<sup>11</sup> Repeating a report that seven hundred executions followed the rebellion, Sanders does not exaggerate the extent of Elizabeth's vengeance. Yet he does misconstrue its effect when he claims that the sight of the dead rebels will move the North to new uprisings.<sup>12</sup> Finally, his assertion that Leonard Dacre, an important Northern gentleman who involved himself in a miscarried sequel to the main rising, refused to enter into his inheritance because of religious scruples is based on an inflated notion of Dacre's Catholicism; actually, Dacre lost his claim to his dead brother's lands because the Duke of Norfolk had arranged a marriage between his sons and the deceased Earl Dacre's daughters.<sup>13</sup>

Even if these relatively minor errors of detail are the results of ignorance rather than of wilful prevarication, their arrangement in the letter, piled one on another to prove a point as they are, betrays the art of the practised propagandist. The same can be said of Sanders' insistence that formal papal support could have turned the Earls' failure into victory. Always anxious to uphold the power of the Pope's spiritual sword, he either ignored or was ignorant of the facts that the leaders of the Rising were not at all sure what they were about and that they never discussed the possibility of papal excommunication and deposition of the monarch.<sup>14</sup> Certainly, it would be wrong to blame Sanders for having missed the significance of the socio-economic grievances which (as most modern authorities agree) the rank and file of the rebels had in mind. Yet it surely was wrong of Sanders to misrepresent the intention of the Earls themselves, who always maintained their respect for the Queen.<sup>15</sup>

Sanders' letter was a misleading appeal to a Pope whose saintly naïveté guaranteed that he was quite ready to be misled.<sup>16</sup> Although Pius V had decided to issue the bull *Regnans* before he could have learned of the Graziani letter, Sanders must still share the responsibility for having long been a member of the faction which urged the Pope on in the policy whose culmination the bull represented. As early as 1563 Sanders had conspired to pro-

duce an excommunication. In that year he attended the final sessions of the Council of Trent as theological advisor to Cardinal Hosius. Having taken the advice of Sanders and others of a like mind, Hosius made an official proposal which would ultimately result in the dethronement of Elizabeth and the succession of Mary Stuart. But this untimely recommendation of Sanders only brought upon his master the angry refusals of Spain, the Empire, and, finally, of Pius IV himself.<sup>17</sup>

It is to this incident at Trent, perhaps, that we can trace the beginnings of the attitude toward the re-conversion of England which Sanders revealed to Graziani in 1570. Although his unfortunate counsel did not move Hosius to dismiss Sanders from his service, the Cardinal's embarrassing position must have made it quite clear to the priest that Philip II and the other leaders of Catholic Europe did not share his single-minded and apolitical zeal when they came to deal with the English problem. By the time of the Graziani letter, certainly, Sanders had become quite skeptical of the roles which Spain and France might play in recapturing England for the Church, so skeptical that he came to prefer the strength of native English Catholicism and of the Pope's spiritual sword to any help the continental powers might give. Even his long mission to the Spanish court during the 1570's did not entirely change Sanders' mind on this point. Time after time, in fact, Sanders was reminded of Philip's fear that some ill-considered attack on Elizabeth might

put . . . in jeopardy of the sword the remnant of the Catholic nobles still in England, having regard to the mischief done by the publication of the bull of Pius V against the pretensions of the pretended Queen and the consequent commotion.<sup>18</sup>

Weary of constantly being put off by Philip's deliberate caution, Sanders was finally moved in 1577 to write to William Allen, beseeching him ". . . to take *hould of the pope*; for *the King of Spaine* is as *fearefull* of warre as a child of fyer."<sup>19</sup>

"To take *hould of the pope*" and to incite the English Catholics to a unified rebellion—this was the policy which Sanders came to prefer as a result of his distrust of the politically minded European Catholics. And this policy explains Sanders' support of Pius V's bull and of papal power in general, as described in the Graziani letter, the lost pamphlet, and certain other of his writings.<sup>20</sup> His support was based on two serious misconceptions—of the strength of Catholicism in England and of the nature of papal power—which might seem foolish to the modern mind but which came quite naturally to an exiled English priest.

In 1561 Sanders wrote a report to Cardinal Moroni on the state of Catholicism in England. "The English people," he told the Cardinal

consist of farmers, shepherds and artisans. The two former are Catholic. Of the others none are schismatic except those who have sedentary occupations, as weavers and shoemakers, and some idle people about the court.<sup>21</sup>

Summarizing his estimate of the population, he concluded that "... hardly one per cent of the English people is infected."<sup>22</sup> In exile since 1558, Sanders was deprived of the contact with his countrymen which might have shaken his faith enough to have made him realize how seriously the numbers of active Catholics had declined in the first twelve years of Elizabeth's rule.<sup>23</sup> He seems never to have changed his original opinion as stated in the Moroni report. Even the language of the Graziani letter is much the same:

Only five or six earls, however, have been infected with heresy; all the remainder of the horde of heretics consists of a few spoiled courtiers and sedentary craftsmen.<sup>24</sup>

This was one of the *idées fixes* which doomed Sanders' English policy to failure.

The other was his unassailable faith in the powers of the Pope, the "... chief set up in the church, that the occasion of schism might be removed."<sup>25</sup> This reference to "schism" is meant to indicate not only the separation of protestants from the Roman church but also the existence of various parties among those faithful to Catholicism. Sanders himself, as leader of the "Louvainists," represented one such party which stood opposed to other groups, the "Allen-Persons Party" and, later, the Appellants, on the English question.<sup>26</sup> Moreover, as Sanders told Graziani, the Catholics who remained in England were divided; some felt that active resistance to the heretic Queen was justifiable without papal approval, but others, less responsive to the changing conditions wrought by the religious turmoil of the latter half of the century, felt it safer to wait on the Pope's decision.<sup>27</sup> Sanders was deeply concerned about these factions which could only reduce the strength of the Catholic cause. It was the job of the papacy, he insisted, to unite all the faithful under Rome's banner, to abolish the causes of the insidious divisions. Pius V agreed with Sanders in this respect for it was his intention in publishing *Regnans in Excelsis* to quiet the scruples of those Englishmen who feared that they might sin grievously in attacking their anointed prince.<sup>28</sup> Sanders was firmly convinced that a papal command could produce a unified and successful Catholic rising in England—this in spite of the failure of the

Northern Rebellion. Papal power was Christ's power; it *could not* fail. Further, papal support of an English rising would not, in Sanders' mind, bring the political difficulties which must attend any intervention by the Spanish or the French. Sanders' estimate of Rome's ability to work wonders in England was, at best, naive and medieval and, at its worst, somewhat akin to a primitive and unreasoning faith in magic. "Believe me," he begged Graziani,

... there is more power in one excommunication from the Apostolic See than in much princely support. Not only because spiritual swords strike more forcibly, but also because in this way all English Catholics will withdraw from the Queen and go over to her enemies.<sup>29</sup>

Sanders' political vision, obviously, was obscured by the blindness of the exile and of the zealot, but it was not completely obstructed. Although he gravely overestimated the strength of the spiritual sword and of the native English Catholics, he was wise enough and enough of an Englishman to be aware of the problems which would befall his fatherland should Philip II be invited there to restore the old faith. "... is it not preferable," he asked, "that the old boundaries of these domains be preserved undiminished rather than that England should be subject either to France or to Spain?"<sup>30</sup> Further, his continuing diplomatic experience served to fortify his conviction that the continental powers were more interested in England as a political entity than in the fate of English Catholics. Finally, although his reliance on an England ninety-nine per cent Catholic was totally mistaken, Sanders did not forget that economic weapons could also be used to fight Christ's battles. Convinced that many Englishmen were bound to the Reformation merely through their ownership of lands confiscated from the Church since the beginning of Henry VIII's attack on the monasteries, he urged the Pope to cut these bonds by formally approving the continued possession of such lands by Catholics without any insistence on restitution. This was to be done by appending the following clause to the bull of excommunication and deposition:

that whoever takes up arms for the Catholic faith can, after penance properly done, continue in sound conscience to hold the unlawfully acquired ecclesiastical lands and properties and can be freed from restitution.<sup>31</sup>

Actually, it was natural for Sanders to have been aware of some of the more obvious economic problems caused by the Reformation; not only was he the author of *A Briefe Treatise of Usurie* but he also discussed economic affairs in his most famous work, *The Rise and Growth of the Anglican Schism*.<sup>32</sup>

In summary, then, it seems that the Graziani letter can do the following things for the historian interested in Sanders as a champion of the English Counter-Reformation:

1. it can, perhaps, serve as a clue to the contents of the lost pamphlet, *Pro defensione excommunicationis . . .*;
2. it shows that Sanders attempted to effect the reconversion of England without submitting his homeland to the dangerous ambitions of Spain and France;
3. it shows that Sanders' faith in the efficiency of papal power was moderated by his awareness of the economic complications of the English Reformation.

In general, the letter can help to "rescue" Sanders from the fate he has shared with many of his contemporaries, men whose reputations have been dragged through four centuries of mire constantly stirred up by the mutual recriminations of Protestant and Catholic.

Yet it should be recognized that contemporary and later Protestant attacks on Sanders were, in general, much more to the point than the often misplaced encomiums which he drew from fellow Catholics. The English government, especially Lord Burleigh and Archbishop Parker, found it necessary to launch a prolonged offensive against Sanders in 1572 upon the publication of *De Visibili Monarchia Ecclesiae*, one of his larger and more famous works; Parker admitted that "As for the answer of Saunders' babbling book, I see few men either able or willing; not for the invincibleness, but for the huge volume."<sup>83</sup> Burleigh himself, in his *Execution of Justice*, entered the fray against Sanders ". . . a lewde scholler and subject of England . . . [who did] gloriously avowe the aforesaid Bull of *Pius Quintus* against her Maistie, to be lawfull. . . ."<sup>84</sup> Sanders' dedication to the papal cause had made him a name to conjure with; henceforth, the clever Protestant polemicist need only prove his opponent's association with the author of *De Visibili* in order to blacken his name ineradicably.<sup>85</sup> Bishop Cox explained to a correspondent why the book was so dangerous:

. . . it takes away from Christian magistrates the right of deciding in matters of religion, and claims it entirely for the pope and his officers as the supreme governor of the church. . . . You will not, I hope, allow him to triumph.<sup>86</sup>

This was an accurate criticism of the exiled priest for it marked him clearly as a proponent of papal power and not, as some modern authorities have thought, as an advocate of Spanish or French interference. Yet even his

support of the Pope's spiritual sword made Sanders a threat to the peace of England, for the Pope could and did make a claim to the rights of deposition, a claim which could incite

. . . conspiracies, whisperings, murmerings, railings, blind prophesies, curses, treacheries, seditions, treasons, rebellions, murders, sorceries, poysonings . . . to depose the Lords anyoynted, and to set up another of their confederacie. . . .<sup>37</sup>

As far as the sixteenth century was concerned, Sanders' attitude toward the throne marked him as a dangerous radical; even in the ". . . case of Apostacie, howe ever the Prince be worthy to be deposed: the deposition lyeth not in any subject, or any foreyne, but in God. . . ."<sup>38</sup> Thus, Sanders became one of the most infamous enemies of Protestant England, but he also became one of the most remembered. Anthony á Wood, in the next century, recalled him as ". . . the most noted defender of the Roman Catholic cause in his time, . . ."<sup>39</sup>

With the notable exception of Cardinal Allen, however, Sanders' Catholic contemporaries were indiscriminately generous in describing him. Sanders himself tells us that he enjoyed a high place in the estimations of Cardinals Hosius, Moroni, and Commendone, and letters from other Curial officials and from Pope Gregory XIII himself support this judgment.<sup>40</sup> The most lavish praise, however, came from his fellow English zealots. Thomas Stapleton, for instance, numbered Sanders in the company of Erasmus, Cajetan, and St. John Fisher, a rather motley arrangement.<sup>41</sup> Father Persons noted that at Sanders' death ". . . England was bereaved of one of y<sup>e</sup> bravest men that she hath bred in many ages," and when the Countess of Northumberland felt constrained to flatter Cardinal Allen she called him ". . . the most singular man . . . next to Sanders, on this side the seas."<sup>42</sup> Yet such blandishments were misplaced, for Allen, in his *Defence of English Catholics*, was quite anxious to disassociate himself and other English papists from the embarrassing proposals of Sanders. Allen favored the suppression of Sanders' pamphlet, *Pro Defensione*; although he would ". . . neither defend nor reprove . . ." it, he admitted that ". . . manie Catholiques were sorie therefore [concerning the Bull], and wished the matter so offensive had never been touched, but committed onlie to higher powers, and especially to Gods judgement." Sanders' later involvement in Ireland caused Allen even more pain. ". . . shal al Priestes & Jesuites be deemed traitors . . .," he asked, "If Doctor Saunders ether upon his owne zeale and opinion of the justnes of the quarel; or at the Popes appointment, were in the warres of Ireland employed. . . ."<sup>43</sup> Allen's Judgment has, in general, prevailed among modern

Catholic historians. Sanders was a sincere but misguided zealot whose dependence on papal power to unseat Elizabeth helped to thwart not only his own efforts to institute the Counter-Reformation in England but also those of the Catholic activists whose plans were more realistic. His plans for "the stowte assailinge of Englande" were ill-founded and poorly organized. The new correspondence studied here can help the historian discover more exactly what these plans were.

## Notes

1. Nicholas Sanders to William Allen, Nov. 6, 1577, in John B. Wainwright, "Some Letters and Papers of Nicolas Sander, 1562-1580," *Catholic Record Society: Miscellanea XIII* (1926), pp. 13-14; Garrett Mattingly, "William Allen and Catholic Propaganda in England," *Aspects de la propagande religieuse*, G. Berthoud et al. ("Travaux d'humanisme et renaissance," Vol. XXVIII; Genève: Librairie E. Droz, 1957), p. 336. Mattingly quotes Sanders' famous phrase while describing his plans for ". . . a political revolution aided by foreign intervention. . . ." The Graziani letter studied here suggests, in fact, that Sanders would have preferred to avoid the "foreign intervention" of Spain or France in England. At least at the time of the Graziani letter, then, his "stowte assailinge of Englande" applied only to the relatively restricted context of Papal intervention.

2. Maurice Powicke, *The Reformation in England* (London: Oxford University Press, 1949), p. 1.

3. Sanders' modern biographer is Thomas McNevin Veech, *Dr. Nicholas Sanders and the English Reformation: 1530-1581* ("Université de Louvain: Recueil de travaux publiés par les membres des Conférences d'Histoire et de Philologie," 2<sup>e</sup> Série, 32<sup>e</sup> Fascicule; Louvain: Bibliothèque de l'Université, 1935); T. G. Law's article in the *DNB* is a briefer and older account. In addition, the following studies contain valuable analyses of certain of Sanders' activities: John Hungerford Pollen, *The English Catholics in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth: A Study of Their Politics, Civil Life and Government* (London: Longmans, Green, 1920); Philip Hughes, *The Reformation in England*, Vol. III: *True Religion Now Established* (London: Hollis and Carter, 1954); Hughes, *Rome and the Counter-Reformation in England* (London: Burns Oates, 1944); Thomas H. Clancy, *Papist Pamphleteers: The Allen-Persons Party and the Political Thought of the Counter-Reformation in England, 1572-1615* ("Jesuit Studies;" Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1964). An older work which does not deal extensively with Sanders but which remains the best treatment of Elizabethan Catholicism is A. O. Meyer, *England and the Catholic Church Under Elizabeth*, trans. J. R. McKee (New York: Barnes and Noble, 1967).

4. Veech, *Sanders*, p. 249; Hughes, *Rome and the Counter-Reformation*, pp. 188-189; Pollen, *English Catholics*, pp. 299-300.

5. G. R. Elton, *England Under the Tudors* ("A History of England," Vol. IV; London: Methuen, 1955), pp. 305, 318.

6. Philip Sega to [Cardinal Galli], Oct. 12, 1577, in Great Britain, *Calendar of State Papers, Rome*, Vol. II: Elizabeth, 1572-1578 (London: HMSO, 1926), pp. 338-340.

7. For a discussion of how Catholic thinkers attempted to reconcile the Pope's spiritual supremacy with national integrity, see J. N. Figgis, *Political Thought from Gerson to Grotius: 1414-1625* (New York: Harper and Row, 1960), pp. 190-217.

8. Antonio Graziani, "Instruzioni, relazioni e confessionisti," University of Kansas Libraries, Department of Special Collections, MS E 46, Vol. I, fol. 26r-30v.

9. Veech, *Sanders*, p. 103; Hughes, *Rome*, pp. 184-185.

10. William Allen, *A True, Sincere, and Modest Defence of English Catholiques That Suffer for Their Faith . . .* (Ingolstadt: 1584), pp. 64-65.
11. Pollen, *English Catholics*, p. 137; Hughes, *Reformation*, III, 270; Hughes, *Rome*, p. 186. In this last-named work, Father Hughes indicates that the two opposing forces were probably equally "Catholic" in make-up.
12. Hughes, *Reformation*, III, 271; Pollen, *English Catholics*, p. 139.
13. Pollen, *English Catholics*, p. 135.
14. *Ibid.*, pp. 139-140; Hughes, *Reformation*, III, 267-270.
15. Hughes, *Rome*, p. 186; Pollen, *English Catholics*, p. 140. Neither Sanders nor the recusant polemicists as a group was ignorant of economic matters, however; see *infra*, p. 30, and Clancy, *Papist Pamphleteers*, pp. 24, 28.
16. Meyer, *England and the Catholic Church*, pp. 73-92.
17. Veech, *Sanders*, pp. 43-46; Hughes, *Rome*, p. 183; Pollen, *English Catholics*, pp. 77-78. Some interesting correspondence relevant to the 1563 excommunication question appears in Meyer, *England and the Catholic Church*, pp. 471-474.
18. Nicholas Ormanetto to Galli, Nov. 26, 1573, in *C.S.P. Rome*, II, 135; Hughes, *Rome*, pp. 188-189; Veech, *Sanders*, p. 46; J. Lynch, "Philip II and the Papacy," *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 5th ser., 2 (1961), pp. 35-36.
19. Sanders to Allen, Nov. 6, 1577, in "Letters and Papers of Nicholas Sander," pp. 13-14; Veech, *Sanders*, p. 223. Many letters of Papal diplomats collected in the *C.S.P. Rome* tell the story of the long delays with which Sanders had to contend at the Spanish Court.
20. *A Treatise of the Images of Christ, and his Saints: and that it is unlawfull to break them. . . . Made by Nicholas Sander, Doctour of Divinitie* (Louvain: Joannes Foulerus, 1567), pp. 2-112. The long preface to this book is a theological and historical argument for Papal supremacy, the subject which was the theme of his famous *De Visibili Monarchia Ecclesia*. Veech (pp. 104-105) says that Sanders made some commentary in *De Visibili . . .* on Pius V's Bull.
21. J. H. Pollen, "Dr. Nicholas Sanders, Report to Cardinal Moroni on the Change of Religion in 1558-9," *C.R.S.: Miscellanea I* (1905), p. 45.
22. *Ibid.*
23. Estimates of population in the early modern period are notoriously risky ventures. G. R. Elton seems to favor A. O. Meyer's interpretation, that the Catholic population declined markedly in the years between Elizabeth's succession and the Rising of the Northern Earls; see Meyer, *England and the Catholic Church*, pp. 59-73, and Elton, *England Under the Tudors*, p. 287.
24. Sanders to Graziani, Feb. 14, 1570, in Graziani, "Instruzioni," Kansas MS E46, Vol. I, fol. 27r. See *infra*, pp. 24, 30.
25. *Ibid.*, fol. 27v. See *infra*, pp. 25, 32.
26. For a discussion of this factionalization among the Catholics, see Clancy, *Papist Pamphleteers*, pp. 3-4, 49, 73, and A. C. Southern, *Elizabethan Recusant prose 1559-1582: A Historical and Critical Account of the Books of the Catholic Refugees Printed and Published Abroad and at Secret Presses in England Together with an Annotated Bibliography of the Same* (London: Sands and Co., 1950), p. 26.
27. J. W. Allen, *A History of Political Thought in the Sixteenth Century* (London: Methuen, 1957), pp. 203-209, 513-515. Allen, incidentally, classifies Sanders with More, Pole, and Cardinal Allen and states that Sanders, like the others, was concerned primarily with the orderly maintenance of true religion and not so much with Papal claims. Although the Graziani letter does not indicate Sanders' concern for order among the Catholics, its language betrays an even stronger interest in Papal powers.
28. Hughes, *Rome*, pp. 184-185.
29. Sanders to Graziani, Feb. 14, 1570, in Graziani, "Instruzioni," Kansas MS 6, Vol. I, fol. 28r-28v. See *infra*, pp. 26, 33.
30. *Ibid.*, fol. 27r. See *infra*, pp. 24, 31.
31. *Ibid.*, fol. 26v-27r. See *infra*, pp. 23, 30.
32. *A Briefe Treatise of Usurie Made by Nicolas Sander, D. of Divinitie* (Louvain:



Joannes Foulerus, 1568); Sanders, *Rise and Growth of the Anglican Schism*, trans. David Lewis (London: Burns and Oates, 1877), pp. 154-159. For a discussion of Sanders as a socio-economic theorist, see Helen C. White, *Social Criticism in Popular Religious Literature of the Sixteenth Century* (New York: MacMillan, 1944), pp. 189-223.

33. Parker to Burleigh, Nov. 22 [1572], in Mathew Parker, *Correspondence: Comprising Letters Written by and to Him, From A.D. 1535, to His Death, A.D. 1575*, ed. John Bruce ("Publications of the Parker Society," Vol. XXXIII; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1853), pp. 409-410. One may trace the government's continuing interest in Sanders as a polemicist in Parker's correspondence, in the second volume of Strype's *Life of Parker*, and in the *C.S.P. Foreign* for Elizabeth's reign.

34. Burleigh, *The Execution of Justice in England . . . Against Certain Surrers of Sedition . . .* (London: 1583), p. 13.

35. John Whitgift, "Of the Authority of the Civil Magistrate in Ecclesiastical Matters," in *Works: The Third Portion, Containing the Defence of the Answer to the Admonition, Against the Reply of Thomas Cartwright: Tractates XI-XXIII. Sermons, Selected Letters, &c.*, ed. John Ayre ("Publications of the Parker Society," Vol. XLVIII; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1853), pp. 297-299; William Fulke, *A Defence of the Sincere and True Translations of the Holy Scriptures into the English Tongue*, ed. Charles Hartshorne ("Publications of the Parker Society," Vol. 17; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1843), pp. 16, 134.

36. Bishop Cox to Rodolph Gualter, Feb. 4, 1573, in *The Zurich Letters, Comprising the Correspondence of Several English Bishops and Others, With Some of the Helvetic Reformers, During the Early Part of the Reign of Queen Elizabeth*, trans. and ed. Hastings Robinson ("Publications of the Parker Society," Vol. 50; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1842), pp. 279-282.

37. John Bridges, *The Supremacie of Christian Princes . . . against the Counterblast of Thomas Stapleton . . . and also against Nicholas Sanders his Visible Monarchie of the Romaine Church . . .* (London: Henry Bynneman, 1573), p. 920.

38. *Ibid.*, p. 911.

