



2021

Early Antiquarian Methodologies: Conflict in the Margins of a Sixteenth-Century Copy of *Itinerarium Kambriae* and *Descriptio Kambriae*

Sarah J. Sprouse
The University of Alabama, sjsprouse@ua.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://repository.upenn.edu/mss_sims



Part of the [Medieval Studies Commons](#), and the [Renaissance Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Sprouse, Sarah J. (2021) "Early Antiquarian Methodologies: Conflict in the Margins of a Sixteenth-Century Copy of *Itinerarium Kambriae* and *Descriptio Kambriae*," *Manuscript Studies*: Vol. 5 : Iss. 2 , Article 1.
Available at: https://repository.upenn.edu/mss_sims/vol5/iss2/1

This paper is posted at ScholarlyCommons. https://repository.upenn.edu/mss_sims/vol5/iss2/1
For more information, please contact repository@pobox.upenn.edu.

Early Antiquarian Methodologies: Conflict in the Margins of a Sixteenth-Century Copy of *Itinerarium Kambriae* and *Descriptio Kambriae*

Abstract

The Tudor period saw a revolution in antiquarian histories of Britain. Their networks of transmission largely circle around major collectors such as Matthew Parker and William Cecil. One prominent figure in Cecil's orbit was Laurence Nowell, the antiquarian whose name is famously associated with the Beowulf manuscript (the "Nowell Codex"). Nowell made copies of the *Itinerarium Kambriae* and *Descriptio Kambriae*, both texts by Giraldus Cambrensis, from differing sources, resulting in the defective manuscript London, British Library Additional MS 43706. His colleague William Lambarde used the Add. MS 43706 as the basis for his copy of *Descriptio Kambriae*. However, before Lambarde finished his transcription, he made annotations in Nowell's copy. This paper will examine the marginal annotations in Add. MS 43706, which include several annotations in Nowell's hand too. Nowell and Lambarde must have exchanged the manuscript back and forth, as demonstrated by their crossing out and correcting of each other's annotations. This correspondence on the physical pages of the manuscript speaks to their differing attitudes towards prominent aspects of Giraldus's text, including how to read and interpret marvels, natural history, and the twelfth-century discord between Wales and Anglo-Norman England. Nowell's more conservative attitude led him to derisively identify many of the anecdotes as "superstitio", "ridiculum", and "fabula", whereas Lambarde resists such disparaging comments by crossing them out and then justifying them with notes such as "mais miraculu[m]". This article ultimately argues that reading conflict in the margins highlights the value of studying marginalia in order to better understand the transmission practices of the antiquarians, including how they read medieval texts and how they interpret, translate, excerpt, and summarize them.

Keywords

medieval manuscripts, wales, early modern manuscripts, antiquarianism, william lambarde, laurence nowell, giraldus cambrensis

MANUSCRIPT STUDIES

A Journal of the Schoenberg Institute for Manuscript Studies

VOLUME 5, NUMBER 2

(Fall 2020)

Manuscript Studies (ISSN 2381-5329) is published semiannually
by the University of Pennsylvania Press



The Schoenberg Institute
for Manuscript Studies

UNIVERSITY of PENNSYLVANIA LIBRARIES

MANUSCRIPT STUDIES

VOLUME 5, NUMBER 2
(Fall 2020)

ISSN 2381-5329

Copyright © 2020 University of Pennsylvania Libraries
and University of Pennsylvania Press. All rights reserved.

Published by the University of Pennsylvania Press,
3905 Spruce Street, Philadelphia, PA 19104.

Printed in the U.S.A. on acid-free paper.

Manuscript Studies brings together scholarship from around the world and across disciplines related to the study of premodern manuscript books and documents, with a special emphasis on the role of digital technologies in advancing manuscript research. Articles for submission should be prepared according to the *Chicago Manual of Style*, 16th edition, and follow the style guidelines found at <http://mss.pennpress.org>.

None of the contents of this journal may be reproduced without prior written consent of the University of Pennsylvania Press. Authorization to photocopy is granted by the University of Pennsylvania Press for libraries or other users registered with Copyright Clearance Center (CCC) Transaction Reporting Service, provided that all required fees are verified with CCC and paid directly to CCC, 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, MA 01923. This consent does not extend to other kinds of copying for general distribution, for advertising or promotional purposes, for creating new collective works, for database retrieval, or for resale.

2020 SUBSCRIPTION INFORMATION:

Single issues: \$30

Print and online subscriptions: Individuals: \$40; Institutions: \$94; Full-time Students: \$30

International subscribers, please add \$19 per year for shipping.

Online-only subscriptions: Individuals: \$32; Institutions: \$82

Please direct all subscription orders, inquiries, requests for single issues, address changes, and other business communications to Penn Press Journals, 3905 Spruce Street, Philadelphia, PA 19104. Phone: 215-573-1295. Fax: 215-746-3636. Email: journals@pobox.upenn.edu. Prepayment is required. Orders may be charged to MasterCard, Visa, and American Express credit cards. Checks and money orders should be made payable to "University of Pennsylvania Press" and sent to the address printed directly above.

One-year subscriptions are valid January 1 through December 31. Subscriptions received after October 31 in any year become effective the following January 1. Subscribers joining midyear receive immediately copies of all issues of *Manuscript Studies* already in print for that year.

Postmaster: send address changes to Penn Press Journals, 3905 Spruce Street, Philadelphia, PA 19104.

Visit *Manuscript Studies* on the web at mss.pennpress.org.

Early Antiquarian Methodologies: Conflict in the Margins of a Sixteenth-Century Copy of *Itinerarium Kambriae* and *Descriptio Kambriae*

SARAH J. SPROUSE
The University of Alabama

THE TWELFTH-CENTURY CAMBRO-NORMAN WRITER Giraldus Cambrensis (1146–1223), also known as Gerald of Wales, recounts in his *Itinerarium Kambriae* (1191) the miraculous powers of a staff that once belonged to Saint Curig. He writes that this relic (“baculus qui Sancti Cyricii”) was especially useful for curing tumors. However, on one memorable occasion, a penitent Welshman with a facial tumor swore on the relic that he would donate a penny for his cure at a later date. He was cured, but when he failed to pay, his tumor reappeared. The man was so terrified that he paid threefold and his health was restored.¹ Commenting on the work in the early 1560s, English antiquarian Laurence Nowell remarked in the margins of his manuscript copy, “Fabulae.”² Curiously, this derisive comment was then crossed out by Nowell’s friend William Lambarde, who wrote above it, “Baculus S[ancti] Cyricij” (Staff of Saint Curig) as well as “S[ancti] Germani ecc[les]iae in / Warthreniaun regio[n]e” (Church of Saint

1 *Itinerarium Kambriae*, in *Giraldi Cambrensis Opera vol. vi*, ed. James F. Dimock, Rolls Series (London: Longman, 1868), 17.

2 London, British Library, Additional MS 43706, fol. 21v.

Germanus in the region of Warthrenion).³ These annotations are typical features of the manuscript, London, British Library, Additional MS 43706, which is a transcript copy of Giraldus's two works about Wales, *Itinerarium Cambriae* and *Descriptio Cambriae* (1194).⁴ [La.] was prepared by Nowell and is dated 1562. The annotations in the margins suggest this manuscript was in active use in the 1560s as Nowell and Lambarde worked together to cultivate a better understanding of the British past.⁵

Nowell is perhaps most famous for lending his name to the "Nowell Codex," or the *Beowulf* manuscript, London, British Library, Cotton MS Vitellius A.xv. He is also known for his work on early English history and the Old English language, though he never published any of his research. His work lived on in manuscript form, later used and adapted for other scholarly works by antiquarians such as William Lambarde and John Stowe after Nowell's death. Nowell was involved in a much wider enterprise under the supervision of Archbishop Matthew Parker, in which like-minded scholars worked not only to seek out useful historical documents, but also to reveal a supposedly nearly-Protestant past of the Anglican Church. Parker organized a collective of antiquarians to find "monuments" of the past from the recently dispersed collections that had been held by monasteries prior to the Dissolution. To that end, Nowell made a series of transcript copies of medieval manuscripts in the 1560s, which are now preserved in the British Library as Additional MSS 43703–43710. Most of the materials found in this series pertain to the early English people, notably including copies of the *Peterborough Chronicle* (from Oxford, Bodleian Library, Laud Misc. MS 636) and an Old English version of Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum* (from London, British Library, Cotton MS Otho B.x). When approaching the [La.] manuscript, then, the first obvious question is why Nowell was interested enough in Giraldus Cambrensis and