39. Anthony à Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses . . .* (London: Thomas Bennet, 1691), I, 162.

40. John Caligari to Commendone, May 27, 1566; [Sega] to [Galli], Mar. 22, 1578; Gregory XIII to Philip of Spain, Sept. 4, 1573, in *C.S.P. Rome*, II, 126, 193-194, 390.

41. Marvin R. O'Connell, *Thomas Stapleton and the Counter Reformation* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1964), p. 62.

42. J. H. Pollen, "The Memoirs of Father Robert Persons," *C.R.S.: Miscellanea II* (1906), p. 199; Countess of Northumberland to the Earl of Northumberland, Jan. 28, 1572, in *Calendar of the Manuscripts of the . . . Marquis of Salisbury . . . , Part II* (Historical Manuscripts Commission; London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1888), p. 7.

43. Allen, *Defence of English Catholics . . .*, pp. 64-65, 135.

NICOLAUS SANDERUS ANGLUS

*Ant. Mar. Gratiano*

Mi charissime Antoni, excusationem silentii tui Idibus Januarii per-scriptam paulo ante Idus Februarii quum accepissem, gaudebam me qui eram in meipso pene mortuus ob ea quae catholicis in Anglia secus quam sperabamus evenerant, adhuc in tuo pectore ita vivere, ut munusculum illud meum gratissimo animo exceperis, quum tamen ego illud tanti esse non iudicem, quin verear interdum, ne tum causae ipsi, tum nomini tuo iniuriam fecerim, qui ad tantum amicum de re tanta usque adeo exiliter scripserim.<sup>1</sup> Neque ego id ab initio non intelligebam; eoque difficiliter adductus sum ut concionem illam ederem. Sed quum omnino edendam urgerent hi, quorum fortasse amoris quam iudicio plus debeo, fateor id mihi non parvo solatio extitisse, ut sub tuo nomine scriptum aliquod meum in lucem prodiret. Misi ad te quatuor libellos, qui ut minore sumptu perferrentur, preces quae a typographo adiunctae erant, separavi, & hic retinui. Illustrissimum Cardinalem non minus meum quam tuum summa observantia colo, summamque salutem, quam in tremendis mysteriis quotidie illi precor, ex me ut dicas, vehementer rogo. Butlerum audio discessisse ex urbe. Gibbonum spero ubi vacaverit, ad nos accessurum, ut meam interim vicem suppleat. Quodsi plura adhuc exemplaria desyderabis, nisi ego fallor, & maiore facilitate, & minore sumptu curabis ea per bibliopolas qui Romae sunt, ex nundinis Francfordianis advehi, quam hinc transmitti queant. Imo quo sumptu haec pauca afferuntur, eodem curasses centum & amplius Romae de novo excudi. De rebus Angliae quod querar habeo, quod cum gaudio scribam, non habeo. Duo catholici comites, & alii nobiles non pauci arma pro causa fidei catholicae sumpserunt hac spe, ut saltem suam Sanctitatem illis affuturam non dubitarent. Nec aliud fere praesidium ab ea postulabant, quam ut ab obedientia Reginae palam absoluti, primum eo modo & suis domi, & aliis qui foris sunt persuadere possent, se non tanquam perduelles, verum tanquam ecclesiae filios arma sumpsisse. Et quanquam suspicari possumus eos eo citius ad arma convolasse, quod sibi ipsis periculum creari viderent, tamen vere iudicamus eos ob fidem potissimum quam semper religiose coluerunt, ad ista se contulisse. Certum quippe nobis est constantissimos catholicos illis se adiunxisse, quorum plerique seipsos a schismate hactenus conservassent. Deinde sperabant fore ut dum [tam]<sup>2</sup> ipsi, quam alii Angli a Reginae obedientia palam absoluerentur, plures etiam catholici Angli ad auxilia ipsis ferenda invitarentur. Sed quum nihil tale a

sua Sanctitate obtineri hactenus potuerit; ex iis qui occidentem & austrum incolunt, ut quisque catholicus maxime timuit deum, ita veritus ne in grave peccatum contra principem suum arma sumendo, incurreret, ab auxiliis ferendis abstinuit. Interim tamen nos testes sumus quanta cum diligentia nobiles ex Anglia ad nos miserint, ut scirent tum an sedes Apostolica quicquam adhuc promulgasset contra Reginam, tum an sine illius autoritate quicquam possent salva conscientia conari, ut se ab ista tyrrannyde liberarent. Quoad primum, respondimus nihil esse hic publicatum, quod nos sciremus[:] quoad secundum, theologi gravissimi dissenserunt, aliis non dubitantibus, quin absque auctoritate Apostolica posset defendi catholica religio in iis articulis qui sunt alioqui notissimi, aliis contra asserentibus vel necessarium, vel tutius esse, ut expectaretur summi pontificis sententia. Interim catholici (qui erant ad dies amplius triginta in castris) progressi sunt a septentrione versus meridiem expectantes maiora indies auxilia. Demum intellexerunt ne eos quidem ipsos quorum ope in primis nitebantur, illis affuturos, praeterquam si Papa sententiam contra Reginam promulgaret. De quo enim dubitarent, dicebant id se non posse tuta conscientia facere. Iam potes coniecere, quid illis animi fuit. Itaque quum vix quatuor millia hominum (ut postea comperiebamus) essent, configendum vero illis esset cum prope triginta millibus, quaesitum est, utrum configere an cedere deberent. Ex comitibus alter volebat pugnare, alter vero cedendum ad tempus putabat. Tandem quum hostis instaret, communi concilio definitum est, ut omnes in Scotiam ad amicos Reginae Scotorum se conferrent, ibique expectarent sententiam sedis Apostolicae & amicorum auxilia. Sunt ergo in Scotia iam tribus fere mensibus, omnes fere incolumes. nec enim ad pugnam uspiam devenerunt, nec aliud iam aut precantur, aut petunt, quam ut sua Sanctitas legitima iuris via in Reginam utatur. Quo semel impetrato, & ipsi cum maioribus Scotorum auxiliis reversuri sunt, & maximum in Anglia praesidium a reliquis catholicis obtinebunt. Certum enim est multos nobiles Angliae non defuturos aut sibi aut catholicae fidei, quum semel intellexerint libera conscientia hoc posse armis tentari. Ergo si sua sanctitas tantum inciperet palam aggredi hanc causam, optimi quique catholici (qui proculdubio multi sunt & satis potentes) pro fide arma sumerent. Verum si & hoc sua sanctitas addendum iudicaret, ut quicumque pro catholica fide arma sumerent, ii fundos & agros ecclesiasticos inique acquisitos post [poenitentiam]<sup>3</sup> legitime actam, retinere salva conscientia possent, & a restitutione liberari, fallimur, si tota nobilitas (exceptis paucissimis) fidem catholicam non propugnaret. Nihil enim eos perinde retardat ab ea re, quam quod timent, ne si obedientia sedis Apostolicae restituta fuerit, a suis praediis excidere cogantur. Alioqui enim sunt catholici pene omnes, quanquam ad

rem suam nimium affecti. Sed quibus merito queas considerare, sunt ex Comitibus, et Baronibus fere sex aut septem; ex equitibus & aliis nobilibus inferiorum ordinum supra mille. Haeresi autem non nisi quinque aut sex comites infecti sunt, reliqua haereticorum multitudo tota constat ex paucis delicatis aulicis, & sedentariis opificibus. Nam rusticana turba quae & longe maxima est, & sola in bello praeclarissimam operam navat, tota catholica est. Duo igitur sunt apud vos procuranda. Unum, ut sua Sanctitas in Reginam Elizabetham aliquid publice moliat: alterum, ut excitet nobiles ad fidem catholicam defendendam, ea conditione, ut si eam propugnaverint, poenitentiamque de fundis iniuste partis agant, a restitutione liberentur. Quae duo si fierint: viri prudentissimi iudicant, non modo catholicos ad unum omnes, sed praeterea omnes neutros, & quosdam etiam ex schismaticis pro catholica fide arma sumpturos. Adeo<sup>4</sup> a Papa vel timent fundis suis in futurum, vel nunc eo timore liberari exoptant. Tales enim agri vix ab ullis emuntur iusto praetio, sed tanquam res vitiosae vilius<sup>5</sup> addici solent. Haec ad te eo plenius scripsi, non tantum ut scires ea; sed multo magis ut Deo & ecclesiae ipsius usui esses, dum iis malis remedium pro viribus tuis adhiberes.<sup>6</sup> Certo enim coniicimus aliquos ex Anglis hac estate in armis futuros—quo tempore si & fidei causa posset adiungi, praeclare nobiscum agi putaremus. Ergo illustrissimos Cardinales nostros, Hosium & Comendonum adibis, eosque de iis rebus certiores facies, addesque supra modum admirari tum Anglos omnes, tum Catholicos qui hic sunt, quid sit quod pontifex nolit his tantis occasionibus ad beneficium ecclesiae uti: praesertim, quum neque Rex Philippus iamdiu commercia ineat cum Anglis, neque Gallus aliud expectat, quam ut Angliae Regina sic domi exerceatur, ut ab ope suis hostibus ferenda retardetur. Iam si (quod putamus) sua Sanctitas expectat, ut Mauris in Hispania, & Calvinistis in Gallia victis, ii duo reges, aut eorum alter cogat reginam nostram suscipere fidem catholicam: praeterquam quod merito dubitari potest, quam tarde hii hostes vincendi sunt; etiam multo magis dubitetur, an quum victi erunt, ii reges velint hoc in se suscipere, quod sua Sanctitas cupit. Praeterea, si per ipsorum Anglorum vires posset remedium huic malo adhiberi, nonne praestaret illibatos conservari veteres regnorum terminos, quam ut Anglia vel Gallo vel Hispano subiiceretur? Ea enim res perpetui belli occasio futura est, non modo Anglis iugum reicere conantibus, sed vel Gallis contra Hispanos, vel Hispanis contra Gallos ob eiusdem insulae aut imperium<sup>7</sup> aut libertatem dimicantibus. Praeterea (quod cum pace prudentiorum dictum sit) quibusdam videtur non tam ad officium pontificis pertinere, quid armis bellicis, quam quid armis ecclesiasticis, hoc est quid<sup>8</sup> excommunicatione effici possit. Illam si palam non tulerit in haereticos, officio Petri parum videbitur functus,

utcunque confidat gladio Pauli, qui tamen & ipse spiritualis est. Qui enim scimus, lata semel excommunicatione, quibus viis Deus curaturus sit eam executioni mandandam? Videamus an regina nostra ecclesiam audiat, an vero quia eam non audit, sit habenda sicut ethnica & publicana? Si ecclesiam non audit, pronuncietur habenda velut ethnica. Quodsi hactenus tuto potuit haec denuntiatio intermitteri, quia gladius temporalis ad manum non fuit qui sententiam exequeretur; ecce, iam est ad manum gladius temporalis, & reiiicitur, quia non est Gallicanus aut Hispanus. Cur non potius Anglicani gladii aut iubentur, aut saltem autoritate legitima permittuntur expiare id<sup>9</sup> quod deliquerunt? Sanguinem suum se in ea causa fusuros Angli promittunt, tantum precantur ut orbi Christiano palam fiat, eos id non facere alias ob causas, verum ob fidem catholicam velut sedis Apostolicae filios. Faxit Deus, ne amicos Romae inveniatur haeresis, quos non invenit fides catholica. Quid enim per hoc decennium posset gratiosius & plausibilius erga Reginam nostram factum fuisse, quam est factum etiamsi ea dimidium regni sui ad studia hominum promerenda quotannis persoluisset? Fateor multa esse tentata: sed quid unquam vel minimum est contra eam effectum? Quis det Cardinalibus nostris spiritum intelligentiae, consilii, & fortitudinis, ut sanctissimum pontificem ex se optime affectum, sed per nescio quos a tam sancto instituto hactenus impeditum, diutius retardari non sinant? Inceperat bene, quum poenitentiarum suum in Angliam misit, & nunc re semel<sup>10</sup> inchoata non est committendum ut deferantur catholici ab ipso Papa, pro quo pugnant. Habes patriae nostrae statum, in qua certissimo expectamus novos tumultus, in quibus faxit deus ut catholica fides vincat. Multi enim putant absque Pontificis autoritate hoc genus belli suscipi posse, ut olim a Machabæis est susceptum, & huic sententiae aliqui forsitan acquiescent. Sed quum alii dubitent, nisi pontifex palam interponat autoritatem suam, futurum est ut secundo ipsi catholici dividantur, & alii aliis auxilium non ferant. Ad hoc autem caput est in ecclesia constitutum, ut schismatis tollatur occasio. Ad Taxum tabellarium si literas tuas miseris, puto quod ad me vel ab Antuerpia vel a Bruxellis tuto perferentur, modo eas inscribas ad me habitantem Louanii prope Sanctam Claram. Expecto enim cupide quid spei adferas. Quod si nihil fiet, ita rem interpretabor, deum constituisse<sup>11</sup> ut Anglia prorsus in solitudinem redigatur. de qua tamen hoc tibi affirmare possum qui mediocriter sum in aliis regionibus & maxime in ista Germania inferiore versatus, me dubitare, an sint tot catholici vel in Belgio, vel in Galliis (si utriusque regionis mensuram conferimus) quot novimus esse in Anglia. Caeteris in locis pene soli reges sunt catholici, apud nos pene soli reges sunt haeretici. Nec putes rem estimandam ex eo quod sub Henrico octavo noluerunt fidem catholicam propugnare. Nam & tunc eam propug-

nare constituerunt, & per summam fraudem a paucis improbis sunt decepti; & nunc multo melius de sedis Apostolicae autoritate instructi sunt, quam unquam antea, & progressum haeresis tum senserunt magis, tum oderunt. Sed modum aliquem huic nostrae orationi faciamus, nullum imposituri modum ei orationi quam facimus pro Cardinalibus nostris Hosio & Comendono, itemque pro Antonio meo, & ecclesia dei. Vale, ac rescribe ubi semel totius causae rationes penetraveris.<sup>12</sup>

Datum Louanni 150. Calendas Martias. 1570.

Iam nunc literae ex Hispania perscriptae sunt a ducissa de feria ad aviam eius quae Louanii agit in quibus significat quanta cum alacritate Rex Catholicus audierit Catholicos in Anglia velle conari ut fidem ibi catholicam restituant eundemque nississe[!],<sup>13</sup> ut auxilia illis opportuna subministrarentur. Ergo favebunt alieni, non favebit iisdem Catholicis Apostolica sedes? obstupescant celi super hoc. Scripsissemus iam multo ante in hanc sententiam, nisi quod certissimo putabamus iam hoc fuisse ac vim quod volebamus petere. Sic res institui apud Catholicos? Uno anno sument arma principes, et deerit[!]<sup>14</sup> illis sedes Apostolica: Alio excommunicationem promulgabit sedes Apostolica, et deerunt illi principes. Crede mihi Antoni, plus virium est in una excommunicatione sedis Apostolicae, quam in multis principum auxiliis. non solum quia gladii<sup>15</sup> spirituales [!] vehementius feriunt, sed etiam quia eo modo Catholici omnes Angli subtrahent se a Regina, et ad hostes ejus transibunt. Sed reprimam me. Verum vale in Christo.

Tuae dominationis  
studiosissimus observator  
Nicolaus Sanderus, p[resbyter].<sup>16</sup>

In hac ipsa hora venit ex Anglia vir bonus, qui narrat Reginam septingentis Catholicis necem nihilisse[!].<sup>17</sup> Scotiam omnem in armis esse, ac suam Reginam Mariam (occiso favebo qui eam vi armebat[!])<sup>18</sup> repetere. Comites utrosque<sup>19</sup> ac ceteros nobiles in Scotia manere incolumes. Imo nobilissimum Baronem ac potentissimum qui appellatur *Leonardus Dacrius* relicta patria sua nuper ad afflictos Comites confugisse. Tota res literis mandari non<sup>20</sup> potest. Hic idem Leonardus vir est iam Catholicus, ut palam Reginae dixerit se haereditatem suam quae longe maxima est, non aditurum, si vel minimam Catholicae fidei partem negare ob eam causam rogatur. Navis etiam ex gallia nuper in Scotiam dicitur apulisse tormentis bellicis instructa, quae res valde molestam habet Reginam nostram. Denique Catholici omnes hac Reginae crudelitate maiorem in modum offensi, nihil

nisi occasionem belli expectant. Non putet Sua Sanctitas tumultus iam esse in Anglia finitos: cum vix dum inchoati fuit. Deum precamur, ut opem suam catholicis humillime eam undique implorantibus non neget. Satis deliberatum fuit, iam mature facto est opus.<sup>21</sup>

*Endorsement:* Louanio 78  
15 Calendas Martii  
Del Sandero.

*Address:* Deli Rumori d'Inghileterra  
Al molto magnifico Signor Antonio Maria  
Gratiano secretario dell' illustrissimo Cardinal  
Commendone. A  
Roma.

## Notes

1. Throughout the transcription all abbreviations have been expanded.
2. End of fol. 26r. The *tam* is the last word on this side of the folio and is somewhat illegible.
3. End of fol. 26v. The last word on this page, *poenitentiam*, is somewhat illegible.
4. *Adeo* was corrected in the MS. The secretary, who seems to have copied all but the last two postscript paragraphs of the letter, had mistakenly written *Addo*.
5. There were originally two "l" 's in *vilius*, but the correction was made in the MS.
6. Another MS. correction—*adhiberes* was originally *adhibes*.
7. End of fol. 27r.
8. The *quid* was an insertion in the MS.
9. The *id* was an insertion.
10. The *semel* was an insertion.
11. End of fol. 27v.
12. After *penetraveris*, the handwriting changes. The remainder of the letter is in Sanders' hand. For comparison of handwriting see Archivio Vaticano, *Nunciatura Angliae*, Tom. ii., p. 146.
13. The MS. reads *nississe*, perhaps an error for *nississe*, from *nitor*.
14. The *deeerit* is in the MS.; a misspelling of *deerit* from *desum*.
15. End of fol. 28r.
16. End of fol. 28v.
17. The *nihilisse* is in the MS.; perhaps a verb coinage from the noun *nihil*.
18. The MS. has *armebat*; it should read *armabat*.
19. *utrosque* is my guess for what is illegible in the MS.
20. The *non* was an insertion.
21. End of fol. 29r.

NICHOLAS SANDERS, Englishman

to *Ant. Mar. Gratiani*

I rejoiced, my dearest Anthony,<sup>1</sup> when a little before the Ides of February I received the excuse, written on the Ides of January, for your silence. Although I was almost dead within myself because of those things which had happened to the Catholics in England otherwise than we expected, I was glad to be still so alive in your heart that you should receive that little gift of mine<sup>2</sup> with so grateful a spirit. And yet I do not consider that thing<sup>2</sup> so great that I need ever fear that I—who have written with such a consistent lack of skill for so great a friend about so great a cause—have done injury either to the cause or to your name. From the beginning I was not unaware of this fact; only with some difficulty was I induced to publish that discourse. But since they, in whose debt I am, perhaps, more for love than for understanding, absolutely insisted that it ought to be published, I admit that it was no small consolation to me that something I wrote should go into the light under your name.<sup>2</sup>

I have sent you four little books; that they might be delivered at a lesser cost, I have separated and kept here prayers which had been added to them by the printer. The illustrious Cardinal,<sup>3</sup> no less mine than yours, I hold in the highest regard, and I urgently plead for his complete welfare for which I pray, as you may tell him, daily in the awful mysteries. Butler,<sup>4</sup> I hear, has left the city. Gibbon,<sup>5</sup> I hope, will join us when he has the time so that he might take my place in the interim.<sup>6</sup> If you desire still more copies,<sup>7</sup> you will get them, if I am not mistaken, with greater ease and at lesser cost from the booksellers at Rome, who are supplied from the Frankfort market, than you could if they were sent from here. These few, indeed, have been brought out at the same price for which you might have gotten a hundred or more newly composed at Rome.

I have something to complain of concerning the affairs of England; there is nothing I can write of with joy. Two Catholic earls and not a few other nobles have taken up arms for the cause of the Catholic faith with this hope—that they have no doubt that at least His Holiness will be with them.<sup>8</sup> And they have asked of him hardly any other help, than that they be publicly absolved from obedience to the Queen; this first of all, that they might be able to persuade their own kind at home and others who are abroad that they have taken up arms not as felons but as sons of the church. And although we can suspect that they have flown more quickly to arms because



they saw a danger being created for them, yet we truly judge that they have taken these things upon themselves moreso for the faith which they have always practised with devotion. To us, indeed, it is certain that the most constant catholics, of whom the greater part have so far saved themselves from schism, have joined with them. It was their hope, then, that as long as they as well as other Englishmen were openly absolved from obedience to the Queen, that still more English Catholics might be induced to bring them aid. But since thus far nothing of this sort has been granted by His Holiness, every Catholic, of those who live in the west and the south, has held back from taking up arms in assistance since each one, fearing God above all, is anxious lest he incur grave sin in taking up arms against his Prince.

Yet in the meantime we witness the great diligence with which the nobles sent despatches to us from England asking, first, whether the Apostolic See has promulgated anything against the Queen and, second, whether without Papal authority they can in sound conscience attempt anything in order to free themselves from that tyranny. As to the first, we answered them that nothing has been published here of which we know; as for the second, the most eminent theologians have disagreed, some not doubting that without the Apostolic authority the Catholic faith can be defended in those of its articles most generally known, others, on the contrary, asserting that it is either necessary or safer to await the decision of the Pontiff.

The Catholics, meanwhile (who had been encamped more than thirty days), moved on from north to south daily expecting greater support. At length they realized that those upon whose assistance they most depended would remain aloof unless the Pope would issue his sentence against the Queen. Indeed, those who said that it could not be done in sound conscience were uncertain about this matter. By now you can guess what spirit there was in them. Since, therefore, they were hardly four-thousand men (as we discovered afterwards) but there were almost thirty-thousand to fight against them, it was asked whether they ought to give battle or to withdraw. One of the earls wished to fight, but the other thought it better to give ground for a time.<sup>9</sup> Finally, since the enemy was pressing close at hand, it was decided by common consent that all should betake themselves to the friends of the Queen of Scots<sup>10</sup> in Scotland where they would await the decision of the Apostolic See and the help of friends. So, they have been in Scotland now for almost three months, almost all unharmed. Indeed, they have never come to battle, nor, even now, do they seek or pray for anything else than that His Holiness adopt some proper course of law against the Queen. Once this has been accomplished, they will come back with greater

forces of Scots, and they will get very great support from the other English Catholics.

It is indeed certain that many English nobles will fail neither themselves nor the Catholic faith when once they know that they may take up arms with free conscience in this affair. Therefore, if his Holiness but begin to undertake this cause openly, all the best Catholics (who doubtless are many and powerful enough) will take up arms for the faith. But if his Holiness decides that this ought to be added,<sup>11</sup> that whoever takes up arms for the Catholic faith can, after penance properly done, continue in sound conscience to hold the unlawfully acquired ecclesiastical lands and properties and can be freed from restitution, we are mistaken if the entire nobility (with a very few exceptions) does not defend the Catholic faith. Indeed, nothing hinders them in this regard except their fear that they may be forced to lose their booty should obedience to the Apostolic See be restored. For in general almost all are Catholics although some are too much involved in their own affairs.

But those with whom you may rightly side are six or seven of the earls and barons, or thereabouts, and over a thousand of the knights and other nobles of lesser degree. Only five or six earls, however, have been infected with heresy; all the remainder of the horde of heretics consists of a few spoiled courtiers and sedentary craftsmen. For the country multitude, which is by far the greatest and which alone does outstandingly energetic work in war, is entirely Catholic.

There are, then, two things which you ought to look after: one, that His Holiness publicly set something in motion against Queen Elizabeth; the other, that he should incite the nobles to defend the Catholic faith, on this condition, that if they do defend it and do penance for the unjustly taken properties, they may be freed from restitution. If these two things be done, it is the judgment of the most prudent men that not only all Catholics to a man, but also all neutrals as well, and even some of the Schismatics will take up arms for the Catholic faith. As far as the Pope is concerned, either they fear for what may happen to their estates in the future or they long to be freed from this fear now. For hardly anyone buys these lands at a just price; like defective things they are usually sold more cheaply.

I have written to you of these things so much the more fully not so much that you might know them but much more that you might be of use to God and His church in as much as according to your strength you might bring forth a remedy for these evils. For we certainly suppose that some of the English will be in arms this summer and if at that time this disturbance can be directed to the cause of the faith, we think that it can be done especially

well in connection with us. Go, therefore, to our most illustrious Cardinals, Hosius<sup>12</sup> and Commendone, and inform them of these things and add that it is a source of immeasurable wonder to all the English and to the Catholics who are here that the Pope is unwilling to use these great opportunities for the benefit of the church—especially since now for a long time King Philip<sup>13</sup> has taken up no trade with the English and since the French King<sup>14</sup> awaits nothing more than that the Queen of England be so harassed at home that she will be forcefully prevented from engaging her enemies. Now if (as we think) His Holiness is waiting until the Moors in Spain and Calvinists in France are conquered<sup>15</sup> for these two Kings or one of them to force our Queen to uphold the Catholic faith, [let him remember that] apart from the fact that it may rightly be doubted how late these enemies will be defeated, it may be doubted even more that these Kings will wish to take upon themselves what His Holiness desires when their enemies have been conquered. Further, if through the strength of the English themselves a remedy can be applied to this evil, is it not preferable that the old boundaries of these domains be preserved undiminished rather than that England should be subject either to the French or the Spanish King? For this matter will be the occasion of perpetual war, not only for the English striving to cast off the yoke, but also for the French struggling against the Spanish or the Spanish against the French for the domination or the freedom of that island. Moreover (let it be said by the good leave of the more prudent) it seems to some that the Pope's business is not the arms of war but the weapons of the church—that business, that is, which can be carried out by excommunication.

If he does not move openly against the heretics, he will seem to have left Peter's duty undone, however assured he may be of the sword of Paul, which, however, is also spiritual.<sup>16</sup> For who of us knows, once the excommunication is levied, in what ways God will see fit to carry it out? Let us see whether our Queen will attend to the church, whether, indeed, since she does not attend to it she must be considered a heretic and a pagan. If she does not listen to the church, let it be publicly pronounced that she ought to be regarded a pagan. If until now it has been possible safely to put off this denunciation since the temporal sword was not at hand to execute the sentence, behold, now the temporal sword is at hand and is spurned because it is not French or Spanish. Or rather why are English swords not ordered out or at least permitted by legitimate authority to atone for that in which they have failed? The English make a pledge of their blood that they will be devoted to this cause; they only pray that it be made public to the Christian world that they do this for no other reason than for the Catholic faith as

sons of the Apostolic See. May God grant it, lest heresy come upon the friends of Rome whom the Catholic faith does not reach.

What, indeed, could have been done through these ten years that was more favorable or more pleasing to our Queen than what has been done, even though she has passed the half of her reign, so many years, in earning the enthusiasms of men? I admit that many things have been tried, but what, even the least thing of all, has been accomplished against her? Who will give our Cardinals the spirit of wisdom, counsel, and fortitude that they will not suffer the most holy Pontiff (as well disposed as one could ask on his own part but put off so far from so holy a project by I know not whom) to be retarded any longer. When he sent his penitentiary<sup>17</sup> into England, he had begun well, and now that it has been begun it ought not to happen that the Catholics be put off by the very Pope for whom they fight.

There you have the condition of our fatherland in which, most certainly, we expect new tumults wherein, may God grant, the Catholic faith will be victorious. For many think that this kind of war can be undertaken without the authority of the Pope, as once it was undertaken by the Machabees, and some, perhaps, will acquiesce in this opinion. But since others are hesitant, it will come to pass that these Catholics will be divided into a second party, and the one group will not bear aid to the other unless the Pope publicly interpose his authority. For this, however, there was a chief set up in the church that the occasion of schism might be removed.

If you send your letters to the Taxis' mail-carrier,<sup>18</sup> I think that they will be delivered to me safely either from Antwerp or from Brussels if you address them to me living in Louvain near Sainte Claire. For I eagerly await what hope you may send. But if nothing be done, I will put this interpretation upon it, that God has decided that England be straightaway reduced to desolation. Being moderately acquainted with various districts and especially with this lower Germany, I can assure you of this, that I doubt whether there are as many Catholics in Belgium or in France (if we may compare the size of these places) as we know are in England. In other places almost only the Kings are Catholic; among us almost only the Kings are heretics. Think not that the affair ought to be judged from the fact that under Henry VIII they were unwilling to defend the Catholic faith. For at that time they did decide to defend it, but through an immense fraud they were deceived by a perverse few. Now they have been much better instructed about the authority of the Apostolic See than ever before, and now they have come to hate heresy more than before, having become aware of its progress.

But let us put some limit to this oration of ours although we will impose

no bounds on the prayers we say for our Cardinals, Hosius and Commendone, also for my Anthony, and for God's church. Farewell, and write back once you have penetrated to the principles of this whole affair.

Given at Louvain, fifteen days before the Kalends of March, 1570

Just now letters have been written from Spain by the Duchess of Feria<sup>19</sup> to her grandmother who lives in Louvain in which she indicates with how much eagerness the Catholic King hears that the Catholics in England wish to undertake the restoration of the Catholic faith there and that they strive for this, putting their trust in him to supply them with useful help. If, then, foreigners will show their favor, will not the Apostolic See do the same for those Catholics? The heavens stand amazed at this. We would have written much earlier against this sort of thinking except that we thought something was most certainly done about it and that we meant to seek out its meaning. Is this the state of the project among Catholics? Let the princes take up arms in one year, and the Apostolic See will fail them; in the next, the Apostolic See will promulgate the excommunication, and the princes will be wanting. Believe me, Anthony, there is more power in one excommunication from the Apostolic See than in much princely support. Not only because spiritual swords strike more forcibly, but also because in this way all English Catholics will withdraw from the Queen and go over to her enemies. But let me restrain myself. Truly yours in Christ.

Your Lordship's most zealous  
attendant,

Nicholas Sanders, priest

At this time a good man comes from England who says that the Queen has slaughtered seven hundred Catholics; that all Scotland is in arms and that they seek Mary as their Queen once again (until I am dead I will speak favorably of him who empowers her to make war); that both the earls and the other nobles remain unharmed in Scotland; finally, that a very noble and powerful Baron, called *Leonard Dacre*,<sup>20</sup> having left his fatherland not long ago, has fled to the distressed earls. The whole thing cannot be entrusted to writing. This man Leonard is such a Catholic that he has openly said to the Queen that he will not enter upon his inheritance, which is very great indeed, if for the sake of it he should be asked to deny even the least part of the Catholic faith. Moreover, a ship is said to have put into Scotland not long ago from France, provided with engines of war, and this has our Queen very much annoyed. Further, all the Catholics who are in great measure offended at the Queen's cruelty await nothing but the occasion for war. Let not His Holiness think that the tumults in England are now done

with for they have scarcely yet begun. We pray God that He will not deny His strength to the Catholics everywhere most humbly begging for it. But enough argument; now the task is ripe for the doing.

Louvain

15 days before the Kalends of March

From Sanders

About the Rumors from England

To the most magnificent Lord  
Antonio Maria Graziani  
Secretary to the most illustrious  
Cardinal Commendone

## Notes

1. Antonio Maria Graziani (1537-1611), became Bishop of Amelia in 1592 and nuncio for Clement VIII in 1596. Sanders most probably knew Graziani through Cardinal Commendone, to whom Graziani was secretary. See *Dizionario Enciclopedico Italiano* (Rome: Enciclopedia Italiana, 1956), V, 574.

I have attempted to keep the translation as close to the original Latin as the demands of English grammar and logic would allow. Some changes, however, were necessary. Sentences were sometimes shortened and sometimes lengthened, and I began a new paragraph whenever English usage seemed to suggest one. Finally, brackets were used to indicate the inclusion of words which will not be found in the Latin text but which were necessary to the English sense.

2. Sanders probably refers here to his pamphlet, *Pro defensione excommunicationis a Pio Quinto latae in Angliae reginam*. The context would seem to indicate that the pamphlet, which was suppressed, was dedicated to or endorsed by Graziani. See *supra*, p. 12.

3. Cardinal Giovanni Commendone (1523-1584), papal diplomat who worked under Popes Julius III, Paul V, Pius IV, Pius V, and Gregory XIII at the courts of Charles V, Philip II, Mary Tudor, and Sigismund II of Poland and at the Council of Trent and the Diet of Augsburg; Commendone is especially remembered for his work in Poland with which country, incidentally, the Graziani *Instruzioni* are mostly concerned. See Michael Ott, "Commendone, Giovanni Francesco," *Catholic Encyclopedia*, ed. C. G. Herbermann, IV (1908), 156-157, and H. Lutz, "Commendone, Giovanni Francesco," *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, Vol. IV, 9-10.

4. This, most likely, refers to Thomas Butler, civil and canon lawyer, author, and theologian who had gone into exile with Sanders in 1559. See Veech, *Sanders*, p. 23, and Joseph Gillow, *A Literary and Biographical History . . . of the English Catholics . . .* (New York: Burt Franklin, 1885), Vol. I, 336.

5. Either Richard Gibbons, S.J. or John Gibbons, S.J., his brother, both scholars, theologians, and authors. See Gillow, *English Catholics*, Vol. II, 437-442.

6. The "interim" may refer to Sanders's leaving Louvain, as he did in 1572; Gibbon, then, would take his place in the Louvain colony. See Veech, *Sanders*, pp. 109-110.

7. Copies of the "little books" or pamphlets which Sanders mentioned earlier in the paragraph?

8. Here Sanders begins his description of the Rising of 1569-1570, led by the Earls of Northumberland and Westmoreland and by Leonard Dacre. "His Holiness" is Pius V, Michele Ghislieri (1566-1572).

9. Sanders is quite accurate here; there was significant disagreement among the leaders of the Rising, Northumberland being the more reluctant of the two Earls. See Conyers Read, *Mr. Secretary Cecil and Queen Elizabeth* (New York: Knopf, 1961), pp. 466-467.

10. Mary Stuart, who fled into English custody after her abdication in 1567.

11. Sanders means that the underlined words should be added to the Bull of excommunication.

12. Cardinal Stanislas Hosius of Cholm, in Ermland, who was associated with Commendone in the efforts of the Counter-Reformation to keep Poland in the Catholic fold. See Henri Daniel-Rops, *The Catholic Reformation* (New York: Dutton, 1962), p. 336.

13. Philip II of Spain (1556-1598).

14. Charles IX (1560-1574).

15. The "Calvinists in France" are the Huguenots who had been engaged in intermittent warfare in France for the previous decade. The "Moors" were engaged in the second rebellion of the Alpujarras, 1568-1570, which the Spanish Crown did not finally crush until half-a-year after the date of the Graziani letter. See J. H. Elliott, *Imperial Spain: 1469-1716* (London: E. Arnold, 1963), pp. 75-76.

16. "... the sword of Paul ..." seems to refer to the medieval notion that it was the function of the secular arm, as auxiliary to the spiritual arm, to carry out the demands of the spirituality which necessitated civil or secular action. See Walter Ullmann, *The Growth of Papal Government in the Middle Ages* (London: Methuen, 1955), pp. 29, 107, 117, 132, 157 ff.

17. A penitentiary was a papal agent who dealt with problems of penance and dispensations. This was ostensibly the role of Nicholas Morton, the penitentiary to whom Sanders refers here; actually, Morton was testing public opinion with reference to the sort of papally-sponsored rising which Sanders himself desires. Sanders and Morton are often described as being of the same party. See Hughes, *Rome*, p. 185, and Pollen, *English Catholics*, pp. 139-146.

18. The princes of Thurn and Taxis were given the right to manage the Imperial post by feudal grant in the late fifteenth century. See G. N. Clark, *The Seventeenth Century* (2nd ed. rev.; Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1947), p. 55.

19. Jane Dormer (1538-1612), who married Don Gomez Suarez de Figueroa of Cordova, Count of Feria and famous Spanish ambassador, in 1558. The Duchess had long been a close companion of Mary Tudor, and she met de Figueroa when he was on embassy at the English court. The pair left England for the Netherlands in 1559 and went to Spain in 1571. The Duchess continued her active support of international Catholicism until her death in Madrid in 1612. The "grandmother" to whom Sanders refers was Lady Jane Dormer, who died in Louvain in 1571. See Alsager Vian, "Dormer, Jane, Duchess of Feria," *Dictionary of National Biography*, ed. Leisle Stephen, XV (1888), 245-247.

20. Dacre died in exile in 1573. He fled to the Netherlands in 1570 and thereafter had contact with the Duke of Alva and the Duchess of Feria in hopes of getting further support for the Catholic cause. See Thompson Cooper, "Dacre, Leonard," *DNB*, XIII (1888), 374-375.

I would like to thank Professors William Gilbert, Henry Snyder, Lynn Nelson and L. R. Lind, and Miss Alexandra Mason, all of the University of Kansas, for their help in preparing this study. B. P. C.

# The Authorship of *A Letter from a Clergyman* (1688)

By DAVID W. JOHNSON

When H. C. Foxcroft published her article, "The Works of George Savile, First Marquis of Halifax," in 1896,<sup>1</sup> she referred to a letter dated May 22, 1688, entitled, *A Letter from a Clergyman in the City to his Friend in the Country, Containing His Reasons for not Reading the Declaration*. It had frequently been attributed to Halifax, Foxcroft indicated, but was more probably the work of Dr. William Sherlock, then Master of the Temple and later Dean of St. Paul's. Commenting upon those few sources which had mentioned the letter previously, Foxcroft noted that Macaulay, in his history,<sup>2</sup> called it Halifax's on the authority of the life of Dr. Prideaux;<sup>3</sup> but that Echard<sup>4</sup> claimed to have heard the document described as Sherlock's. This view, Foxcroft contended, was apparently endorsed by Ranke, who described it as an "ecclesiastical tract,"<sup>5</sup> and that Sherlock was its author, rather than Halifax, seemed, she concluded, "infinitely the more probable . . ."<sup>6</sup> But Foxcroft spent less than a page discussing the letter. She observed that its style recalled Sherlock rather than Halifax, particularly in that it did not contain the archaic "-th" ending in the third person singular, a characteristic of Halifax and a rarity with Sherlock. Further, the document advocated retention of the Penal Laws, something which Halifax never recommended. Finally, Foxcroft suggested, Sherlock, as Master of the Temple, "might well describe himself as a clergyman in the city; and he had certainly been present at the famous Lambeth meeting of four days earlier, at which a resistance to the royal mandate had been determined."<sup>7</sup>

Raleigh, who did not include the letter in his *Complete Works of George Savile, First Marquis of Halifax* may also have held this view.<sup>8</sup> On the other hand both Halkett and Laing,<sup>9</sup> and Wing<sup>10</sup> attribute it to Halifax. The *British Museum General Catalogue of Printed Books*, which contains the most extensive bibliography of Sherlock's published works, also attributes it to Halifax.<sup>11</sup>

In her article, Foxcroft suggested that the best internal evidence against Halifax's authorship—the conspicuous absence of the archaic, extended third person singular—found superb illustration elsewhere. *A Seasonable Address to Both Houses of Parliament concerning the Succession, the Fears of Popery, and Arbitrary Government*, likewise frequently ascribed to Halifax, lacked these terminations. It also contained significant stylistic differences;



"the essential refinement and delicacy of touch peculiar to Lord Halifax" were absent, and there existed "direct and rather scurrilous personal allusions which were singularly alien to the practice of Lord Halifax. . . ." <sup>12</sup> This, she proposed, compensated for the fact that printers often modernized Halifax's verb endings, as was the case with his *Character of a Trimmer*. At any rate, the Marquis' superior political sagacity and pamphleteering ability, cited explicitly by Mackintosh <sup>13</sup> and Ranke, militated against imitation. His *Letter to a Dissenter*, which Mackintosh described as perhaps the most perfect model of a political tract, <sup>14</sup> was sage and statesmanlike, void of personal invective, precise but forceful in its arguments, political rather than religious. His *Anatomy of an Equivalent, Observations Upon a Late Libel*, and *Character of a Trimmer* show similar qualities.

But the principal tone of the *Letter from a Clergyman* is religious rather than political. This was the case with most of Sherlock's work. Internal evidence of a religious nature presents, in fact, some of the best arguments in favor of Sherlock's having written the letter.

In the third paragraph of the letter, the author suggests that "To lose our livings and preferments, nay our liberties and lives in a plain and direct opposition to Popery, as suppose for refusing to read Mass in our churches, or to swear to the Trent Creed, is an honorable way of falling, and has the divine comforts of suffering for Christ and his religion; and I hope there is none of us but can cheerfully submit to the will of God in it." The Council of Trent, which had met from 1545 to 1563 and had adopted both dogmatic and disciplinary decrees, was Sherlock's constant target. In 1685 he warned that should any doctrines be imposed upon the Church of England as articles of faith, "which are nowhere to be found in Scripture, or which are plainly contrary to it, (as the new Trent Creed is) whatever pretence there be for the antiquity of such doctrines, she utterly rejects them. . . ." <sup>15</sup> And in the following year he suggested that such conferences as Trent played with the faith of the church "as it may best serve the interest of the Catholic cause." <sup>16</sup> In 1687 he demanded scriptural proof from the Roman Church for the Trent Articles of Faith, "for if the belief of them be necessary to salvation, as they say they are, then either the Scriptures do not contain all things necessary to salvation, or they are bound to show where these doctrines are contained in Scripture." <sup>17</sup> And responding to Cardinal Bellarmine's *De Notis Ecclesiae*, which had defended the Antiquity of the Church and had denied that there was cause for "suspicion of novelty," Sherlock proposed that "Antiquity is not novelty, but a pretence to antiquity may be so: for how old is the Council of Trent, which is the true antiquity of many Popish articles of faith?" <sup>18</sup> In 1688, commenting upon the doctrine regarding the invocation of Saints,

as proclaimed by Trent, he wrote that "if I could find any such thing in Scripture, it would be a good reason to pray to them; but all the arguments in the world cannot prove them without a revelation . . .,"<sup>19</sup> and in another treatise called for clarification of conflicts between the Council of Trent and the Council of Basel, which had met from 1431 to 1449. Basel, Sherlock noted, was a Conciliar triumph; Trent was a triumph for the Pope, "and it were very strange if contradictions should be infallible."<sup>20</sup>

Sherlock's concern with matters of Roman Catholic doctrine finds duplication in the letter. Suggesting that any clergyman who read James' Declaration implied his approval of that document, the author continued, "If this be not so, I desire to know, why I may not read an homily for transubstantiation, or invocation of saints, or the worship of images, if the King sends me such good Catholic homilies, and commands me to read them?" Whereas Halifax refrained from doctrinal discussions, Sherlock delighted in them, and saints, images, and transubstantiation were frequent themes. In 1686, he devoted several pages to such a discourse in *A Papist Not Misrepresented by Protestants*,<sup>21</sup> and in 1687 devoted even greater attention to the subject in *A Short Summary of the Principal Controversies Between the Church of England and the Church of Rome*, his 150-page response to a pamphlet entitled, *Protestancy Destitute of Scriptural Proofs*. In a section headed, "Honoring the Cross, the Reliques and Representations of Our Lord and his Saints, with that degree of Reverence, as we do the Gospels . . . Altar, and other Sacred Utensils is Idolatry," Sherlock summarized his attitude. "It is strange to me," he wrote, "that at this time of day, he can think to impose upon Protestants with such shams."<sup>22</sup> And in 1688 he proposed that the Second Commandment "does so expressly condemn all image-worship, that no reasons can justify image worship against such an express law. . . ."<sup>23</sup> By contrast, Halifax engaged in no such specific doctrinal disputation; his references were extremely general, as in *The Anatomy of an Equivalent*, where he wrote, "When God Almighty maketh covenants with mankind, his promise is a sufficient security, notwithstanding his superiority and his power; because first, he can neither err nor do injustice."<sup>24</sup> The Marquis' work was, correspondingly, void of Scriptural references.

But while the letter's strongly religious orientation suggests Sherlock's authorship, it is literary style which furnishes the more incontrovertible proof. One of the letter's most striking characteristics is its tendency to ask questions in series:

Can we blame any man for not preserving the laws and the reli-

gion of our church and nation when we ourselves will venture nothing for it? Can we blame any man for consenting to repeal the Test and Penal Laws, when we recommend it to them by reading the Declaration? Have we not reason to expect that the nobility and gentry, who have already suffered in this cause, when they hear themselves condemned for it in all the churches of England, will think it time to mend such a fault, and reconcile themselves to their Prince? And if our Church fall this way, is there any reason to expect that it should ever rise again?

This type of questioning, also used thereafter in further reference to repeal of the Test and Penal Laws,<sup>25</sup> is remarkably similar to a device widely employed by Sherlock. In *A Preservative Against Popery*, Sherlock wrote, "For . . . suppose the Protestant faith were uncertain. How is the cause of the Church of Rome even the better? Is this a sufficient reason to turn Papists, because Protestants are uncertain? Does this prove the Church of Rome to be infallible, because the Church of England is fallible? Must certainty necessarily be found among them, because it is not to be found with us? Is Thomas an honest man because John is a knave?"<sup>26</sup> And in *A Vindication of Both Parts of the Preservative Against Popery*, Sherlock questioned the infallibility of the Roman Church. "But what tergiversation is here? Does the Church of Rome infallibly know," he inquired, "that the Christian religion is certainly true? Does she infallibly know that the certain truth of Christian religion is founded upon certain reasons?"<sup>27</sup>

Another stylistic trait, observable both in the letter and in Sherlock's treatises, is the frequent use of extremely caustic personal references. In the letter's postscript the author seeks to assure his friend that Care's newssheet, *The Public Occurrences*, had misled its readers when it claimed that several eminent Anglican clergymen had read the Declaration in London, as ordered, on May 20. In fact, said the author, clergymen read the Declaration in only four or five churches out of more than one hundred, and in one of those, the majority of the people left the church when the priest read it. "This I tell you," he concluded, "that you may be provided for the future against such an impudent liar, who, for bread, can vouch and put about the nation the falsest of things." Such a scurrilous reference was highly uncharacteristic of Halifax, who was much more accustomed to addressing his opponent as he did in the *Letter to a Dissenter*. "Sir, since addresses are in fashion," he wrote, "give me leave to make one to you. This is neither the effect of fear, interest, or resentment; therefore you may be sure it is sincere, and for that reason it may expect to be kindly received. . . . It ought not to be

the less welcome, for coming from a friendly hand, one whose kindness to you is not lessened by difference of opinion. . . ."<sup>28</sup>

Sherlock, in comparison, was not averse to harsh address. "Now our author, and some of his size who don't see half a consequence before them," he wrote in 1687, "think they have a mighty advantage to us in demanding the same proofs from us to justify our rejecting their doctrines. . . ."<sup>29</sup> In the same year, responding to Cardinal Bellarmine, he concluded his argument by observing, "Thus I have with invincible patience particularly answered one of the most senseless pamphlets that ever I read; and I hope it will not be wholly useless; for sometimes it is as necessary to expose nonsense as to answer the most plausible arguments; though notwithstanding the mirth of it, I do not desire to be often so employed."<sup>30</sup> And in 1688, he opened another argument by proposing, "I must confess, F. Lewis Sabran of the Society of Jesus, as he writes himself, has all the good qualities belonging to his Order, excepting that learning, which some of his Order have formerly had, but he is excusable for that, because of late, that has been the least of their care; but what they want in learning, they make up in confidence and noise, which is a nearer conformity to the temper and spirit of their first founder."<sup>31</sup>

In much of his work, Sherlock concentrated upon the problem of representation and misrepresentation, and parallels appear in the letter. The author, while admitting that reading the Declaration did not necessarily imply consent, believes that many people would interpret it as consent. It might be possible to rely upon their good faith, and their recognition that reading the Declaration was only a sign of obedience. But this, in fact, would be a misrepresentation, and while the individual clergy might depend upon their congregations for support, they could not overlook the possibility of false representation by others. "It is not likely," he suggested, "that all the people will be of a mind in this matter. . . . When the world will be divided in their opinions, the plain way is certainly the best, to do what we can justify ourselves, and then let men judge as they please." He summarized the issue of misrepresentation by stating that if reading the Declaration might, in any way, imply consent, he was bound by conscience not to read it.