3 London, British Library, Additional MS 43706, fol. 21v.

4 Subsequent references will be to the abbreviation [La.].

5 An early version of this paper was presented at the 54th International Congress on Medieval Studies (Kalamazoo, 2019) in a session titled "Old Codices, New Contexts I: Latin Manuscripts." I am grateful to the presenters and participants of that session for productive conversations on manuscripts and the feedback received that ultimately helped shape this article.

his works on Wales that he bothered to make full transcript copies of *Itinerarium* and *Descriptio*.⁶ These textual copies are in Nowell's hand, as are most of the transcriptions in the Additional series noted above. We must also consider what [La.] can reveal about the working relationship between Nowell and Lambarde. Further, what can this relationship tell us about the antiquarian process and mood of the mid-sixteenth century?

I will address each of these questions in an effort to better understand Nowell's process of manuscript production and scholarship. Since Nowell never published any of his research, I intend to think beyond the transcript copy as a step toward a printed product; our concern instead is the production and use of transcription as a sixteenth-century antiquarian practice. We can infer that Nowell included Giraldus in his research on the topography of Britain in preparation for a map he produced in the 1560s for his patron William Cecil, Lord Burghley.⁷ Like so many of his contemporaries, starting with John Leland, Nowell's thinking in the 1560s was topographical, which is evident in the annotations found in [La.]. His colleague Lambarde was instrumental in cultivating the annotations as topographical finding aids. The topography of the anecdotes in *Itinerarium* and *Descriptio* was critical to how Giraldus described the place of Wales; however, many of those stories were met with a Reformist skepticism by Nowell. Critically, those anecdotes still mattered to the early modern antiquarian's conception of the topography; these anecdotes still defined the space for Nowell, but his Protestantism necessitated a conceptual shift. Marvels and miracles are no longer the truth of the world, but instead curiosities and fables that

6 Nowell did not make transcript copies of any of Giraldus Cambrensis's numerous other texts. The *Fontes Harleiani* notes that London, British Library, Harley MS 359, which contains both Giraldus's Welsh texts and Irish texts (*Expugnatio Hibernica* and *Topographia Hibernica*), originated with Nowell and was possibly in his hand. However, a comparison of Additional MS 43706 with Harley MS 359 proves that the hands are substantially different. Harley MS 359 first belonged to John Dee. See Cyril Ernest Wright, *Fontes Harleiani: A Study of the Sources of the Harleian Collection of Manuscripts Preserved by the Department of Manuscripts in the British Museum* (London: The British Museum, 1972), 260.

7 The map is now preserved in London, British Library, Additional MS 62540. The title on folio 1r reads: "Cart of England, / Ireland & Scotland /" with a note that "L(or)d Burleigh carried / this map always about / him."