A pamphlet which Sherlock published in 1686 bore the title, *A Papist not Misrepresented by Protestants, Being a Reply to the Reflections upon the Answer to a Papist Misrepresented and Represented*. Another, published in the same year, urged that when men spoke of the Papist's character, they should only discuss his faith and his religious practices, and not interject their own opinions, for to do so was to misrepresent; ". . . if we put our own opinions of his faith and practice into his character, this is misrepresenting,

because a Papist has not the same opinion of these things which we have, and this makes it a false character."<sup>32</sup> He entitled a section of his 1688 *Preservative Against Popery*, "Concerning Protestant Misrepresentations of Popery,"<sup>33</sup> and in the same year he referred to Romish complaints of misrepresentation in *A Vindication of Some Protestant Principles*.<sup>34</sup>

Closely related to the issue of representation and misrepresentation and contained in the letter as well as in many of Sherlock's works, was a concern for morality. "Moral actions, indeed, have not such necessary consequences as natural causes have necessary effects," the author observes, having discussed implications of reading the Declaration against the judgment of conscience, "because no moral causes act necessarily. Reading the Declaration will not as necessarily destroy the Church of England, as fire burns wood, but if the consequence be plain and evident, the most likely thing that can happen [is that] . . . either I must never have any regard to moral consequences of my actions, or if ever they are to be considered, they are in this case." In *A Vindication of Both Parts of the Preservative Against Popery*, Sherlock wrote, "Now in moral evidence every man must use his own judgment; thus we do, we consider all the arguments they allege for the infallibility of their church from Scripture,"<sup>35</sup> and in *A Vindication of Some Protestant Principles*, he discussed the propriety of holding a general ecumenical council of bishops, concluding that it was unwise, because bishops should not remain away from their dioceses for extended periods of time. Therefore, the idea of a grand council was "next to a moral impossibility."<sup>36</sup> Like the author of the letter, Sherlock's concern for moral propriety was constant.

Similarly, both the author and Sherlock are concerned with teaching. "Indeed," the writer observes, "let men's private opinions be what they will . . . he that reads such a Declaration to his people teaches them by it. For is not reading teaching? . . . he who can distinguish between consenting to read the Declaration, and consenting to teach the people by the Declaration, when reading the Declaration is teaching it, has a very subtle distinguishing conscience." To read the Declaration would be to teach unlimited and universal toleration, in violation of the 1672 Parliamentary statute. It would be "to teach my people that they need never come to church more, but have my free leave, as they have the King's, to go to a Conventicle or to Mass," and it would be to advocate constitutional alteration by an authority other than Parliament. Sherlock's *Preservative Against Popery*, published in the same year as the letter, sought to teach Anglicans how to resist Popish challenges and defend their own faith. "But that which I intend at present," he wrote, "is . . . to teach our people a way to make these men [i.e. Popish

opponents] sick of disputing themselves, to make them leave off these impertinent and noisy squabbles, with which they disturb all company they come into. . . ."<sup>37</sup> His pamphlet entitled, *A Papist Not Misrepresented*, was somewhat unusual among his writings, for it contained short, concise summaries of Protestant arguments against specific Roman Catholic dogma and practice which provided convenient responses to Catholic challenges.<sup>38</sup> And *An Answer to the Request to Protestants to Produce Plain Scriptures Directly Authorizing these Tenets*, published in 1687, was an instructive pamphlet designed to show that claims about transubstantiation, saints, images, and idols could not be proven scripturally.<sup>39</sup>

In addition to such similarities in content, one may observe a number of parallels in style and in reasoning between the letter and Sherlock's works. The letter contains a series of six brief, declaratory sentences about the Declaration with parallel openings: "It is against the constitution of the Church of England. . . . It is to teach an unlimited and universal toleration . . . . It is to teach my people that they need never come to church more. . . . It is to teach the dispensing power. . . . It is to recommend to our people. . . . It is to condemn all those great and worthy patriots. . . ." Halifax used this construction infrequently. Sherlock, however, employed it often. In *A Vindication of Both Parts of the Preservative against Popery*, he offered suggestions to his opponent, wishing "that he would be more modest and sparing in his title-page. . . . That he would not think he has confuted a book. . . . That he would not boast of confuting a book. . . . That when he talks big of calumnies and misrepresentation, he would not only say but prove them to be so. . . ."<sup>40</sup> In *A Preservative Against Popery*, he urged Protestants to question their Roman adversaries: "Ask whether they will allow the Holy Scriptures to be a complete and perfect rule of faith. . . . Ask such disputants . . . to prove their Popish doctrines. . . . Again, ask them whether these fathers [i.e., delegates to the Councils of Basel and Trent] were infallible or traditionary expositors of Scripture. . . ."<sup>41</sup> And in the same pamphlet he gave some advice to his fellow Protestants:

. . . it is very consistent with their liberty, which Protestants allow, to advise Christians to be very careful how they hearken to such as preach any new doctrine, which they have not been taught; that the weak in faith and knowledge should not venture upon doubtful disputations; that they should not be hasty to question what they have believed, nor to give heed to new doctrines; that they should not rely on their own understanding in these matters, but when they meet any difficulties, should consult their spiritual guides. . . ."<sup>42</sup>

The author of the letter, in suggesting that the Declaration only appeared to grant new advantages to Dissenters, while in fact it afforded Roman Catholics new opportunities, follows a line of reasoning similar to that pursued in Sherlock's *The Case of the Allegiance Due to Sovereign Powers*. There, speaking three years after the Glorious Revolution and recalling James' Romish orientation, Sherlock wrote, "This helped some men easily to absolve themselves from the obligation of their oaths; for they could not think their oaths, which were made and imposed for the preservation of a Protestant prince, and the Protestant rights and liberties of church and state, could oblige them to defend and maintain a prince in his usurpations, as they thought on both."<sup>43</sup>

Near the end of the letter the author discusses the relative dangers of alienating the nobility and gentry on the one hand, and the Dissenters on the other, by reading the Declaration. It would be better, he urges, to alienate the latter rather than the former, because "to disoblige all the nobility and gentry by reading it is likely to be much more fatal. . . . For the Dissenters who are wise and considering are sensible of the snare themselves, and though they desire ease and liberty, they are not willing to have it with such apparent hazard of Church and State." This line of reasoning is very similar to a segment of Sherlock's *Answer to the Amicable Accommodation*, written in 1686. Replying to a challenger who was attempting to drive an additional wedge between the Church of England and the Dissenters, Sherlock wrote, "It would be a pleasant scene, could he at this time of day engage the Church of England and Dissenters in a new quarrel; but thanks be to God many of our Dissenters are grown wiser now, and I hope more will every day. Whatever they have formerly suspected of our inclinations to Popery," he continued, "they find now that they were mistaken in us; and whatever defects they may charge our worship with, I believe they will call it Popish and Anti-Christian no longer. . . ."<sup>44</sup>

The Marquis of Halifax certainly could have produced a tract which was essentially religious in tone, for he was the self-appointed Trimmer who recognized the wisdom and efficacy of adjusting his temper to fit the prevailing political currents. But the fact is that he did not, in any of the work ascribed to him, depart from a political style which was secular and philosophic, not religious. And the significant coincidence of style, tone, and timbre which exists between the letter and Dr. Sherlock's pamphlets and tracts gives considerable support to the view that Sherlock was, in fact, its author.

## Appendix

*A Letter from a Clergyman in the City, to his Friend in the Country, Containing his Reasons for not Reading the Declaration*

Sir,

I do not wonder at your concern for finding an Order of Council published in the *Gazette* for reading the King's Declaration for Liberty of Conscience in all churches and chapels in this Kingdom. You desire to know my thoughts about it, and I shall freely tell them; for this is not a time to be reserved.

Our enemies, who have given our gracious King this counsel against us, have taken the most effectual way not only to ruin us, but to make us appear the instruments of our own ruin, that what course soever we take, we shall be undone; and one side or other will conclude that we have undone ourselves, and fall like fools.

To lose our livings and preferments, nay our liberties and lives in a plain and direct opposition to Popery, as suppose for refusing to read Mass in our churches, or to swear to the Trent Creed, is an honorable way of falling, and has the divine comforts of suffering for Christ and his religion; and I hope there is none of us but can cheerfully submit to the will of God in it. But this is not our present case; to read the Declaration, is not to read the Mass, nor to profess the Roman faith; and therefore some will judge that there is no hurt in reading it, and that to suffer for such a refusal, is not to fall like confessors, but to suffer as criminals for disobeying the lawful commands of our Prince: but yet we judge, and we have the concurring opinions of all the nobility and gentry with us, who have already suffered in this cause, that to take away the Test and Penal Laws at this time, is but one step from the introducing of Popery; and therefore to read such a Declaration in our churches, though it does not immediately bring Popery in, yet it sets open our church doors for it, and then it will take its own time to enter. So that should we comply with this order, all good Protestants would despise and hate us, and then we may be easily crushed, and shall soon fall with great dishonor, and without any pity. This is the difficulty of our case; we shall be censored on both sides, but with this difference: we shall fall a little sooner by not reading the Declaration, if our gracious Prince resent this as an act of an obstinate and peevish or factious disobedience, as our enemies will be sure to represent it to him; we shall as certainly fall, and not long after, if we do read it, and then we shall fall unpitied and despised, and it may be with the curses of the nation, whom we have ruined by our compli-



ance; and this is the way never to rise more. And may I suffer all that can be suffered in this world, rather than contribute to the final ruin of the best Church in the world.

Let us then examine this matter impartially, as those who have no mind either to ruin themselves, or to ruin the Church. I suppose no minister of the Church of England can give his consent to the Declaration. Let us then consider whether reading the Declaration in our churches be not an interpretative consent, and will not with great reason be interpreted to be so. For,

*First*, by our law all ministerial officers are accountable for their actions. The authority of superiors, though of the King himself, cannot justify inferior officers, much less the ministers of state, if they should execute any illegal commands; which shows that our law does not look upon the ministers of Church or State to be mere machines and tools to be managed wholly by the will of superiors, without exercising any act of judgment or reason themselves; for then inferior ministers were no more punishable than the horses are which draw an innocent man to Tyburn. And if inferior ministers are punishable, then our laws suppose that what we do in obedience to superiors, we make our own act by doing it, and I suppose that signifies our consent, in the eye of the law, to what we do. It is a Maxim in our law, "That the King can do no wrong;" and therefore if any wrong be done, the crime and guilt is the minister's who does it. For the laws are the King's public will, and therefore he is never supposed to command anything contrary to law; nor is any minister, who does an illegal action, allowed to pretend the King's command and authority for it. And yet this is the only reason I know why we must not obey a prince against the laws of the land, or the laws of God, because what we do, let the Authority be what it will that commands it, becomes our own act, and we are responsible for it; and then as I observed before, it must imply our own consent.

*Secondly*, the ministers of religion have a greater tie and obligation than this, because they have the care and conduct of men's souls, and therefore are bound to take care that what they publish in their churches, be neither contrary to the laws of the land, nor to the good of the Church. For the ministers of religion are not looked upon as common criers, but what they read, they are supposed to recommend too, though they do no more than read it; and therefore to read anything in the church, which I do not consent to and approve, nay which I think prejudicial to religion and the Church of God, as well as contrary to the laws of the land, because it is presumed that I neither do, nor ought to read anything in the church, which I do not in some degree approve. Indeed, let men's private opinions be what they will, in the nature of the thing, he that reads such a declaration

to his people teaches them by it. For is not reading teaching? Suppose then I do not consent to what I read, yet I consent to teach my people what I read; and herein is the evil of it; for it may be it were no fault to consent to the Declaration, but if I consent to teach my people what I do not consent to myself, I am sure that is a great one. And he who can distinguish between consenting to read the Declaration, and consenting to teach the people by the Declaration, when reading the Declaration is teaching it, has a very subtle distinguishing conscience. Now if consenting to read the Declaration be a consent to teach it my people, then the natural interpretation of reading the Declaration is that he who reads it in such a solemn teaching manner, approves it. If this be not so, I desire to know why I may not read an Homily for Transubstantiation, or Invocation of Saints, or the Worship of Images, if the King sends me such good Catholic Homilies, and commands me to read them? And thus we may instruct our people in all the points of Popery, and recommend it to them with all the sophistry and artificial insinuations, in obedience to the King, with a very good conscience, because without our consent. If it be said, this would be a contradiction to the Doctrine of our Church by law established; so I take the Declaration to be. And if we may read the Declaration contrary to law, because it does not imply our consent to it, so we may Popish Homilies, for the bare reading them will not imply our consent, no more than the reading the Declaration does. But whether I consent to the Doctrine or not, it is certain I consent to teach my people this Doctrine; and it is to be considered whether an honest man can do this.

*Thirdly*, I suppose no man will doubt, but the King intends that our reading the Declaration should signify to the nation our consent and approbation of it; for the Declaration does not want publishing, for it is sufficiently known already. But our reading it in our churches must serve instead of addresses of thanks, which the clergy generously refused, though it was only to thank the King for his gracious promises renewed to the Church of England, in his Declaration, which was much more innocent than to publish the Declaration itself in our churches. This would persuade one that the King thinks our reading the Declaration to signify our consent, and that the people will think it to be so. And he that can satisfy his conscience to do an action without consent which the nature of the thing, the design, and intention of the command, and the sense of the people expound to be a consent, may, I think, as well satisfy himself with equivocations and mental reservations.

There are two things to be answered to this which must be considered.

I. That the people understand our minds and see that this is matter of force upon us and mere obedience to the King. To which I answer,

1. Possibly the people do understand that the matter of the declaration is against our principles. But is this any excuse that we read that, and by reading recommend that to them, which is against our own consciences and judgments? Reading the Declaration would be no fault at all, but our duty when the King commands it, did we approve of the matter of it; but to consent to teach our people such doctrines as we think contrary to the laws of God, or the laws of the land, does not lessen but aggravate the fault, and people must be very good natured to think this an excuse.

2. It is not likely that all the people will be of a mind in this matter, some may excuse it, others, and those it may be the most, the best, and the wisest men, will condemn us for it, and then how shall we justify ourselves against their censures? When the world will be divided in their opinions, the plain way is certainly the best, to do what we can justify ourselves, and then let men judge as they please. No men in England will be pleased with our reading the Declaration, but those who hope to make great advantage of it against us, and against our Church and religion. Others will severely condemn us for it, and censure us as false to our religion, and as betrayers both of Church and State. And besides that, it does not become a minister of religion to do anything which in the opinion of the most charitable men can only be excused; for what needs an excuse is either a fault or looks very like one. Besides this I say I will not trust men's charity; those who have suffered themselves in this cause will not excuse us for fear of suffering; those who are inclined to excuse us now will not do so when they consider the thing better, and come to feel the ill consequences of it. When our enemies open their eyes and tell them what our reading the Declaration signified, which they will then tell us we ought to have seen before, though we were not bound to see it; for we are to guide and instruct them, not they us.

II. Others therefore think that when we read the Declaration, we should publicly profess that it is not our own judgment, but that we only read it in obedience to the King; and then our reading it cannot imply our consent to it. Now this is only *Protestatio contra factum*, which all people will laugh at and scorn us for. For such a solemn reading it in the time of divine service, when all men ought to be most grave and serious, and far from dissembling with God or men, does in the nature of the thing imply our approbation. And should we declare the contrary when we read it, what shall we say to those who ask us, Why then do you read it? But let those who have a mind try this way, which, for my part, I take to be a greater and more unjustifiable provocation of the King, than not to read it; and, I suppose, those who do not read it will be thought plainer and honester men and will escape as well as those who read it and protest against it. And yet nothing less than

an express protestation against it will solve this matter. For only to say they read it merely in obedience to the King does not express their dissent. It signifies indeed that they would not have read it if the King had not commanded it. But these words do not signify that they disapprove of the Declaration, when their reading it, though only in obedience to the King, signifies their approbation of it, as much as actions can signify a consent. Let us call to mind how it fared with those in King Charles the First's reign who read the *Book of Sports*, as it was called, and then preached against it.

To return then to our argument, if reading the Declaration in our churches be in the nature of the action, in the intention of the command, in the opinion of the people, and interpretative consent to it, I think myself bound in conscience not to read it, because I am bound in conscience not to approve it.

It is against the Constitution of the Church of England, which is established by Law, and to which I have subscribed, and therefore am bound in conscience to teach nothing contrary to it, while this obligation lasts.

It is to teach an unlimited and universal toleration, which the Parliament in 72 declared illegal, and which has been condemned by the Christian Church in all ages.

It is to teach my people that they need never come to church more, but have my free leave, as they have the King's, to go to a Conventicle or to Mass.

It is to teach the dispensing power, which alters, what has been formerly thought, the whole Constitution of this Church and Kingdom: which we dare not do, till we have the Authority of Parliament for it.

It is to recommend to our people the choice of such persons to fit in Parliament, as shall take away the Test and Penal Laws, which most of the nobility and gentry of the nation have declared their judgment against.

It is to condemn all those great and worthy patriots of their country, who forfeited the dearest thing in the world to them, next a good conscience, *viz.* the favour of their Prince, and a great many honorable and profitable employments with it, rather than consent to that proposal of taking away the Test and Penal Laws; which they apprehend destructive to the Church of England and the Protestant religion; and he who can in conscience do all this, I think need scruple nothing.

For let us consider further, what the effects and consequences of our reading the Declaration are likely to be, and I think they are matter of conscience too, when they are evident and apparent.

This will certainly render our persons and ministry infinitely contemptible, which is against that Apostolic Canon, “Let no man despise thee,” Titus 2. 15. That is, so to behave himself in his ministerial office as not to fall

under contempt; and therefore this obliges the conscience not to make ourselves ridiculous, nor to render our ministry, our counsels, exhortations, preaching, writing, of no effect, which is a thousand times worse than being silenced. Our sufferings will preach more effectually to the people when we cannot speak to them. But he who for fear of cowardice or the 'love of this world, betrays his church and religion by undue compliances, and will certainly be thought to do so, may continue to preach, but to no purpose; and when we have rendered ourselves ridiculous and contemptible, we shall then quickly fall, and fall unpitied.

There is nothing will so effectually tend to the final ruin of the Church of England, because our reading the Declaration will discourage, or provoke, or misguide, all the friends the Church of England has. Can we blame any man for not preserving the Laws and the Religion of our Church and Nation, when we ourselves will venture nothing for it? Can we blame any man for consenting to repeal the Test and Penal Laws, when we recommend it to them by reading the Declaration? Have we not reason to expect that the nobility and gentry, who have already suffered in this cause, when they hear themselves condemned for it in all the churches of England, will think it time to mend such a fault, and reconcile themselves to their Prince? And if our Church fall this way, is there any reason to expect that it should ever rise again? These consequences are almost as evident as demonstrations, and let it be what it will in itself, which I foresee will destroy the Church of England and the Protestant religion and interest, I think I ought to make as much conscience of doing it, as of doing the most immoral action in nature.

To say that these mischievous consequences are not absolutely necessary, and therefore do not affect the conscience, because we are not certain they will follow, is a very mean objection; moral actions indeed have not such necessary consequences as natural causes have necessary effects, because no moral causes act necessarily. Reading the Declaration will not as necessarily destroy the Church of England as fire burns wood, but if the consequence be plain and evident, the most likely thing that can happen, if it be unreasonable to expect any other, if it be what is plainly intended and designed, either I must never have any regard to moral consequences of my actions, or if ever they are to be considered they are in this case.

Why are the nobility and gentry so extremely averse to the repeal of the Test and Penal Laws? Why do they forfeit the King's favor, and their honorable stations, rather than comply with it? If you say that this tends to destroy the Church of England and the Protestant religion, I ask whether this be the necessary consequence of it? Whether the King cannot keep his

promise to the Church of England if the Test and Penal Laws be repealed? We cannot say, but this may be. And yet the nation does not think fit to try it; and we commend those great men who deny it; and if the same questions were put to us, we think we ought in conscience to deny them ourselves. And are there not as high probabilities that our reading the Declaration will promote the repeal of the Test and Penal Laws, as that such a repeal will ruin our Constitution and bring in Popery upon us? Is it not as probable that such a compliance in us will disoblige all the nobility and gentry who have hitherto been firm to us, as that when the power of the Nation is put into Popish hands, by the repeal of such Tests and Laws, the priests and Jesuits may find some salvo for the King’s conscience and persuade him to forget his promise to the Church of England? And if the probable ill consequences of repealing the Test and Penal Laws be a good reason not to comply with it, I cannot see but that the as probable ill consequences of reading the Declaration, is as good a reason not to read it.

The most material objection is that the Dissenters, whom we ought not to provoke, will expound our not reading it to be the effect of a persecuting spirit. Now I wonder men should lay any weight on this, who will not allow the most probable consequences of our actions to have any influence upon conscience. For if we must compare consequences, to disoblige all the nobility and gentry by reading it, is likely to be much more fatal than to anger the Dissenters. And it is more likely, and there is much more reason for it, that one should be offended than the other. For the Dissenters who are wise and considering, are sensible of the snare themselves, and though they desire ease and liberty, they are not willing to have it with such apparent hazard of Church and State. I am sure that though we were never too desirous that they might have their liberty, (and when there is opportunity of showing our inclinations without danger they may find that we are not such persecutors as we are represented) yet we cannot consent that they should have it this way, which they will find the dearest liberty that ever was granted.

This Sir, is our case in short, the difficulties are great on both sides, and therefore now if ever, we ought to besiege Heaven with our prayers for wisdom and counsel and courage; that God would protect his Church and Reformed Christianity, against all the devices of their enemies: which is the daily and hearty prayer of,

Sir,

Your Friend and Brother

May 22, 1688

## POSTSCRIPT

I have just now seen H. Care's paper called, *The Public Occurrences*, which came out today, and cannot but set you right as to his news about the reading of the Declaration on Sunday. He tells you, 'That several Divines of the Church of England, in and about this City, eminent for their piety and moderation, did yesterday read his Majesty's late Declaration in their churches, according to the Order in that behalf; but some (to the great surprise of their parishoners) were pleased to decline it.' You in the country are from this account to believe that it was read here by the generality of the clergy, and by the eminent men among them. But I can, and do assure you, that this is one of the most impudent lies that ever was printed. For as to this city which hath about a hundred parishes in it, it was read only in four or five churches, all the rest, and best of the clergy refusing it everywhere. I will spare their names who read it; but should I mention them, it would make you, who know this city, a little heartily to deride H. C.'s account of them. And for the surprise he talks of, the contrary of it is so true that in Wood Street, where it was read by one Dr. M. the people generally went out of the church. This I tell you, that you may be provided for the future against such an impudent liar, who, for bread, can vouch and put about the nation the falsest of things. I am Yours.

## Notes

1. H. C. Foxcroft, "The Works of George Savile, First Marquis of Halifax," *English Historical Review*, XI (1896), pp. 703-720.
2. Thomas Babington Macaulay, *The History of England from the Accession of James II* (New York, 1850-1856).
3. *The Life of Humphrey Prideaux, D.D., Dean of Norwich* (London, 1748).
4. Laurence Echard, *The History of England* (London, 1720).
5. Leopold von Ranke, *History of England, Principally in the Seventeenth Century* (Oxford, 1875).
6. Foxcroft, *op. cit.*, p. 718.
7. *Loc. cit.*
8. Walter Raleigh, *The Complete Works of George Savile, First Marquis of Halifax* (Oxford, 1875).
9. Samuel Halkett and John Laing, *Dictionary of Anonymous and Pseudonymous English Literature*. New and enlarged ed. (London, 1928), III, p. 263.
10. Donald G. Wing, *Short-title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland, Ireland, Wales, and British America, and of English Books Printed in other Countries, 1641-1700* (New York, 1945-1951).
11. *British Museum General Catalogue of Printed Books* (London, 1955- ).
12. Foxcroft, *op. cit.*, p. 707.
13. Sir James Mackintosh, *History of the Revolution in England in 1688* (London, 1834). Quoted in Foxcroft, *op. cit.*, p. 703.
14. Foxcroft, *op. cit.*, p. 717.
15. William Sherlock, *The Protestant Resolution of Faith, Being an Answer to Three Questions* (London, 1685), p. 28.

16. Sherlock, *An Answer to a Discourse Intituled, Papists Protesting against Protestant-Popery; Being a Vindication of Papists not Misrepresented by Protestants, etc.* (London, 1686), p. 15. Hereafter cited as *Discourse*.

17. Sherlock, *A Short Summary of the Principal Controversies Between the Church of England and the Church of Rome* (London, 1687), p. 4. Hereafter cited as *Short Summary*.

18. Sherlock, *A Vindication of the Brief Discourse Concerning the Notes of the Church* (London, 1687), p. 13. Hereafter cited as *Brief Discourse*.

19. Sherlock, *A Preservative Against Popery: Being Some Plain Directions to Unlearned Protestants, How to Dispute with Romish Priests* (London, 1688), p. 41. Hereafter cited as *Preservative*.

20. Sherlock, *A Vindication of Some Protestant Principles of Church-Unity and Catholick-Communion, from the Charge of Agreement with the Church of Rome* (London, 1688), p. 61. Hereafter cited as *Protestant Principles*.

21. Sherlock, *A Papist Not Misrepresented by Protestants: Being a Reply to the Reflections upon the Answer* (London, 1686), pp. 6-12. Hereafter cited as *Papist Not Misrepresented*.

22. Sherlock, *Short Summary*, p. 86.

23. Sherlock, *A Vindication of Both Parts of the Preservative Against Popery: In Answer to the Cavils of Lewis Sabran, Jesuit* (London, 1688), p. 37. Hereafter cited as *Both Parts*.

24. Raleigh, *op. cit.*, p. 125.

25. "Why are the nobility and gentry so extremely averse to the repeal of the Test and Penal Laws? Why do they forfeit the King's favor, and their honorable stations, rather than comply with it? If you say that this tends to destroy the Church of England and the Protestant religion, I ask whether this be the necessary consequence of it? Whether the King cannot keep his promise to the Church of England if the Test and Penal Laws be repealed?"

26. Sherlock *Preservative*, pp. 79-80.

27. Sherlock, *Both Parts*, p. 49.

28. Raleigh, *op. cit.*, p. 128.

29. Sherlock, *Short Summary*, p. 4.

30. Sherlock, *Brief Discourse*, p. 69.

31. Sherlock, *Both Parts*, p. 1.

32. Sherlock, *Discourse*, p. 17.

33. Sherlock, *Preservative*.

34. Sherlock, *Protestant Principles*, p. 9.

35. Sherlock, *Both Parts*, p. 51.

36. Sherlock, *Protestant Principles*, p. 51.

37. Sherlock, *Preservative*, p. 4.

38. Sherlock, *Papist Not Misrepresented*, *passim*.

39. Sherlock, *An Answer to the Request to Protestants to Produce Plain Scriptures Directly Authorizing these Tenets* (London, 1687).

40. Sherlock, *Both Parts*, pp. 108-110.

41. Sherlock, *Preservative*, pp. 47-53.

42. *Ibid.*, pp. 3-4.

43. Sherlock, *The Case of the Allegiance Due to Sovereign Powers, Stated and Resolved, According to Scripture and Reason, and the Principles of the Church of England, with a More Particular Respect to the Oath, lately enjoyned, of Allegiance to Their Present Majesties, K. William and Q. Mary* (London, 1691), p. 49.

44. Sherlock, *An Answer to the Amicable Accommodation of the Difference Between the Representor and the Answerer* (London, 1687), p. 16.



# The Identification of Sir James of the Peak:

## *A Corrigendum to the Editions of Swift's Correspondence*

By HENRY L. SNYDER

Students of the Augustan period who have had occasion to consult Swift's correspondence may have noticed a reference to *Sir James of the Peak* in a letter to Archbishop William King. He was first identified by Sir Walter Scott and "called sometimes Sir James Baker, . . . a notorious gambler of the time."<sup>1</sup> F. Eldrington Ball<sup>2</sup> and Sir Harold Williams<sup>3</sup> both accept this attribution in their editions of the Swift correspondence. Ball added a further connection between the names of Sir James Baker and Swift.<sup>4</sup> There the evidence concludes. The name turns up again in the correspondence of Joseph Addison, and the editor cites Scott without further comment for an identification of this obviously cant name.<sup>5</sup> In editing the correspondence of the 1st Earl of Godolphin with the 1st Duke and Duchess of Marlborough, I found the name appearing again. Noting the references in the Swift and Addison correspondence, I attempted to verify this attribution from other sources. No reference to a Sir James Baker appears in the standard lists of knights or in the baronetage.<sup>6</sup> My suspicion as to the error of this identification of *Sir James of the Peak* was confirmed when I discovered more references to him. By studying all of them together I have been able to establish a much more likely identification.

As not all of the references to *Sir James of the Peak* are in print, I shall quote some of them before proceeding with the other evidence relating to this question. The earliest is a letter of 8 October 1702 from Godolphin to the Countess of Marlborough. Godolphin writes in answer to two letters of hers, in one of which she must have mentioned the death of some placeholder, for he responds:

The Housekeeper of Newmarket is not here, but that news was here before mee, and *Sir James of the Peak*, a great Heir of this place [Newmarket], desired mee to speak for him. I made the same answer which I find the Queen has done, and I think it is right for her Majesty's service.<sup>7</sup>

Addison's letter to the Earl of Manchester on 6 December 1707 is next. "*Sir James of the Peak* will I hear be made a Commissioner of the Appeals in the room of Mr Beal deceased."<sup>8</sup> Two years later, Arthur Maynwaring, political writer and satirist, confidant and secretary to the Duchess of

Marlborough, mentions him to his patroness in a disquisition on the subject of flattery, an art in which Maynwaring excelled. He reports that Hannibal "had but one Eye, (He was a predecessor of *Sir James of the Peake*, the monocus of his time)" but a portraitist painted the general with two which drew upon him the great man's wrath.<sup>9</sup> Another reference appears in a letter from Lord Lansdowne to Lord Treasurer Oxford, written probably in 1712, in which he repeats a previous request for a place for a dependent, one George Courtney. "Mr Courtney having had already some assurances of your favour, has desired me to mention him to you as my friend for the vacancy upon the death of *Sir James of the Peak*."<sup>10</sup> Finally, Swift's remark: "*Sir James of the Peake* said to Bouchier the Gamester, 'Sirrah, I shall look better than you, when I have been a month in my Grave.'"<sup>11</sup>

Who then is *Sir James of the Peak* if not Scott's Sir James Baker? Addison notes he is to succeed to a place on the Board of Commissioners of Appeal (for the Excise). Addison sat himself on this Board, and thus must have been well informed about other appointments to it. As he prophesied, a new Board was appointed the day after he wrote to Manchester and a new member, James Ashburne, was added, replacing the deceased Richard Beak.<sup>12</sup> Lansdowne, some five years later, reports the death of *Sir James*, and one finds that Ashburne must have died in the first half of 1712, after Lansdowne's creation. His name is omitted from the names of the commissioners recorded in a place list published in August of that year.<sup>13</sup> A replacement was not appointed until either 1713 or 1714,<sup>14</sup> but such a lapse was not too unusual. Oxford had a difficult time parrying Tory demands for places, the party was breaking in two, and he may well have kept this place vacant until he could make an appointment with the least offense to those interested. As *Sir James* or Ashburne had solicited Godolphin for a place early in the reign, it is not surprising that the Treasurer was finally worn down by his importunities, and awarded him this place of small income (200 pounds p.a.) but steady employment in 1707. It would appear then that James Ashburne is our man. Why, then, was he called *Sir James of the Peak*?

Unfortunately, the evidence so far discovered does not reveal the answer. The accolade *sir* is obviously a gratuitous honour not awarded by the sovereign but by an acquaintance as a jest. What about *of the Peak*? There is a town of Ashburne situated a few miles south of the Peak in Derbyshire and it was referred to on occasion as "Ashburne-in-ye-Peake."<sup>15</sup> The name is a very old one dating back to Domesday book, and a family by that name resided there in the medieval period at least. The appropriateness of the descriptive *of the Peak* for an Ashburne cannot be denied. It may well be

that James Ashburne had property or hailed from that region although he might have won this sobriquet merely on the strength of his name.<sup>16</sup>

What further conclusions can be drawn from all the references to Ashburne as *Sir James of the Peak*? To begin with, he must have been well known in court circles in Anne's time if a number of people could identify him to correspondents by use of his nickname alone. Three of the writers were literary figures (four if one counts Lansdowne), two of them Kitkats and noted conversationalists, suggesting that Ashburne was a bon vivant or minor wit and a congenial companion. At the very least he was the frequent butt of their witticisms, perhaps because he had only one eye. It is quite possible that it was the influence of Addison and Maynwaring with Godolphin and the Whig lords that finally won Ashburne his office. The clue to his personal appearance may assist in locating other references to him.<sup>17</sup> Swift's remark indicates that he indulged in gaming or betting. This is confirmed by Godolphin who wrote his letter from Newmarket, where he had gone for the races, and noted that *Sir James* was "a great Heir of this place."<sup>18</sup> Indeed nearly everyone in fashionable society around the court did the same, the Queen and the Treasurer setting the example. And it is in this society that Ashburne must be found, one of that numerous (usually anonymous to us) company which flocked to the popular centers of entertainment and diversion, drawn by the prospect of pleasures and company,<sup>19</sup> and the hope of office and fortune that attended those favorably received by the court. In this latter objective he eventually achieved limited success. *Sir James of the Peak* or James Ashburne as he should be called was apparently not an important person, never a member of parliament or major place-holder. But surely he was rather more typical of contemporary society than the celebrated politicians and literary figures in whose correspondence he recurs so regularly.

## Notes

1. Jonathan Swift, *Works*, ed. Scott, 2nd ed. (London, 1824), XVI, 378, n. 1.
2. Swift, *Correspondence*, ed. Ball (London, 1910-14), III, 102, n. 3.
3. Swift, *Correspondence*, ed. Williams (Oxford, 1963-5), II, 406, n. 1.
4. Ball, *op. cit.*, VI, 244. He noted that Jonathan Smedley introduced Swift's poem *The Journal* by letters between Philoxenus and "Sir James Baker, Knight, Chief Journalist of Great Britain," in his *Gulliveriana* (London, 1728), pp. 11-20. Very likely this Baker was fictitious. As Swift's letter was written some nine years after the death of *Sir James of the Peak* (infra) one concludes there is no connection between the two names. Two further contemporary allusions to Sir James Baker may be noted here. *A Letter to a Buttonian K-- from Sir James Baker, Admirer-General of the Fair-Sex, and late Secretary of the Toasts of the Kit-Cat-Club* (1715), listed in Quaritch's catalogue no. 888 (1968), item no. 636, where it is ascribed tentatively to John Gay on the basis of an attribution of a similar work under the same pseudonym by the British

Museum: *An Admonition Merry and Wise* (1717). Is there any connection between these and the ascription in *Gulliveriana*?

5. Joseph Addison, *Letters*, ed. Walter Graham (London, 1941), p. 82, n. 2.

6. William A. Shaw, *Knights of England* (London, 1906); *Le Neve's Pedigrees of the Knights* (Harleian Society, 1873); G. E. Cokayne, *Complete Baronetage* (Exeter, 1900-6).

7. Blenheim MSS, E-20. I am grateful to the Duke of Marlborough for permitting me to inspect his muniments and quote from them.

8. Addison, *Letters*, *loc. cit.*

9. "Tuesday morning [4 October 1709]," Blenheim MSS, E-28.

10. British Museum, Portland loan, 29/311/4. The letter, undated, is part of a collection of letters from Lansdowne to Oxford in the Portland papers. It bears the same watermark as letters dated 18 July, 18 December 1712 and 10 December 1713. Lansdowne was elevated to the peerage on 1 January 1712 so the letter postdates that event. Courtney wrote Lansdowne on 18 October 1712 requesting that the promise made him two years before of *Sir James'* place be honoured. Lansdowne's letter to Oxford may well have been written in response to this plea. Historical Manuscripts Commission, *Portland MSS*, V, 237. I must thank the Duke of Portland for permission to inspect and quote from his manuscripts.

11. Williams, *loc. cit.*

12. Great Britain, Public Record Office, *Calendar of Treasury Books*, XXI, part 2, 512. Ashburne's commission was renewed on 25 June 1708 and 10 May 1712. (*Ibid.*, XXII, 285; XXIV, part 2, 281.) The deceased man's name is spelled Beak or Beke in the standard references rather than Beal as printed in the Addison correspondence.

13. Abel Boyer, *Quadriennium Annae Postremum*, 2nd ed. (London, 1718), IV, 56. His removal was suggested to Harley (Oxford) in 1710 on the grounds that "those places [Commissioners of Appeals] are fitter for men of the law than for Sir James of the Peak and such sort of cattle." Somehow Ashburne managed to survive the general change of places, however. Robert Price to Harley, 11 September 1710, H.M.C., *Portland MSS*, IV, 592.

14. Robert Beatson, *Political Index*, 3rd ed. (London, 1806), gives the date of the new commission as 17 February 1713. The next commission, however, of 6 December 1714, was appointed vice that of 12 Anne. The regnal year 12 Anne ran from 7 March 1713 to 6 March 1714. It may be Beatson was confused by the practice of dating the new year from Lady Day, 25 March, and failed to consider this custom when transcribing the date from his source.

15. John Sleight, "The Old Ashburne families," *Journal of the Derbyshire Archaeological and Natural History Society*, III (1881), 3.

16. Considering Scott's role in perpetuating this misidentification, it is interesting to note that he adopted this regional name appendage in the title of one of his own novels, *Peveril of the Peak*.

17. Ashburne's notoriety and this distinguishing physical feature led him to be caricatured by Steele in the *Tatler*. Cf. Henry L. Snyder, "The Identity of Monoculus in the *Tatler*," *Philological Quarterly* (in preparation).

18. His fame as a gambler is attested to by two contemporary satires in which he is mentioned as *Sir James*: a Whig broadside of 1701, *A full and true relation of a horrid and detestable conspiracy against the lives, estates and reputations of three worthy members of this present Parliament, which God long preserve*; and a Tory poem of 1704, *Faction Display'd* (usually attributed to William Shippen).

19. He may also have had a reputation as a gallant if one interprets a remark of Erasmus Lewis correctly. "Lord Pembroke is to be married to Lady Arundel. Mrs. Pearshal succeeds her in her former station under the guardianship of the Knight of the Peak." To Harley, 21 August 1708, H.M.C., *Portland MSS*, IV, 502.

# P. A. Mattioli: Sixteenth Century Commentator on Dioscorides

By JERRY STANNARD

Until the beginning of the nineteenth century, a strong historical bond united botany and medicine. *Materia medica*, that branch of medicine which deals with drugs, their source, preparation, and use, occupied a prominent place in the normal medical curriculum. The practicing physician often had no alternative but to prescribe a drug, selected from a bewildering array, most of which were of vegetable origin.

The phrase "materia medica" originated as a Latin translation of the title of a book, written in antiquity, but sufficiently popular to call forth approximately one hundred editions between 1478 and 1800, nearly eighty of which appeared in the sixteenth century. One of the prime reasons for the popularity of Dioscorides' *De materia medica* in the late Renaissance was the work of the Sienese physician Pietro Andrea Mattioli. But before we turn to Mattioli's role in the popularization of Dioscorides in the sixteenth century, it will be convenient to outline briefly the few known facts about Dioscorides.

Almost all of the biographical data we possess regarding Dioscorides' life stem from the "Preface" of his *Περὶ ὕλης ἰατρικῆς* or, as it is customarily translated in Latin, *De materia medica*.<sup>1</sup> According to an old tradition, Pedanios Dioscorides was born in the town of Anazarbos, near Tarsus, in Cilicia.<sup>2</sup> His exact dates are unknown, but he was probably a near contemporary of Pliny the Elder (A.D. 23-79), author of the influential and encyclopedic *Historia naturalis*. Dioscorides' "Preface" is addressed to a certain Areios who has been identified as Laecanius Areios of Tarsus, a friend of C. Laecanius Bassus, Roman Consul in A.D. 64.<sup>3</sup> One other piece of information helps to fix Dioscorides' *floruit*. The fact that neither Pliny nor Dioscorides mentions the other by name while the many close parallel passages tend to rule out the commonplaces of literary convention, led Wellmann to postulate a common source, Sextius Niger, an authority on herbs and their medical uses, cited by both.<sup>4</sup> Despite the account often found in the standard histories of medicine, there is no certain evidence that Dioscorides was a military physician.<sup>5</sup> He may have been, of course, but in the "Preface" he merely states that he led a military life (*στρατιωτικὸν τὸν βίον*) during which he traveled widely.<sup>6</sup> Unfortunately, this cannot be translated into more precise geographical terms. However, on the basis of internal evidence,

chiefly derived from the geographical epithets used by Dioscorides in conjunction with naming and describing medicinal plants, it may be assumed that he traveled in the Near East: in Syria, and perhaps in Egypt. If Wellmann's dating be accepted, he lived in the time of Claudius and Nero when he may have been attached to a Roman Legion.

Although definitive biographical data are lacking, the text of his only known writing has come down to us virtually intact. Sometimes two short works, *De venenis* and *De venenatis animalibus*, have been added to the five indisputably genuine books comprising his *De materia medica*.<sup>7</sup> Other, doubtful works have been attributed to Dioscorides and occasionally printed following the *De materia medica* in early editions.<sup>8</sup>

In the opening sentence of his "Preface," Dioscorides states that he undertook the task of writing on drugs and medicines because existing texts were incomplete and contained, in some instances, astonishing errors. "It is clear to everyone," he continued a few lines later,

that a treatise on drugs is necessary. For it is conected with the entire art [*sc.* of healing] and, standing alone, is a useful ally to every part [*sc.* of the healing art]. Moreover, it can be expanded in accordance with preparations, mixtures, and the experience of diseases, thus contributing to our knowledge of each individual drug. We have, accordingly, added other, closely related yet familiar information in order that it be complete.<sup>9</sup>

The remainder of the text bears out Dioscorides' sense of responsibility to write a manual intended to serve a practical need. The five books may be divided roughly as follows:

Book I (129 chapters) aromatic substances, oils of vegetable origin, and fruits.

Book II (186 chapters) drugs of animal origin, cereals, and herbs of bitter and acid taste.

Book III (158 chapters) herbs and roots.

Book IV (192 chapters) herbs and roots.

Book V (162 chapters) wines and drugs of mineral origin.

Despite the efforts of many botanists, historians, philologists, and physicians, there is no unanimous agreement regarding the number of different simples discussed in the 827 chapters. The variation among the estimates is due to the different criteria by which the various plants and animals have been identified.<sup>10</sup> Some of the chapters on plants, moreover, contain two or three forms or "varieties" (*ειδη*) which, of course, do not necessarily corre-

spond to the modern botanical concept of a sub-species or a variety. A consensus of the major studies devoted to the identification of Dioscoridean plants suggests that approximately five hundred and fifty different species are described. Some eighty species of animals and fifty minerals make up the remainder. Even on a conservative basis, the *De materia medica* was the largest collection of drugs described in classical antiquity. Although other and larger collections were later described, it remained the most comprehensive collection in European medicine until the Renaissance.<sup>11</sup> But what made Dioscorides' *opus magnum* even more valuable was the detailed descriptions of the plants. Not since the time of Theophrastus (370-285 B.C.) had anyone written about so many plants, after having personally examined them and seen them in the living state. It is some testimony to Dioscorides' powers of observation and description that the great majority of the plants described by him can be identified with near certainty.

Thus it will come as no surprise to find that Mattioli, a trained physician busily engaged in his practice, would take an interest in Dioscorides. In the days before antiseptics and anaesthesia, chemotherapy, the microscope, and the germ theory of disease, drugs of vegetable origin were routinely dispensed in the belief that success or failure lay in the correct choice of drugs. What is surprising, then, is not Mattioli's interest in Dioscorides, for this he shared with many practicing physicians whose marginal annotations in their copies of Dioscorides attest to daily use. Rather, it was the form that Mattioli's interest took. For as we shall see, he was not only a translator of and commentator upon Dioscorides; he brought to bear upon those literary activities a wide, personal knowledge of plants. Nor was this knowledge restricted to plants growing locally or those that he saw as he traveled about in Italy, Austria, and Bohemia. His commentary and his correspondence both indicate that he spared no effort to learn about plants from the little known and still mysterious portions of the East.