shape descriptions of the place of Wales. As Matthew Boyd Goldie recently observed, “Changes in space are neither a fact of nature nor the result of material alterations to space itself but instead are bound up with modifications in human understanding, observation, and experience.”⁸ Beyond the concerns of “papisty,” the sixteenth century also bore witness to an ever-expanding knowledge of the world, which would later be addressed by William Camden as necessitating a rediscovery of familiar terrain. Camden, whose work was scaffolded on the earlier efforts of John Leland as well as the kinds of work performed by Nowell and Lambarde, among others, argued in the prefatory remarks to a later English translation of his *Britannia*, an extensive chorographical work, that “Of all morall knowledge, the knowing of our selues; of all Mathematicall, the knowledge of our owne Countrey is the most vsefull and profitable. Yet had most men rather spend themselues and their precious houres in the most difficult trifles in the world, than once to enter into themselues. And most Students in Geographie take more delight to contemplate the remotest and most barbarous Countries of the earth, than lightly to examine the Descriptions of their owne.”⁹ Over the course of the many editions of *Britannia*, Camden advocated for a rediscovery of the place of Britain, which Nowell and Lambarde explored in [La.] and beyond in their other research into British antiquities. Nowell placed Wales, always a difficult subject for English antiquarians due to its complicated location in history and space, under the domain of England in the map he produced for William Cecil.¹⁰ Lambarde benefited from this work too, as is evident in his posthumously published *Dictionarium Angliae Topographicum & Historicum* (1730). However, the evidence in [La.] demonstrates his awareness of the extensive spatial and linguistic history of the Welsh people that would differentiate them from the English.

8 Matthew Boyd Goldie, *Scribes of Space: Place in Middle English Literature and Late Medieval Science* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2019), 2.

9 William Camden, *The Abridgment of Camden's Brita[n]nia with the maps of the seuerall shires of England and Wales* (London: John Bill, 1626), a3.

10 This map treats Wales as a region of England, but does not identify that region by the name “Wales” or “Wallia.” The legend declares the map is “A general description / of England & Ireland / with þe costes adioy / ning.” See London, British Library, Additional MS 62540, fol. 4r.

All of these issues come down to Nowell's divergence between Protestant skepticism of the anecdotes in the text itself and his methodology of manuscript production, which is a continuation of medieval practices. [La.] bears witness to a compelling moment in the history of historical production that is ultimately transitional. I will argue that this liminal state between two periods (medieval and early modern) serves as a reminder that we cannot neatly fit historical periods into airtight boxes. Instead we must examine a historical transition as a continuum.

[La.] serves as a reminder of that continuum between medieval and early modern. The texts in the manuscript are demonstrative of what Elizabeth Bryan calls the "continuance of a text," that is, "the process between text and reader, a process of collaboration among first authors, scribes, illuminators, correctors, annotators, and other readers. The continuance of such a scribal text did not mean exactly repeated 'mechanical' reproduction, but instead a renegotiation among meaning and words of preceding models and current writers and readers every time a single codex was reproduced."¹¹ Nowell is a latecomer to the two Geraldine texts, but he serves multiple functions per Bryan's definition of continuance. He is a scribe, an annotator, and a reader. As a scribe, Nowell alters the text into an adaptation that best serves his own needs. As Daniel Wakelin argues, correction and adaptation are not "automatic or unreflective" alterations, but instead indicative of a continuing tradition of critical response to the work itself, which he suggests is analogous to philology or literary criticism.¹² The act of conscious alteration and correction of a text demonstrates active engagement with the material from across generations. Nowell's efforts in [La.] are not preservationist in a modern sense, but instead represent a continued tradition from the medieval period of active use. The Geraldine works are still alive as working documents rather than as objects or artifacts of the past that are unalterable. Despite the advent of print, manuscripts continued to be a part of British culture. Many texts moved back and forth between print and

11 Elizabeth Bryan, *Collaborative Meaning in Medieval Scribal Culture* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1999), 46.

12 Daniel Wakelin, *Scribal Correction and Literary Craft* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 4.

manuscript in this period. For example, Giraldus's two Welsh works were printed in 1585, but were then copied back into manuscript form by George Owen of Henllys (1552–1613) in order to be translated.¹³ The movement of text continued to be fluid in the sixteenth century.