Let us then turn to the most illustrious of the many sixteenth century students of Dioscorides.<sup>12</sup>

Pietro Andrea, the son of Francesco Mattioli and Lucrezia Buoninsegni, was born in Siena on 12 March 1500. Although his father was a physician, it was decided that the son would study law. Apparently this was not to the liking of Pietro Andrea, for the records show that he received his diploma in medicine from the University of Padua in 1523. Upon the death of his father, he returned briefly to Siena, only to pass on to Rome to study surgery under the guidance of Gregorio Caravita. In 1528, he moved to Trento where he married Elisabetta of Cles, and began the practice of medicine. He was apparently successful, for the evidence suggests that he enjoyed a large

clientele. He was not too busy, however, to botanize, for passages in his commentary refer to plants he had seen in Trento and of vernacular names used by the Trentine peasants. The outbreak of an epidemic took him to Gorizia where he remained from 1540 to 1554, at which time he was summoned to the Imperial Court at Prague. Mattioli became the personal physician to the Archduke Ferdinand, a position he retained under his successor, Maximilian II.<sup>13</sup> In 1557, he remarried. His second wife, Girolama di Varmo, bore him two sons, Ferdinando and Massimiliano. Thirteen years later, he married for a third time and his last wife, Susanna Cherubina, presented him with three more children. Having been relieved previously of his duties at court, Mattioli had turned to the no less arduous tasks of scholarship at his estate in Innsbrück. On a visit to Trento in 1577, he fell victim to an epidemic of the plague.<sup>14</sup> He was buried in the Cathedral of Trento where, according to Schmidt, his sarcophagus bears an epitaph befitting his station.<sup>15</sup>

As far as can be judged, Mattioli's life was as productive as it was long. In addition to his medical duties, of which manuscript fragments remain, and his botanizing trips, he conducted a large correspondence, still not completely edited, and published some ten writings of book length.<sup>16</sup> This figure must remain provisional until a thorough study can be made of the differences, in successive editions, of his translations of and commentaries upon Dioscorides.

Mattioli's first publication, *De morbo gallico*, appeared in 1533, and was later reprinted several times.<sup>17</sup> This book, in dialogue-form, was part of the controversy about the origin and treatment of syphilis or the French Disease, as it was termed by the Italians, which was then ravaging much of Southern Europe. The center of the controversy concerned the efficacy of a potion made from the wood of guaiacum (*Guaiacum officinale* L.), a tree native to the New World where the *morbus gallicus*, according to many scholars, had its origin. In the light of a surprisingly large number of tracts devoted to the holy wood, as it was decorously termed, it is difficult to assess Mattioli's contribution in a bibliomachy as unwholesome as was its subject.<sup>18</sup> It appears, however, that Mattioli's maiden effort was not marked by anything distinctive.

Six years passed before Mattioli's second book appeared. This book, *Il Magno Palazzo*, was one of the few books written by Mattioli which did not deal with medical or botanical matters.<sup>19</sup> Rather, it is a rhymed description, filled with all the graces and conceits of which humanistic Latin was capable, of the palace of the Cardinal of Trent, Bernardo Clesio, who died within a month of its publication.<sup>20</sup> Perhaps because of local demand, the



*Palazzo* was reprinted in 1558.<sup>21</sup> But at that time, as we shall see, the fame of Mattioli's name may have been sufficient to induce a provincial printer to publish a book for which there would have been, at best, a limited audience. Since that time, its historical value has been recognized, thanks to a nineteenth century edition.<sup>22</sup>

Mattioli's name next appeared on a title page in 1544. In that year began a career which united his name with that of Dioscorides so firmly that they became virtually synonymous.<sup>23</sup> Since it is his editions of Dioscorides on which his fame principally rests, his several editions and translations will be examined separately below. It will be convenient, however, to note briefly his other writings.

Leaving to the side, for the moment, his translation of Dioscorides (1544), Mattioli's next publication was an Italian translation of Ptolemy's *Geography*.<sup>24</sup> Why, in 1548, an outdated classic of ancient science was worth the effort of a vernacular translation is open to conjecture. At any rate, it offered Mattioli the opportunity of exercising his abilities as a translator and making available, for the first time to the Italian public, another classic of ancient science.

From the "Preface" to his Latin translation of Dioscorides of 1554, we know that it was written in Gorizia, the very year that he moved from there to Prague. It was there, in easy reach of the Imperial Library, that Mattioli wrote another five books in quick succession. Again, postponing the illustrated edition of Dioscorides (1557) and the second Latin edition (1558), we may turn first to his defense against Amatus Lusitanus, and secondly, his letter on the *bulbocastaneum*.

The former of these two writings has been taken by some scholars as evidence of Mattioli's controversial nature and his willingness to enter into polemics.<sup>25</sup> It is true that the tone of his reply to Amatus was anything but kindly, but the Counter-Reformation had produced a militancy that extended even to secular matters. Joao Rodrigues de Castello Branco (1511-1568), better known under his *nom de plume* of Amatus Lusitanus, had sharply criticized Mattioli's method in his own *Index Dioscoridis*.<sup>26</sup> First published in 1536, the *Index* covered only Books I and II of the *De materia medica*. This was followed, in 1553, by a commentary on the whole of Dioscorides which was, in turn, reprinted in 1554, 1557, and 1558.<sup>27</sup> According to Friedenwald, Amatus was not shy about pointing out the errors of Mattioli and Ruelle, about whom we shall speak later, nor those of Otto Brunfels (1488-1534), Leonhart Fuchs (1501-1566), and other leading authorities on medical botany. This was the normal procedure of the times and was, in many cases, little removed from the philological approach to

Dioscorides typified by the humanists (*see below* p. 10). It is not surprising, consequently, that when, finally stung into action in 1558, Mattioli replied with a vehemence that is no credit to his memory. The result was his *Apologia adversus Amatum Lusitanum*, a small work of fifty pages, first printed together with the commentary in his edition of Dioscorides of 1558, in which invective far too often replaced scholarly disagreement.<sup>28</sup> It would take us too far afield to analyse in detail the merits of Amatus' claims and his opponent's counter-claims. In all probability, the latter do not form a fair picture of Amatus' objections. At least, this may be inferred from the tone of Mattioli's replies to what he punningly terms the *calumniae Amathi*, the calumnies of a fool! The replies form a series, twenty in number, which answers Amatus point by point. Following them, appear 101 *censurae Matthiolii*, Mattioli's counter charges, the burden of which is that the errors are Amatus', not his. The twenty replies to the *calumniae* and the *censurae* when taken together cover the entire range of contemporary materia medica. They follow a somewhat monotonous pattern of invective and peevishness, broken only rarely by moments of real insight. More than once, Mattioli reveals himself to be insensitive to the difference between a blunder on Amatus' part and a slight inconsistency. Despite the efforts of two well-informed scholars, the all-important question concerning the identity of Dioscorides' plants would remain an issue—and an incentive to more polemics.

The second of the two writings of 1558 to be examined is the *Epistola de bulbocastaneo*.<sup>29</sup> Smaller than the *Apologia*, it exhibits another side of Mattioli's personality and demonstrates his scientific abilities to a better advantage. Despite what appears to be a dated set of problems, the *Epistola* points ahead to new methods in botany. To the old question regarding the identity of the plants mentioned by the ancients, their synonymy and their proper orthography, Mattioli brought the results of years of classical scholarship. Even more important than his linguistic virtuosity was his practical experience with plants, gained by a personal knowledge of the local Italian flora. There was something almost prophetic about Mattioli's choice of the particular plant names he chose to debate in the pages of the *Epistola*. Today, despite the advantages of nearly 400 years, scholars are not in agreement concerning the identification of some of the plants discussed in the *Epistola*.<sup>30</sup>

During the years immediately preceding 1558, Mattioli must have been busy. In addition to the two works mentioned above, he supervised the preparation of the new plates for the second Latin edition of Dioscorides.

At the same time, he was putting together his *notulae* and correspondence with an eye toward future publication.

In 1561 his *Medical Letters* appeared.<sup>31</sup> These "open letters" as we might term them, for some of them seem to have been written for publication, date from 1557 onwards. In some cases, the epistolary style is all but obscured by what amounts to independent tracts or essays. There is no discernible theme in the collection other than a broad concern with matters pertaining to the healing arts. Just how broadly Mattioli understood the Aesculapian tradition may be indicated by the fact that he dealt with alchemy, magnetism and the properties of the magnet, as well as pharmacology, the etiology of disease, and symptomology.<sup>32</sup> Naturally, for one who was now an acknowledged master in botany and materia medica, considerable space was devoted to plants, their identity, and their therapeutic virtues. In addition to this, Mattioli discoursed upon the names, descriptions, and locations of medicinal plants, and methods for collecting and preserving plant specimens.<sup>33</sup> Polemics were not absent either, for he took to task the interpretations of Dioscorides proposed by others, and especially those of Melchior Guilandino (1520-1589), the second Prefect of the Botanic Garden at Padua.<sup>34</sup> On the whole, however, Mattioli, now secure in his place in the sun, seems to have mellowed with age. We find him, for example, admitting the force of the criticism of Conrad Gesner (1516-1565), the doyen of the scholar-naturalists.<sup>35</sup> Other contemporary scholars represented in the *Letters* are Ulisse Aldrovandi (1522-1605), Francesco Calzolari (1521-1600), Giacomo Antonio Cortuso (1513-1603), Gabriele Faloppio (1523-1562), Bartolomeo Maranta (d. 1570), Willem Quackelbeen (1527-1561), and a host of now forgotten investigators.<sup>36a</sup>

It is now time to examine the editions of Dioscorides which have been the principal causes for keeping Mattioli's name alive. As mentioned above, the year 1544 saw his first contribution to the age-old task of interpreting Dioscorides.

Mattioli was not the first to translate the *De materia medica* into Latin nor was his Italian translation of 1544 the first Italian translation.<sup>36</sup> Already in classical antiquity, Dioscorides' descriptions were recognized as authoritative. First Galen (131-200 A.D.), then after him nearly all of the physicians of antiquity—Greek, Roman, Byzantine, and Arabic—copied or paraphrased his descriptions and borrowed heavily of his therapeutic counsels.<sup>37</sup> One indication of the high regard felt for Dioscorides' text is that an illuminated manuscript was sent to the Emperor of the West as a wedding present for his daughter, Juliana Anicia, in 512 A.D.<sup>38</sup> A facsimile of t

priceless manuscript, one of the treasures of the Österreichische Nationalbibliothek in Vienna, is now in the process of being published.<sup>39</sup>

Sometime toward the close of the sixth century, another illustrated version of Dioscorides had been prepared, for Cassiodorus (490-585) explicitly advised those of his fellow monks who could not read Greek to study the pictures of plants in the monastery's copy of the *De materia medica*.<sup>40</sup> Approximately two centuries later, another Latin translation appeared, a contemporary manuscript copy of which is still preserved in Munich.<sup>41</sup> The complete text tradition of Dioscoridean manuscripts has not been completely unraveled and need not be entered into here. Suffice it to say, in subsequent centuries the *De materia medica* was endlessly copied and epitomized as many European manuscript catalogues testify. Throughout the Middle Ages, Dioscorides, along with Pliny and Galen, provided the principal sources for the descriptions of plants and their medicinal uses. In those medieval medical texts in which Dioscorides is not explicitly listed as one of the *auctores veteres*, his influence can still be detected at second hand through one of the many anonymous or pseudonymous tracts whose popularity is matched only by the difficulty of determining their authorship and dates.<sup>42</sup>

With the advent of printing in the middle of the fifteenth century, it was only a question of time before a printed edition of Dioscorides would keep company with Pliny's *Historia naturalis*, first printed in 1469, and the incunable editions of other texts on materia medica. The *translatio princeps* was, however, already an old version when it appeared in 1478.<sup>43</sup> For, as Rose has demonstrated, the Colle edition was the same text as that commented upon by Pietro d'Abano (*ca.* 1250-*ca.* 1316) about 1300.<sup>44</sup> The *editio princeps* of 1499 marked a great improvement for there was then made available for those who could read Greek, a text that bore some resemblance to Dioscorides' own works.<sup>45</sup>

After a lull of seventeen years, translations, editions, and commentaries began to appear at an ever increasing tempo.<sup>46</sup> Physicians and scholars alike took their turn in interpreting Dioscorides' text, in identifying his plants, adding new synonyms, vernacular as well as those of classical origin, and in discoursing about the meaning of obscure words in a learned manner. It was, in retrospect, too learned, too esoteric to be of much practical value for a physician who wished to learn of the virtues of a certain plant or who sought advice regarding the proper drug therapy. Scholars such as Ermolao Barbaro (1454-1493), Marcello Vergilio (1464-1521), Walther Ryff (d. 1548), and Johann Lonitzer (1528-1586), each of whom commented upon Dioscorides, had borrowed from the humanists the technique of using a classical text as a vehicle for their own erudition. But being more adept

at philological subtleties than botany, and more willing to enter into polemics than into the fields in search of plants, they had little to contribute to the practical tasks envisioned by Dioscorides.<sup>47</sup>

Certainly efforts to establish a correct text of the *De materia medica* constituted a step in the right direction. But the early editions of Dioscorides, of more appeal to the scholar than to the physician, were not the answer. In looking back, there were several obstacles to the unqualified acceptance of Dioscorides. First, there was the problem concerning the reliability of the text. Although a definitive Greek edition did not appear until the early years of the present century, the *textus receptus* was sufficient for the workaday needs of the average practicing physician.

Another problem was the controversy between the "Arabists," *i.e.*, the physicians who tended to accept the doctrines of such masters as Mesue, Serapion, and Avicenna, as the final authorities, and those who wished to "reform" European medicine by ridding it of the doctrines espoused by infidels. This controversy touches upon Mattioli only in the sense of explaining some of the vitriol in his attacks on Amatus Lusitanus and Melchiore Guilandino. The lessening influence of Arabic materia medica, however, had the result that Dioscorides' text was slowly becoming accepted as authoritative.

Although the exact areas covered by Dioscorides' travels cannot now be determined, there is little doubt that the plants discussed by him were essentially those of the Mediterranean Basin and the Near East. Against the background sketched in above, imagine a physician in Frankfort, Lyon, Paris, Prague, or Venice (the principal cities in which sixteenth century editions of Dioscorides were published) attempting to identify a native plant by comparing it with Dioscorides' description. Two questions would immediately arise: Was the text reliable? and What was its Arabic name? or alternatively, What was Dioscorides' Greek name? It soon became evident to the physician that the heavily burdened commentaries, more concerned with grammatical niceties than medical botany, were of little practical use.

At this juncture, Mattioli's Italian translation was published.<sup>48</sup> It was in an effort to bypass the sterilities of the aforementioned philological approach to Dioscorides that Mattioli undertook a task which would occupy the remainder of his life. His original purpose was to make available to physicians a reliable, yet practical text. But, as we shall see, his horizons were soon broadened. In 1544, however, his aim was comparatively modest and not out of line with other contemporary editions of the *De materia medica*: a vernacular translation with a commentary dealing only with the

all-important matter of identifying the medicinal plants mentioned by Dioscorides.

Mattioli's Italian translation was apparently based on the Latin translation of Jean Ruelle (1474-1537) which first appeared in 1516.<sup>49</sup> Although he does not state this in the preface of the 1548 edition, in his later, Latin edition he frankly admits his dependence upon Ruelle's version.

The 1544 edition, judging from its rarity, may have had a small printing. Admittedly only a conjecture, it could be argued that a publisher would be reluctant to invest much capital in the translation of an author better known outside Italy. It is also possible that Mattioli was, in some way, dissatisfied with his publisher, for the next edition of his Italian translation was published in 1548 by the Valgrisi firm, the publishers or co-publishers of the majority of Mattioli's books.

It has been claimed by Durling that Mattioli revised his Italian translation for the 1548 edition.<sup>50</sup> I have been unable to confirm this personally, though the title page of the 1548 edition clearly states that the commentary or *discorsi* were revised and enlarged. Moreover, new material was added in the form of an Italian translation, with commentary, of the *De venenis* and *De venenatis animalibus* ascribed to Dioscorides. These two small tracts, whose authenticity has not been universally accepted, comprise Book VI and appear as such in all the subsequent editions undertaken by Mattioli. Under these circumstances, the 1548 edition may be designated as the second Italian edition.

The dedication is dated and signed while Mattioli was living in Gorizia, yet passages in the commentary indicate that he had been collecting data much earlier, perhaps in the hope of an expanded version. Several times, for example, he remarked on the local Siense name for a certain plant, or that he saw it growing in "our Siena."<sup>51</sup> Even more numerous are the references to Trento.<sup>52</sup> It would, in fact, be possible in part to determine the limits of his botanizing excursions on the basis of the place-names. The mountainous areas around the Anania Valley in Trento seem to have been one of his favorite localities for collecting plants. Others have studied Mattioli's interest in Alpine plants, several new species of which he added to the plants already known to Dioscorides.<sup>53</sup> References to contemporary writers such as Brunfels, Fuchs, Antonio Musa Brasavola (1500-1555) and others, throw interesting light on his reading habits and his efforts to stay abreast of the latest findings.

The success of the second Italian edition, reprinted in quick order in Venice in 1550 and 1552, emboldened Mattioli to the more venturesome task of a Latin translation, plus commentary. Reasons for his decision are not

far to seek. First and foremost was the language barrier created by the Italian translation. That not everyone read Italian was an inescapable fact. As a basic reference work, the Italian translation was severely limited in one obvious respect. The names of the plants, herbs, and trees, were given only in Italian, without Greek or Latin synonyms. Unless one knew the Italian name or, more precisely, the name in Tuscan dialect, Mattioli's edition would likely remain a closed book to the practicing physician outside Italy. A Latin translation, on the other hand, could be read by all educated Europeans, laymen as well as physicians.

The years following the publication of Mattioli's first Italian translation of 1544, saw the re-appearance of Ruelle's translation numerous times,<sup>54</sup> another Italian translation,<sup>55</sup> an unauthorized (?) edition of Mattioli's Italian translation<sup>56</sup> and a new French translation of Dioscorides by Mathée.<sup>57</sup> Mattioli and the proprietors of the Valgrisi firm in Venice, the publishers of the 1548 edition, must have looked at this outpouring with watchful eyes, hopeful of an opportunity of regaining the advantage enjoyed locally, at least, by the 1548 edition. That opportunity came in 1554.

Mattioli's Latin translation of 1554, the first Latin edition, was a publishing success on all counts.<sup>58</sup> As we have noted above, Mattioli used Ruelle's Latin translation as a basis but modified it in accordance with his own standards of latinity. Whether as a result of these modifications, Mattioli's text was a more faithful rendering of the Greek than was Ruelle's, cannot be answered in the absence of a detailed, textual analysis. But its success cannot be explained solely in terms of the "improved" text. The addition of synonyms drawn from various languages was a decided advantage to the physician, the apothecary, and the professional herb-collector, all of whom benefited by this additional source of information. Written while Mattioli was still in Gorizia, the commentary was relatively meagre by Renaissance standards. Instead of parading his knowledge of plants and of various languages, Mattioli established a model followed by later commentators by restricting his comments to practical matters, relevant to the task a book on medical botany should serve. Finally, the inclusion of illustrations of the plants and animals doubtlessly contributed to its success. Whether or not the illustrations permitted the reader to identify a Dioscoridean simple, the fact remains that Mattioli capitalized on the successes of the earlier, illustrated herbals of Brunfels, Fuchs, and Hieronymus Tragus (1498-1554) or Jerome Bock as he was known in the Rhineland.<sup>59</sup>

The Latin translation with its restrained, practical *commentarii* was a triumphant success for Mattioli. Yet room existed for improvements, especially regarding the incorporation of botanical details that had escaped the

earlier editions.<sup>60</sup> Thus, in 1558, Mattioli's name again appeared yoked to that of Dioscorides.

The Latin translation of 1558, the second Latin edition, provided Mattioli with the opportunity of adding new data in the commentary. In addition, 133 new illustrations were added, and a new writing, the *Apologia*, was added following Book VI.

As in the first Latin edition, the *commentarii* of the 1558 edition were printed in italics immediately below the translation, which was set in Roman characters. As a result of the data collected as early as 1548, Mattioli was eminently prepared to expand the commentary. That he held it down to a reasonable limit showed considerable restraint. It is true that sometimes he succumbed to temptation, for instance, in citing some verses from Virgil's *Georgics* or in emending, within obelized passages, the Greek text of Marcello Virgilio.<sup>61</sup> On the whole, however, the expansion reflected new and significant data bearing upon botanical identification, nomenclature, and even taxonomy. Some of these data were the result of gifts of plants, seeds, and drawings sent to Mattioli by his widening circle of correspondents. This included, among others, Luigi Anguillara (*ca.* 1512-1570), the first Prefect of the Botanical Garden at Padua, the oldest such garden in Europe, and Anguillara's teacher, Luca Ghini (*ca.* 1490-1556), both of whom sent specimens to Mattioli.<sup>62</sup>

The new illustrations, designed by Giorgio Liberale and cut by Wolfgang Meyerpeck, the scholarly introduction, "Epistola nuncunatoria," and the enlarged commentary established a standard for Dioscoridean scholarship surpassed only by Mattioli's own edition of 1565. From the point of view of a reference work for physicians, one of the greatest advantages was the list of synonyms printed at the end of the individual commentaries. Armed with the Greek, Arabic, German, and French synonyms of Latin and Italian plant names, the physician was well served in the endless quest of finding the proper remedy for a specified complaint. For ease in referring to material contained in the densely printed folios, every tenth line of letterpress was numbered on the inside margin. The marginal notes, also, served a need, though too often they merely called attention to the advancement of knowledge as seen through Mattioli's eyes. Again and again, the notes proclaim a *lapsus Fuchsii* or an *error Ruellii*. In some cases, Mattioli appears to have had the better of the one-sided exchange, for he usually was on solid ground when discussing Italian plants. These he knew by personal inspection as the many passages testify which begin with the tell-tale phrase *vidimus nos. . .*<sup>63</sup>

As we have noted, the years between 1558 and 1562 were not spent idly



by Mattioli. Even while his *Medical Letters* were being published, he was in correspondence with other naturalists concerning questions of mutual interest. Some of his correspondents sent him plants, some to identify, some to study, but rarely, it may be supposed, capable of being revived in Mattioli's garden. Ever eager for knowledge, Mattioli did not neglect the more familiar plants of the countryside nor did the plants growing in his friends' gardens escape his eye.<sup>64</sup> The accomplishments of others too, particularly those of writers outside of Italy, were duly noted in their proper place. In the meantime, the second Latin edition was enjoying considerable success, having been reprinted in Venice in 1559 and 1560.<sup>65</sup> Further recognition came in the sixties. A French translation, plus an abridgement of his *commentarii*, appeared in 1561.<sup>66</sup> Moreover, the Latin translation of 1558 appeared in Lyon in 1562, but with smaller and reversed illustrations.<sup>67</sup> Mattioli was now becoming the recognized spokesman for Dioscorides.

The most notable event preceding the *editio renovata* of 1565 (the fourth Latin edition) was the appearance of two more vernacular translations of Dioscorides. The Bohemian translation of 1562, was a significant milestone in several ways.<sup>68</sup> It was the first Bohemian translation of either Dioscorides or Mattioli. Secondly, the new wood blocks cut for that edition exceeded in size and in artistic quality those of earlier editions.<sup>69</sup>

The year following, in 1563, a German translation entitled *New Kreüterbuch* was published in Prague.<sup>70</sup> Unlike the Prague edition of the preceding year, the *Kreüterbuch* is not a translation of Mattioli's translation of Dioscorides. Rather the text is a translation of the botanical portions of Mattioli's *commentarii* alone. All of the plates of the *Kreüterbuch*, save one, were new, the remaining plate having appeared in the 1562 Bohemian translation.

With such prolegomena, Mattioli's crowning achievement came in 1565. In that year, the fourth Latin edition was published.<sup>71</sup> The years of scholarship and the countless letters that passed between Mattioli and his co-workers are clearly evident in his commentary. And to enhance a great work, the blocks of the Bohemian edition of 1562 were used. In addition, a curious work, the *De ratione distillandi aquas*, is appended at the end.<sup>72</sup> Little seems to be definitely known of this short tract, though its striking woodcuts of distilling apparatus have been reproduced in modern studies on the history of alchemy and distillation.<sup>73</sup> Like Mattioli's other writings, the *De ratione distillandi* was later reprinted, and, reversing the order of his commentaries on Dioscorides, the Italian translation of the *De ratione* was based on the Latin edition.

The woodcuts of the 1565 edition are nearly full page, measuring 22 by

15 centimeters. Carefully executed, the illustrations mirror the intricate habits of many of the plants depicted. The commentary, moreover, included details on plants which even Mattioli, for all his veneration of the past in general and of Dioscorides in particular, was forced to admit as new introductions.<sup>74</sup> Among the plants new to European botanical and gardening circles were the lilac (*Syringa vulgaris* L.), the horse-chestnut (*Aesculus Hippocastanum* L.), and the common garden tulip (*Tulipa Gesneriana* L.).<sup>75</sup>

The summit of success reached in 1565 did not put an end to Mattioli's literary activity. Within four years, the *Opusculum* appeared.<sup>76</sup> This was followed, in 1571, by the *Compendium*, the last of Mattioli's writings, as well as the last of his writings to be published in his lifetime.

Since I have not succeeded in examining a copy of the *Opusculum*, and have not been able to find any discussion of its contents, I can add nothing to the few bibliographical entries where the work has been listed.

A copy of the 1571 edition of the *Compendium de plantis omnibus*, on the other hand, is housed in the Spencer Library.<sup>77</sup> The title was aptly chosen, for this book is an epitome, having been expressly designed for physicians as well as for those who wished to cure themselves in the absence of professional medical advice. Like the *Kreüterbuch*, the text of the *Compendium* derives from the *commentarii* of Mattioli's Latin editions of Dioscorides. For each of the some 900 plants described, its names are supplied in Greek, Latin, Italian, Arabic, German, and French; occasionally the Spanish, Bohemian, and Polish names are also listed. After the section entitled *Nomina*, occur three short sections entitled *Forma*, *Qualitates*, and *Vires*. By these are meant, respectively, the appearance of the plant, *i.e.*, its description, its properties, and its virtues, both real and alleged. In addition to the sections just mentioned, two other sections occur when applicable: *Genera*, *i.e.*, the "varieties" of the plant in question, and *Locus*, the location where the plant may be found, either under cultivation or growing wild. Each page also contains an illustration of the plant in question. In order to accommodate such a large number of plants into a volume designed for a practical purpose, Mattioli went back to the smaller wood blocks of the second Latin edition of 1558. As if to compensate for the lack of scholarly references, abbreviated marginal notes direct the reader to such standbys as Theophrastus, Galen, Avicenna and, of course, Dioscorides. As in so many of Mattioli's books, a companion piece is added at the end. In the present instance, there is added an interesting example of a genre having close affinities with his own work. Written by Francesco Calzolari, one of Mattioli's old correspondents, and first published in Italian in 1566, the *Iter Baldi* is one of the

earliest Italian local floras.<sup>78</sup> Its value as a guide book to the plants of Monte Baldo was sufficiently recognized as late as 1745 when it was reprinted in Seguier's *Plantae Veronenses*.

A fitting but posthumous tribute to Dioscorides' Sieneese spokesman was the *Opera omnia* of 1598.<sup>79</sup> Despite the title of this massive volume, it does not contain all of Mattioli's writings. Included were the Latin translation of the *De materia medica* and the *commentarii* thereto, the *Apologia*, *De morbo gallico*, the *Letters*, *De ratione disillandi* and the *Epistola*. Not included were the *Opusculum*, *Compendium*, *Palazzo*, the Italian translation of Ptolemy, and the *Kreüterbuch*, perhaps on the grounds that the *Palazzo* and the Ptolemy were non-medical while the remaining three were mere abstracts or summaries of his larger works.

Another feature of this edition must also be mentioned. This is the list of synonyms of plant names printed beneath Mattioli's commentaries by the editor, Caspar Bauhin (1560-1624). The addition of these synonyms at once reflects the past and points to the future. Drawn from the latest botanical publications, the synonyms represented the combined efforts of a growing band of European botanists. As the world grew larger as the result of exploration and commerce, hitherto unknown plants posed a major nomenclatural problem. No one understood better than Bauhin the need for a standardized, universal nomenclature by means of which botanists could communicate their data in a succinct, yet unambiguous manner.<sup>80</sup> Bauhin's *Pinax* of 1623 is often regarded as the forerunner of the *Species plantarum* of Carl Linnaeus (1707-1778), now the internationally recognized starting point of modern botanical nomenclature and taxonomy. But these latter two works, it is pleasant to think, owed much to Mattioli's indefatigable efforts to transform botany from medieval pedantry to a science of international cooperation.

## Notes

1. Unless otherwise specified, all references to Dioscorides' Greek text are to the critical edition by Max Wellmann, *Pedanii Dioscuridis Anazarbei De Materia Medica Libri Quinque*. 3 vols. Berlin: Weidmann, 1906-1914.

2. Galen (131-200 A.D.) already knew this tradition, for he referred to Dioscorides as ὁ Ἀναξαρβεύς (*Opera omnia*), ed. C. G. Kühn. Vol. XIII (Leipzig: Cnobloch, 1827) p. 589.

3. Max Wellmann, "Λεκάριος Ἄρειος [i.e. Areios 13]." *Pauly-Wissowa Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*. Vol. II (Stuttgart, 1896) col. 626.

4. Max Wellmann, "Sextius Niger, eine Quellenuntersuchung zu Dioscorides." *Hermes* 24(1889)530-569.

5. Although it is only conjecture, Stadler may have been correct in supposing that Dioscorides was a *Sanitätsoffizier* attached to a legion. Herman Stadler, "Der latein-

ische Dioscorides der Münchener Hof- und Staatsbibliothek." *Allgemeine medicinische Central-Zeitung* 68(1900)165-166.

6. "Preface" 4 (I p.2 Wellmann).

7. The spurious *Περὶ ἰοβόλων* and *Περὶ δηλητηρίων* were last printed by K. Sprengel in vol. II of his edition of Dioscorides (forming vols. XXV-XXVI of C. G. Kühn, ed. *Medicorum graecorum opera quae exstant*. Leipzig: Cnobloch, 1829-30).

8. *Περὶ ἀπλῶν φαρμακῶν*, sometimes known as *Εὐπόριστα* or *Euporista* is printed in Wellmann's edition of Dioscorides (III, 151-326). The most recent attempt to authenticate this work is Max Wellmann, *Die Schrift der Dioscorides Περὶ ἀπλῶν φαρμακῶν*. Berlin: Weidmann, 1914. A German translation, with notes, was prepared by Julius Berendes, "Die Hausmittel der Pedanios Dioskurides." *Janus* 12(1907)10 *et passim*.

9. "Preface" 5 (I p.3 Wellmann).

10. There is no single work by means of which all of Dioscorides' plants can be identified and given their modern technical names. Still valuable, however, is C. Fraas, *Synopsis plantarum florum classicae*. 2. Aufl. Berlin: S. Calvary, 1870. For incidental information relating specifically to Dioscorides' names cf. E. Bonnet, "Essai d'identification des plantes médicinales mentionnées par Dioscoride. . . ." *Janus* 8(1903)169-177, 225-232, 281-285 and E. Emmanuel, "Etude comparative sur les plantes dessinées dans le Codex Constantinopolitanus de Dioscoride." *Schweizerische Wochenschrift für Chemie und Pharmazie* 50(1912)45-50, 64-72.

11. Cf. Jerry Stannard, "Dioscorides and Renaissance Materia Medica." (in) *Materia Medica in the XVI Century*. Proceedings of a Symposium at the International Academy of the History of Medicine held at the University of Basle 7 September 1964 (London: Pergamon Press, 1966)pp.1-21.

12. For biographical details, I have followed principally Giuseppe Fabiani, *La vita di Pietro Andrea Mattioli*. Con aggiunte ed annotazioni per cura di Luciano Banchi. Siena: G. Bargellini, 1872; Giovanni Battista De Toni, "Pierandrea Mattioli" (in) Aldo Mieli, ed., *Gli scienziati italiani dall'inizio del medio evo ai nostri giorni*. Vol. I parte ii (Rome: Nardecchia, 1923)382-387; C. Raimondi, "Pro Petro Andrea Matthiolo medico senensi (A. 1500-1577)." *Archivio di Farmacologia e Terapeutica* 9(1901)450-464; and Leopold Senfelder, "Beiträge zu einer Biographie des Petrus Andreas Matthioli." *Wiener medizinische Wochenschrift* 81 (1931) 1479-1482.

13. Cf. H. Kühnel, "Pietro Andrea Matthioli. Leibarzt und Botaniker des 16. Jahrhunderts." *Mitteilungen des österreichischen Staatsarchivs* 15(1962)63-92. Particularly valuable for Mattioli's career after 1554, based on unpublished manuscripts.

14. Cf. Francesco Ambrosi, "Di Pietro Andrea Matthioli sanese e del suo soggiorno nel Trentino." *Archivio Trentino* 1(1882)49-61.

15. Cf. Gunther Schmid, "Ein bisher unbekanntes Bildnis von P. A. Mattioli (1500-1577)." *Sudhoffs Archiv für Geschichte der Medizin* 30(1937)133-151. A photograph of the sarcophagus is reproduced in Giulio Conci, "Nel IV centenario della venuta di Pier Andrea Mattioli nel Trentino." *Studi Trentini di Scienze Naturali* 9 (1928) 34-58. For the epitaph, cf. Ambrosi, *op. cit.* p.55.

16. For Mattioli's unpublished manuscripts cf. notes 13 and 35. Others are mentioned by G. B. De Toni (*op. cit.* p.387) in the Aldrovandi MSS in Bologna. For his correspondence cf. C. Raimondi, *Una lettera di Pietro Andrea Mattioli al collegio dei medici di Lucca con la risposta, ora per la prima volta pubblicate*. Siena: Tipografia Cooperativa, 1901 [not seen] and notes 19, 32, and 35a. Some of his medical opinions and consilia have been published: cf. V. Busacchi, "I tre consulti inediti di P. A. Mattioli conservati alla Biblioteca Università di Bologna." *Rivista di Storia delle Scienze, Mediche e Naturali* 31(1940)192-197 and *ibid.*, "Un consiglio medico sull'epilessia di P. A. Mattioli" (in) *Scritti in onore del Prof. P. Capporoni* (Torino, 1941)pp.35-41 [not seen], while still others appear in the older collection edited by Laurentius Scholzius, *Consiliorum medicinalium, conscriptorum a praestantissimis atque exercitatissimis nostrorum temporum medicis liber singularis*. . . . fol. Hanau:

"Typ. Mechelianis" for heirs of J. Aubrius, 1610 [not seen]. A *Mattiolianum* not described by his biographers is Antonio Berthioli, *Delle considerazioni . . . sopra l'olio di scorpioni dell' eccellentissimo Matthioli*. Mantova: F. Osana, 1585 [not seen]. The source for the Scholzius reference is Richard J. Durling, compiler. *A Catalogue of Sixteenth Century Printed Books in the National Library of Medicine*. Bethesda: National Library of Medicine, 1967 No. 4141 (hereafter cited simply as Durling, plus number). Another writing doubtfully attributed to Mattioli is *Delle virtù et operationi delli bagni di Bormio*. (s.l., 1540). Cited by Ambrosi, *op. cit.* p.51n, who admits he has never seen a copy and knows of it only at second hand.

17. *Dialogus de morbi gallici curandi ratione*. Bologna, 1530. [not seen; reference: G. B. De Toni (in) Mieli p.384.] Presumably this was the same text published later as: *Morbi gallici novum ac utilissimum opusculum quo vera et omnimoda ejus cura percipi potest*. 4to. Bologna: Heirs of H. de Benedictis, 1533. Mattioli's tract was later published in several collections, e.g., *Liber de morbo gallico*. . . . 8vo. Venice: J. Patavinus & V. de Ruffinellis, 1535 and *Morbi gallici curandi ratio exquisitissima*. 4to. Basel: J. Bebel, 1536 and Lyon: Scipione de Gabiano, 1536 [not seen; ref. Durling 3296]. Finally, Mattioli's tract was published in an even later collection: *De morbo gallico omnia quae extant*. . . . fol. Venice: J. Ziletti, 1566-1567 [not seen; Durling 1108; cf. Durling p.388 post 3035].

18. In general, see R. S. Munger, "Guaiacum, the Holy Wood from the New World." *Journal of the History of Medicine* 4(1949)196-229.

19. *Il magno palazzo del Cardinale di Trento*. 4to. Venice: F. Marcolini, 1539. This book was dedicated to Bernardo Cardinal Clesio to whom the *Morbi gallici opusculum* of 1533 was also dedicated. Nine letters from Cardinal Clesio to Mattioli and one letter from Mattioli to Christoforo Cardinal Madruzzo were edited by Mario Bori, "Nuovi documenti intorno alle relazioni di Pietro Andrea Mattioli con i principi Vescovi di Trento." *Studi Trentini di Scienze Naturali* 3 (1922) 239-253. Seven letters from Mattioli and two addressed to him are printed in G. Fabiani, *op. cit.* pp.49-74.

20. G. Schmid, *op. cit.* p.149 terms the *Palazzo* "ein langes Prunkgedicht."

21. I have no data on the 1558 edition other than the fact that it was printed in Trento *vide* G. B. De Toni (in) Mieli p.387. The editors of the 1858 edition (next note) remarked in the "Preface" that only two copies were known to them.

22. *Il magno palazzo del Cardinal di Trento descritto in ottava rima*. Edd. Bartolomeo Malfatti & Amalia Crippa. 8vo. Trento: Dalla Tipografia Monauni, 1858.

23. In an effort to find a "moderate and seasonable" form of exercise, Burton can think of nothing better than "To see a well-cut herbal, herbs, trees, flowers, plants, all vegetables expressed in their proper colours to the life, as that of Matthiolus upon Dioscorides. . . ." Robert Burton, *The Anatomy of Melancholy*. London: Chatto and Windus, 1883, pp.349-350.

24. Ptolemeo. *La Geografia . . . Con alcuni comenti & aggiunte fattene da Sebastiano Munstero Alamanno . . . ridotta in volgare Italiano da M. Pietro Andrea Mattiolo Senese medico eccellentissimo*. 8vo. Venice: Gioan. Baptista Pedrezano, 1548. (Two later editions are recorded by Raimondi *op. cit.* p.462, neither of which I have seen.) For further details concerning the editions of Mattioli in the Spencer Library, cf. Jerry Stannard, "P. A. Mattioli and some Renaissance Editions of Dioscorides." *Books and Libraries at the University of Kansas*, IV/1(October 1966)1-5.

25. Cf. Henri Leclerc, "Un naturaliste irascible: P. A. Matthiole de Sienne." *Janus* 31 (1927)336-345.

26. *Index Dioscoridis. Historiales Dioscoridis campi . . . , Ioanne Roderico Casteli albi Lusitano autore*. 4to. Antwerp: The Widow of Martini Caesaris, 1536. [not seen] The title page of the only known copy is reproduced by Friedenwald (see note 27). In addition cf. José Lopes Dias, *Comentários ao "Index Dioscoridis" de Amato Lusitano*. Castelo Branco: Grafica de S. José, 1968.

27. The title of Amatus' larger work is *In Dioscoridis . . . Enarrationes*. 4to. Venice: Scorius, 1553. For later editions cf. Harry Friedenwald, "Amatus Lusitanus." *Bulletin of the Institute of the History of Medicine* 5(1937)603-653.

28. *Apologia adversus Amathum Lusitanum cum censura in eiusdem enarrationes.* fol. Venice: Vincent Valgrisi, 1558.

29. *Epistola de bulbocastaneo, oloconitiide, mamira, traso, moly, doronico, grano zelin, zedoaria, zurambeto, carpesio & aliis. Ad praeclarissimum medicum Gabrielem Faloppium Mutinensem.* 12mo. Prague: Joh. Cantor, 1558. Reprinted in *Epistolarum medicinalium libri quinque* (Prague, 1561) pp.159-172. (Cf. note 31.)

30. For a study devoted to the identification of one of the plants discussed by Mattioli, cf. Jerry Stannard, "The Plant Called Moly." *Osiris* 14(1962)254-307.

31. *Epistolarum medicinalium libri quinque.* fol. Prague: Georg Melantrich for Vincent Valgrisi, 1561. Reprinted: Lyon: C. Farina, 1564. [not seen]

32. For an analysis of some of the medical portions of the *Letters*, cf. Otakar Matoušek, "The Influence of Vesalius in Bohemia." *Proceedings of the XIXth International Congress of the History of Medicine, Basel 1964.* (Basel: Karger, 1966) pp. 160-164.

33. Cf. Jules Camus, "Historique des premiers herbiers." *Malpighia* 9(1895)283-314.

34. Guilandino (originally Melchior Wieland of Königsberg) was one of Mattioli's favorite targets. Part of the reason for the open hostility was Guilandino's first publication: *De stirpium aliquot nominibus vetustis ac novis.* . . . 8vo. Basel: N. Episcopius, 1557, which directly challenged recent identifications of ancient plant-names and was addressed to Gesner. Guilandino's letter and Gesner's reply underly Mattioli's *Epistola de bulbocastaneo* (1558) and were reprinted in Mattioli's *Medical Letters* (pp. 143-158) immediately preceding the *Epistola*. Other writings by both Mattioli and Guilandino added fuel to the fire. The culmination of the controversy was the publication of Paul Hess, editor, *Defensio XX. problematum Melchioris Guilandini adversus quae Petr. Andreas Mattheolus ex centum scripsit.* . . . *Adjecta est Petr. Andreae Matthaoli adversus XX problemaia Melchioris Guilandini disputatio.* . . . 12mo. Patavia: M. A. Ulmus, 1562. On Guilandino, cf. G. B. De Toni, "Melchiorre Guilandino" (in) Mieli *op. cit.* I i(1921)pp.73-76. A detailed study of Guilandino and Mattioli is now in the course of preparation and will be published elsewhere.

35. The exchange between Mattioli and Gesner is a complex matter and not all of the data are available to me at present. The issue hinges on Dioscorides' description of *akonion* and its synonyms. The relevant portion of the text reads ἀκόνιτον . . . φύλλα ἔχει τρία ἢ τέσσαρα, ὅμοια κυκλαμίνῳ ἢ σικύῳ, μικρότερα δέ, ὑποτραχέα. καυλὸς δὲ σπιδαμῆς, ρίζα ὁμοία σκορπίου οὐρᾶ, στιλβουσα ἀλαβατροειδῶς (IV 76, II p. 237-38 ed. Wellmann). This was literally translated by Ruelle as follows: *Aconitum* . . . *folia habet cyclamini aut cucumeris, tria aut quatuor, minora et subhirsuta: caulem palmo altum: radix scorpii caudam aemulatur, et alabastri modo splendet* . . . (*De Materia Medica*, Lyon: Frelon Brothers, 1546. Book IV cap. 66 p. 342). Mattioli's Latin translation is identical and the Italian translation (1548 p.558) is equally literal. The controversy with Gesner arose over the illustration accompanying the text which clearly shows a small plant, with four cyclamen-shaped, hirsute leaves and a root which is segmented in the fashion of a scorpion. I have not yet been able to reconstruct the precise sequence of events, but sometime after 1548 but before 1558, Mattioli learned of Gesner's doubts about a plant that possessed "a root resembling a scorpion and which shone like alabaster." At any rate, a long Appendix in the 1558 edition (pp.541-542 following chapter 73 Book IV; absent in the 1548 Italian translation) shows Mattioli skillfully, but politely parrying Gesner's strictures. In an unpublished letter to Gesner (his only known letter to Gesner), Mattioli is more candid and admits that there exists some confusion over the identification of Dioscorides' first form of *aconitum* and the so-called *iora*. (Zürich Zentralbibliothek MS 50a Nr. 36 fol. 238r. I am grateful to Dr. Rudolf Steiger who placed this MS at my disposal and also called to my attention Gesner's own, annotated copy of Mattioli's 1558 Latin translation of Dioscorides: Zürich Zentralbibliothek shelf mark TZ 97<sub>1</sub>). The

last episode in the exchange is the posthumous publication of Gesner's *Epistolarum Medicinalium Libri* III. 4to. Zürich: Christopher Frosch[over], 1577, of which pp. 2-27 are entitled "De aconito primo Dioscoridis asseueratio."

35a. Mattioli's relations with some of his fellow naturalists have been studied by C. Raimondi, "Una lettera inedita di P. A. Mattioli a Gabriele Faloppio." *Bollettino Senese di Storia Patria* 10 (1903) 279-289; *idem* "Lettere di P. A. Mattioli ad Ulisse Aldrovandi." *Bollettino Senese di Storia Patria* 13 (1906) 121-185, and J. E. Opsomer, "Un botaniste trop peu connu: Willem Quackelbeen (1527-1561)." *Bulletin de la Société royale de botanique de Belgique* 93 (1961) 113-130. In addition see L. Elaut, "De briefwisseling tussen Willem Quackelbeen en Pierandrea Mattioli." *Biologisch Jaarboek* 22 (1955) 50-74.

36. The first Italian translation was that of Sebastiano Fausto da Longiano (b. ca. 1502): *Dioscoride fatto di Greco Italiano. Al cui fine sono apposte le sue tavole ordinate, con certe auertenze, e trattati necessarij, per la materia medesimo*. 8vo. [Venice]: Curtio Troiano di Navò, 1542.

37. On Dioscorides' influence among Islamic writers, cf. Lucien Leclerc, "De la traduction arabe de Dioscorides." *Journal Asiatique* 9(1867)5-38 and Max Meyerhof, "Die Materia Medica des Dioskorides bei den Arabern." *Quellen und Studien zur Geschichte der Naturwissenschaften und die Medizin*. 3(1933)72-84.

38. Cf. Anton von Premmerstein, "Anicia Iuliana im Wiener Dioskorides-Kodex." *Jahrbuch der kunsthistorischen Sammlung*, 24(1903)105-124. For the socio-political background, cf. Arnaldo Momigliano, "Gli Anicii e la Storiografia Latina del VI Sec. D.C." *Atti della Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei*, Rendiconti, Classe di Scienze morali, (ser. VIII) 11(1956)279-297.

39. G. E. Dann, "Ein Faksimile-Druck des 'Wiener Dioskurides.'" *Zur Geschichte der Pharmazie* 18(1966)9-11.

40. Cassiodorus, "De institutione divinarum litterarum" I, 31 (in) J.-P. Migne, *Patrologia Latina* vol. 70 (Paris, 1874) col. 1146.

41. Book I edited by T. M. Auracher, "Der Longobardische Dioskorides des Marcellus Virgilius." *Romanische Forschungen* 1(1883)49-105. Continued by Hermann Stadler, "Dioscorides Longobardus. (Cod. Lat. Monacensis 337)." *Romanische Forschungen* 10(1899)181-247, 369-446; 11(1901)1-121; 13(1902)161-243; 14(1903)601-636.

42. As examples, see H. F. Kästner, ed., "Pseudo-Dioscoridis De herbis femininis." *Hermes* 31(1896)578-636; Hermann Stadler, "Dioskorides als Quelle Isidors." *Archiv für lateinische Lexikographie* 10(1898)403-412, and Jerry Stannard, "Medieval Reception of Classical Plant Names." *Revue de Synthèse* 3<sup>e</sup> série 89(1968)153-162.

43. Dioscorides, *De materia medica latine a Petro Paduano*. . . fol. Colle: Joh. Allemanus de Medemblick, July, 1478. Described by Ludwig Hain, *Repertorium Bibliographicum*. 2 vols. Stuttgart: J. G. Cotta, 1826-1838, No. 6258 and A. C. Klebs, *Incunabula Scientifica et Medica*. Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1963, No. 342.1. I am grateful to Dr. Owsei Temkin, former Director, Institute of the History of Medicine, Johns Hopkins University, for permission to examine the photostatic copy of this edition, preserved in the Welch Medical Library.

44. Valentin Rose, *Anecdota graeca et graeco-latina*. 2 vols. Berlin: Dümmler, 1864-1870, II, 115, 119.

45. Πεδακίου Διοσκοριδίου ἀναζαρβέως Περὶ ὕλης ἰατρικῆς λόγου ἔξ. fol. Venice: Aldus Manutius, July 1499. Greek text only. (Hain 6257; Klebs 343.1). Reprinted: Venice: Aldus & A. Asulanus, 1518. Whether the Greek text, edited by Girolamo Rossi and Francesco Torresani (*vide*, Durling, No. 1133) shows any departures, has not yet been determined.

46. In 1516 two editions appeared: *In hoc volumine haec continentur Ioannis Baptistae Egnatii Veneti in Dioscoridem ab Hermolao Barbaro tralatum annotamenta*. . . Pedacii Dioscoridis Anazarbei de medicinali materia ab eodem Barbaro latinitate primum donati libri quinque. *Eiusdem de noxiis venenis ut caveri vitarique possint, liber I. Eiusdem De venenatis animalibus & rabioso cane, liber I*. . . Hermolai Barbari

... *Corollarium libris quinque absolutum*. fol. Venice: de Gregoriis Brothers for A. & F. Barbari & J. B. Astensis, 1516. For Ruelle's edition cf. note 49.

47. For some examples of the philological wranglings, cf. Stannard (note 11) pp. 9-10, 13.

48. *Di Pedacio Dioscoride Anazarbeo Libri Cinque. Della historia, & materia medicinale tradotti in lingua volgare Italiana da M. Pietro Andrea Matthiolo Sanese Medico. Con amplissimi discorsi, et comentii, et dottissime annotationi, et censure del medesimo interprete*. . . fol. [Venice: Nicolo de Bascarini] 1544.

49. *Pedacii Dioscoridis Anazarbei, De Medicinali materia libri quinque. De virulentis animalibus, et venenis cane rabioso, et eorum notis, ac remediis libri quatuor Ioanne Ruellio Suesionensi interprete*. fol. [Paris] Henri Estienne [1516]. Based upon the Aldine Greek text of 1499, the four books of the "De venenis" and "De venenatis animalibus" are called books VI-IX in the running titles.

50. Durling, No. 1160.

51. Writing of the *centaurea minore* (*Erythraea Centaurium* L.), he states "la qual volgarmente noi Sanesi chiamiamo Biondella" (p. 371). Elsewhere of the herb *trago* (? *Aposeris foetida* Less.) he remarks "nelle nostre maremme di Siena nasce solta" (p. 537). For Mattioli's role in early Sienese botany, cf. F. Tassi, "Contributo alla Storia della botanica in Italia. La Botanica nel Senese." *Bullettino del Laboratorio ed Orto Botanico di Siena*. 7(1905)p.8.

52. E.g., he writes that cherry trees "nasconne . . . nella Valle Anania della giuriditione di Trento" p.163. Cf. also pp.365, 509, 526, 544 et *passim*. For a list of the plants found by Mattioli in Trento, cf. Conci, *op. cit.* pp.50-51.

53. Cf. K. W. Dalla Torre, "Botanische Forschungstouren in Tirol bis zum Ende des 18. Jahrhunderts." *Deutsche Alpenzeitung* 7 (1907)136-140, and Hermann Fischer, "Pietro Andrea Matthioli und die Anfänge der Alpenfloristik." *Jahrbuch des Vereins zum Schutze der Alpenpflanzen* 4(1932)76-83.

54. Lyon: Frelon Brothers, 1546. 8vo; Lyon: J. Frelon, 1547. 16mo (?) [not seen]; Lyon: T. Paganus, 1547. 16mo [not seen]; Frankfurt: Christopher Egenolph, 1549. fol.; Paris: Benedict Prevost for widow of Arnold Birkmann, 1549. 8vo; Paris: Petrus Haultinus, 1549. 8vo; Lyon: Balthazar Arnoullet, 1550. 8vo; Venice: Domenico Lilio, 1550. 16mo; Lyon: Balthazar Arnoullet, 1552. 8vo; Lyon: Jacobus Faure, 1554. 16mo [not seen].

55. The translator of the Italian edition: Florence, 1545, 8vo, was Marcantonio Montigiano [not seen, cited *vide* Jean François Seguier. *Bibliotheca Botanica*. Leiden: C. Haak, 1740. p. 52]. A later edition is recorded by Durling No. 1161: *Della materia medicinale. Tradotto per M. Marcantonio Montigiano da S. Gimignano medico in lingua fiorentina*. 8vo. Florence: B. di Giunti, 1547 [not seen].

56. *Il Dioscoride dell' eccellente dottor medico M. P. Andrea Matthioli da Siena, con suoi discorsi da esso la seconda volta illustrati, & diligentemente ampliati: con la giunta del sesto libro de i rimedi di tutti i veleni, da lui nuovamente tradotto, & con dottissimi discorsi per tutto commentato, con la giunta di tutte le figure delle piante, delle herbe, delle pietre, et de gli animali, tratte dal vero & istesso naturale, & non piu stampate*. 4to. Mantova: Iacomo Rossinello, 1549. While the text is Mattioli's, the plates are not those of the Valgrisi editions and appear to have been designed expressly for this edition.

57. *Les six livres de Pedacion Dioscoride d'Anazarbe de la matiere medicinale, translatez de Latin en Francois*. fol. Lyon: Balthazar Arnoullet, 1553. The dedication is signed "Martin Mathee" (sic). Pp. 392-417 contain an interesting section entitled "Description de plusieurs simples non mentionnez par Dioscoride, avec leurs facultez & vertus singulieres." The 1553 edition was reprinted in quarto format in Lyon: Macé Bonhomme, 1559. (Colophon): Lyon: for the widow of Balthazar Arnoullet. [not seen].

58. *Petri Andreae Matthioli Medici Senensis Commentarii, in libros sex Pedacii Dioscoridis Anazarbei, De medica materia. Adjectis quam plurimis plantarum & animalium imaginibus, eodem authore*. fol. Venice: Vincent Valgrisi, 1554.



59. Still the best overall study of the illustrated herbals of the sixteenth century is Agnes Arber, *Herbals, their origin and development*. 2nd edition. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1953.

60. There exists no modern study of Mattioli's contributions as a botanist. A starting point is provided by Kurt Sprengel, *Geschichte der Botanik*. 2 vol. Altenburg & Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus, 1817-1818 who lists (II, 294-299) about 200 species first described by Mattioli or described better by Mattioli than by his predecessors. A few remarks will also be found in V. Maiwald, *Geschichte der Botanik in Böhmen*. Wien & Leipzig: Carl Fromme, 1904, pp.20-27, and G. B. De Toni, "Commemorazione di Pietro Andrea Mattioli." *Atti, R. Accademia dei Fisiocritici* (ser. IV) 13 (1901) 137-156. Another useful study is Graf Kaspar von Sternberg, *Catalogus Plantarum ad septem varias editiones Commentariorum Mathioli in Dioscoridem*. Prague: J. G. Calve, 1821. The discussion by E. H. F. Meyer, *Geschichte der Botanik*, 4 vols. Königsberg: Bornträger, 1854-57 is disappointing, being occupied mainly with bibliographic matters (IV, 366-378).

61. Virgil, *Georgics*. IV 137 is cited on p.371 but, oddly, with a reading unacceptable to modern students of Virgil. Other verses from Virgil appear on pp.96, 198, 247, and 422. Frequently, Mattioli offers an emendation to Marcello Virgilio's Greek text and translates accordingly, cf. pp.19, 70, 75, 139, etc.

62. For specimens sent by Anguillara cf. p.325 and for a drawing from Anguillara cf. p. 464. For Ghini cf. pp. 463, 469, 495, 551, etc. A more detailed account of the plants sent to Mattioli by Ghini from Pisa in 1551 has been published by Giovanni Battista De Toni, "I Placiti di Luca Ghini (Primo Lettore dei Semplici in Bologna) intorno a piante descritte nei Commentarii al Dioscoride." *Memorie del Reale Istituto Veneto di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti*, XXVII/8(1907)1-49.

63. "Vidimus nos hoc [*sc. nerium, Nerium oleander L.*] primum ad Benaci ripas. . . ." (p.544); "vidimus primum in ForoIulensium civitate Austriae. . . ." (p.552). Cf. also pp.98, 273, 277, 301, 315, etc. Another source of information was the apothecary shops where Mattioli observed the dried products of plants imported from the Near East, cf. pp.31, 66, 317, etc.

64. Mattioli records that he first observed rosemary (*Rosmarinus officinalis L.*) in Venice "in horto amoenissimo Maphei medici excellentissimi" (p.414). Cf. p.322 for another reference to Maphaeus' garden. Sometimes the owners of other gardens are mentioned, e.g., Julius of Marostica where Mattioli saw a species of *umbilicus veneris* (p.552). Elsewhere, he describes specimens without supplying the owners' names, e.g., pp.106, 407, etc.

65. The editions of 1559 and 1560, both folios, were printed by V. Valgrisi. In 1559, another printing of the Italian translation was also published by Valgrisi.

66. *Les commentaires de M. Pierre Andre Matthioli medecin Senoys: sur les six livres des simples de Pedacius Dioscoride Anazarbeen. Avec une table medicinale extraite d'iceux, des remedes de toutes les maladies qui peuvent advenir au corps humain, tant en general qu'en particulier. Nouvellement traduits de latin en françois*. . . . Lyon: Gabriel Cotier, 1561. fol. The translator was Antoine Du Pinet, Seigneur de Noroy (1515-1584). The same year, an abridged form appeared, containing Mattioli's commentaries, and woodcuts, but without the French translation of Dioscorides: Antoine Du Pinet, ed., *Historia Plantarum. Earum imagines, nomenclaturae, qualitates, et natale solum. Quibus accessere simplicium medicamentorum facultates, secundum locos et genera, ex Dioscoride*. 12mo. Lyon: Gabriel Cotier, 1561. Both the French translation and the *Historia plantarum* proved popular and were reprinted several times.

67. Lyon: Gabriel Cotier, 1562. 8vo. On the basis of the translations, this edition can be termed the third edition of Mattioli's Latin translation.

68. *Herbarz: ginaĸ Bylináĸ, welmi užiteĸný, a figúrami pieĸnými y ųřetედlnymi, podlé praweĸo a yaĸo ziwéĸo zrostu bylín, ozdobyeny, y také mnohými a zĸussenými leĸarzstwiĸými rozhognieny, gessto takowy niĸdá w ziadnem yazyĸu prwé wydán nebyl: od Doĸtora Petra Ondřeĸe Matthiola . . . nayprw w latinské rřeĸi sepsáný, a giĸ . . . na*

*českou rčec, oá Doktora Thadeáse Hágka z Hágku, přeložený. . . .* fol. Prague: Georg Melantrich, 1562.

69. Cf. Spencer Savage, "A little-known Bohemian herbal." *The Library* (ser. 2) 2(1921)117-131.

70. *New Kräuterbuch mit den allerschönsten und artlichsten figuren aller gewechss, dergleichen vormalis in keiner sprach nie an tag kommen. Von dem hochgelerien und weiterümbten Herrn Doctor Petro Andrea Matthiolo. . . .* fol. Prague: Georg Melantrich, 1563. The translator and editor was Georg Handsch. Cf. F. W. E. Roth, "Das Kräuterbuch des P. A. Matthiolus 1563-1586." *Archiv für die Geschichte der Naturwissenschaften und die Technik* 2(1910)317-321 for later editions, and Leopold Senfelder, "Georg Handsch von Limus." *Wiener klinische Rundschau* Nr. 28-30 (1901) 495-499, 514-516, 533-535.

71. *Commentarii in sex libros Pedacii Dioscoridis Anazarbei de medica materia, iam denuo ab ipso autore recogniti, et locis plus mille aucti. Adiectis magnis, ac novis plantarum, ac animalium iconibus, supra priores editiones longè pluribus, ad vivum delineatis. . . .* fol. Venice: "Ex Officina Valgrisiana," 1565.

72. The short tract on distilling apparatus first appeared in the Bohemian translation (Prague, 1562) where it occupies signatures Sssii<sup>r</sup>-Sssvi<sup>r</sup>. Later reprinted in the second Bohemian translation: Prague: Adam Huber, 1596 pp.472<sup>r</sup>-476<sup>v</sup>. A Latin translation accompanied the fourth Latin edition: Venice: Valgrisi, 1565, Hhhhhh2<sup>r</sup>-Hhhhhh6<sup>v</sup> and its reprint Venice: Valgrisi, 1569 [not seen]. At least three Italian translations were published: [Venice: Valgrisi, 1568; Durling, 3030.1]; [Venice: Heirs of Vincent Valgrisi, 1573; Durling 3031], [Venice, 1604—cf. next note] while a French translation appeared in des Moulin's translation of Mattioli: Lyon: Guillaume Roville, 1579 fol. (pp.849-859).

73. Cf. Hermann Schelenz, *Zur Geschichte der pharmazeutisch-chemischen Destilliergeräte*. Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1964 Fig. 16 (p.37). Denis Duveen, *Bibliotheca Alchemica et Chemica*. London: E. Weil, 1949, p.395 cites as the work of Mattioli a late Italian edition: *Del Modo di Distillare le Acque da tutte le Piante*. [Venice: Bartolomeo de gli Alberti, 1604] [not seen].

74. He did this reluctantly, however. Commenting on the *ἔβευος* (*Diospyros* sp.) of Dioscorides (I 98 vol. I p.89 ed. Wellmann), Mattioli argued that the *guaiacum* could be classified as *ebeni* genus and that it possessed the same virtues as Dioscorides' *ἔβευος*. (p.122 ed. Venice: Valgrisi, 1558). It has been argued, ironically, that the *De materia medica* would have become obsolete much sooner if Mattioli had had the courage to publish his results independently of the framework offered by a commentary. Guido Piccinini, "La rinomanza di Dioscoride e la denominazione 'Materia Medica.'" *Rivista di Storia delle Scienze, Mediche e Naturali* 11(1920)68-82, 101-115. For other plants from the New World mentioned in the *commentarii*, cf. Conci, *op. cit.* p.42.

75. Very much involved in these new introductions was Ogier Ghiselin de Busbecq (1522-1592), the Ambassador from the Emperor Ferdinand I to the court of Suleiman the Magnificent in Constantinople, and the one who first sent to Mattioli specimens of ornamental plants. Cf. George Sarton, "Brave Busbecq." *Isis* 33(1942)557-575. An older account, but still valuable for botanical details is Graf Kaspar von Sternberg, *Abhandlung über die Pflanzenkunde in Böhmen*. Prague: Gottlieb Haase, 1817 pp. 110-122.

76. The full title is: *Opusculum, de simplicium medicamentorum facultatibus secundum locos, & genera. Accesserunt quoque praejectiones quaedam huic opusculo ad modum necessariae*. 8vo(?). Venice: Vincent Valgrisi, 1569. (References: Durling 3030); G. B. De Toni (in) Mieli *op. cit.* p.385). In addition to the above, a 12mo edition, Lyon: G. Roville, 1571 is listed in *A Catalogue of Printed Books in the Wellcome Historical Medical Library*. Vol. I (London: Wellcome Historical Medical Library, 1962) Nos.4156, 4157. The *Opusculum* should not be confused with the tables, occurring in the unnumbered preliminary leaves of Mattioli's editions of Dioscorides and entitled, "Simplicium Medicamentorum facultates secundum locos [et genera] ex Dioscoride" (folios γvi<sup>r</sup>-ηiv<sup>v</sup> in the Venice, 1558 edition).

77. *Compendium de plantis omnibus, una cum earum iconibus, de quibus scripsit suis in commentariis in Dioscoridem editis, in eorum studiosorum commodum, atque usum; qui plantis conquirendis, ac indagandis student. Accessit praeterea ad calcem opusculum de itinere, quo e Verona in Baldum montem plantarum refertissimum itur . . .* Francisco Calceolario . . . auctore. . . 4to. Venice: In Officina Valgrisiana, 1571. Reprinted as *De plantis epitome utilissima . . .* a D. Joachimo Camerario. Frankfurt: [Siegmund Feyerabend] 1586 [not seen].

78. *Il viaggio di Monte Baldo dalla magnifica città di Verona, nel quale si describe con maraviglioso ordine il sito di detto monte e d'alcune altre parti ad esso contigue, et etiamdo si narra d'alcune segnalate piante e herbe che ivi nascono e che all'uso della medicina più di tutte l'altre conferiscono.* 4to. Venice: Vincent Valgrisi, 1566. For Calzolari's only other publication and the later translations of his *Viaggio* cf. G. B. De Toni (in) Aldo Mieli, ed. *Gli scienziati italiani . . .* Vol. I parte ii [Roma: Nardecchia, 1923] pp.387-391.

79. Petri Andreae Matthioli medici Caesarei et Ferdinandi Archiducis Austriae, *Opera quae extant omnia: Hoc est, Commentarii in VI. libros Pedacii Dioscoridis Anazarbei de medica materia: Adiectis in margine variis Graeci textus lectionibus, ex antiquissimis codicibus desumptis, qui Dioscoridis deprauatam lectionem restituunt. . .* fol. [Frankfort: Nicolas Bassaeus] 1598. (Reprinted) Basel: Johann Koenig, 1674.

80. Caspar Bauhin, *Pinax theatri botanici, sive index in Theophrasti, Dioscoridis, Plinii et botanicorum qui a saeculo scripserunt, opera: plantarum circiter sex millium ab ipsis exhibitarum nomina cum earundem synonymiis et differentiis methodice secundum earum et genera et species proponens.* 4to. Basel: Ludwig Koenig 1623. Reprinted: Basel: Johann Koenig, 1671. Cf. P. Schwartz, "Une classification botanique au début du XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle: le 'Pinax theatri botanici' de Gaspard Bauhin." *Thalès* 4(1937-1939)113-120.

UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS PUBLICATIONS  
Library Series

Editor, JAMES HELYAR

1. *University of Kansas: List of Publications*. Compiled by Mary Maud Smelser. 1935. available on request
2. *University of Kansas Graduate School Theses, 1888-1947*. Compiled by Bessie E. Wilder. 1949. \*
3. *Two Augustan Booksellers: John Dunton and Edmond Curll*, by Peter Murray Hill. 1958. \*
4. *New Adventures Among Old Books: An Essay in Eighteenth Century Bibliography*, by William B. Todd. 1958. \*
5. *Catalogues of Rare Books: A Chapter in Bibliographical History*, by Archer Taylor. 1958. \*
6. *What Kind of a Business is This? Reminiscences of the Book Trade and Book Collectors*, by Jacob Zeitlin. 1959. \*
7. *The Bibliographical Way*, by Fredson Bowers. 1959. \*
8. *A Bibliography of English Imprints of Denmark*, by P. M. Mitchell. 1960. \$2.00
9. *On the Burning of His Library and On Medical Travel*, by Thomas Bartholin, translated by Charles D. O'Malley. 1961. \*
10. *A Bibliography of the Frank E. Melvin Collection of Pamphlets of the French Revolution in the University of Kansas Libraries*, by Ambrose Saricks. 1961. 2 vols., \$7.50
11. *Observations on Paper as Evidence*, by Allen H. Stevenson. 1961. 85c
12. *University of Kansas Graduate School Theses, 1948-1958*. Compiled by Bessie E. Wilder. 1961. \$2.50
13. *Six Variant Readings in the First Folio of Shakespeare*, by Charlton Hinman. 1961. \*
14. *A Petition Regarding the Conditions in the C.S.M. Prison at Columbia, S.C., Addressed to the Confederate Authorities by Col. John Fraser*. Edited by George L. Anderson. 1961. \$1.50
15. *William Dampier: Seaman-Scientist*, by Joseph C. Shipman. 1962. \$1.50
16. *Maps of the 16th to 19th Centuries*, by Thomas R. Smith and Bradford L. Thomas. 1963. \$3.50
17. *Looking at an Early Map*, by R. A. Skelton. 1965. \*
18. *A Bibliography of James Joyce Studies*, by Robert H. Deming. 1963. \$3.00
19. *Maps of Costa Rica*, by Albert H. Palmerlee. 1965. \$6.00
20. *A Checklist of Linneana, 1735-1835*, by Terrence Williams. 1964. \$1.50
21. *International Bibliography of Vegetation Maps*, edited by A. W. Küchler. Volume 1: North America. 1965. \*
22. *Four Centuries of Shakespeare Publication*, by Giles E. Dawson. 1964. \$1.00
23. *A Guide to the Ssu Pu Ts'ung K'an*, by Karl Lo. 1965. \$1.50
24. *A Classified Bibliography of Korean Materials, 1808-1962*, by Felix Moos. In preparation
25. *Censored: Books and their Right to Live*, by Elmer Gertz. 1965. \*
26. *International Bibliography of Vegetation Maps*, edited by A. W. Küchler. Volume 2: Europe. 1966. \$10.00
27. *Bibliography and Natural History: Essays presented at a Conference convened in June 1964 by Thomas R. Buckman*. 1966. \$5.00
28. *A Bibliography of 17th Century German Imprints in Denmark and the Duchies of Schleswig-Holstein*, compiled by P. M. Mitchell. In preparation
29. *International Bibliography of Vegetation Maps*, edited by A. W. Küchler. Volume 3: Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Asia, and Australia. 1968. \$7.50
30. *Rilke's last year*, by George R. Schoolfield. 1968. \$1.50
31. *The Two Worlds of University Publishing*, by Roger W. Shugg. \$1.00
32. *Bibliographical Contributions*, I. \$2.00

\* Titles marked with an asterisk are now in short supply, and are normally only available to complete the files of institutions maintaining exchange agreements with the University of Kansas Libraries.

The Library Series and other University of Kansas Publications are offered to learned societies, colleges and universities and other institutions in exchange for similar publications. All communications regarding exchange should be addressed to the Exchange Librarian, University of Kansas Libraries, Lawrence, Kansas. Communications regarding sales, reviews, and forthcoming publications in the Library Series, should be addressed to the Editor of Library Publications, University of Kansas Libraries, Lawrence, Kansas.