Beyond proving the adaptability of the texts, [La.] provides an opportunity to witness the antiquarian process of engagement with the material. To borrow a phrase from Rebecca Brackmann, Nowell and Lambarde engaged in a kind of “coterie scholarship,” in which they passed the manuscript back and forth to improve each other's work and arrive at a better, more accurate list of place names and finding aids in the margins.¹⁴ The result is what appears to be extensive conflict in the margins of the manuscript. Nowell and Lambarde would not only correct each other's work, but also cross out opinions with which they disagreed and factual matters that they found incorrect. Especially illustrative of this work are the ways in which they would together attempt to capture the correct Welsh orthography for place names and personal names. On folio 26 recto, for example, there are multiple efforts at spelling “Tudor” correctly. Nowell attempts “Teuther,” then crosses it out and advances the idea that “Tewdur” might be correct. Lambarde strikes that second effort out and replaces it with “Tewddur,” followed by commentary below noting that Gruffydd ap Rhys ap Tewdwr was a lord in Cantref Mawr, which is in South Wales. This example shows not only that Nowell and Lambarde are attempting to correctly identify the historical vernacular spelling, but also that the effort was collaborative.

The two antiquarians noticed that Giraldus did not always provide proper vernacular terminology; however, they treat Giraldus as an authority on the matter of Wales more broadly. Giraldus remained the Latin authority on the topography and ethnography of Wales for Latin and English-reading

13 See London, Lambeth Palace, MS 263.

14 Rebecca Brackmann, *The Elizabethan Invention of Anglo-Saxon England: Laurence Nowell, William Lambarde, and the Study of Old English* (Rochester, NY: Boydell & Brewer, 2012), 10. See also Elizabeth Yale, *Sociable Knowledge: Natural History and the Nation in Early Modern Britain* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2016), especially Chapter 2, “Putting Texts, Things, and People in Motion: Learned Correspondence in Action,” 55–88.

antiquarians until the 1584 printing of the *Historie of Cambria*, a translation and adaptation of the fourteenth-century Welsh *Brut y Tywysogyon*. Lambarde wrote in his *Dictionarium* that “This *Gyraldus* was a *Welsbman*, learned in the Antiquities of his Country, & lived in *Hen. II. Tyme*, and before.”¹⁵ Giraldus’s authoritative position seems to be due in large part to the fact that there were no other surviving extensive descriptions of medieval Wales available in Latin or English. That deference to Giraldus and the process of transcription and adaptation in [La.] are juxtaposed with Nowell and Lambarde’s sixteenth-century attitudes toward religion and superstition. As Richard J. Terrill points out, the medieval construction of history incorporated a biblical timeline from creation to Apocalypse into its linear design, and miracles were considered credible drivers of events in history.¹⁶ This perception of the world guides Giraldus’s inclusion of miracles and marvels in his descriptions of the places of Wales; however, it also forms a point of divergence from Nowell’s worldview that arises in the margins of [La.] in the form of derisive commentary. So, while the production of the manuscript involves an unchanged methodology from the late medieval period, the annotations represent a newer perception of time and space. Together these factors situate [La.] in the continuum of time between medieval and early modern. The sixteenth century was a period of change politically and culturally, but also for modes of history production. The remainder of this article will examine the construction of [La.] and its position in sixteenth-century thought. I will first provide some biographical details about Nowell and Lambarde to situate my discussion of their partnership. I will then examine [La.] in the context of its exemplars, and finally analyze the annotations and finding aids in the margins in the context of Nowell and Lambarde’s coterie working relationship.

15 William Lambarde, *Dictionarium Angliae Topographicum & Historicum. An Alphabetical Description of the Chief Places in England and Wales; With an Account of the most Memorable Events which have distinguish’d them* (London: Printed for Fletcher Gyles, 1730), 6.

16 Richard J. Terrill, “William Lambarde: Elizabethan Humanist and Legal Historian,” *Journal of Legal History* 6, no. 2 (1985): 157–78 at 161.

Laurence Nowell and William Lambarde

The biography of Laurence Nowell has been a point of confusion and dispute among scholars since the earliest biographical sketch in William Dugdale's *The Antiquities of Warwickshire* (1656).¹⁷ The principal difficulty, as identified by Retha M. Warnicke, is that there must have been at least two men by that same name of "Laurence Nowell" who were likely cousins.¹⁸ The fallout of such a discovery was the need to determine which parts of the biography found in Robin Flower's seminal 1935 article belonged to the Dean of Lichfield (the cousin) and which belonged to the antiquarian.¹⁹ To further complicate matters, Carl T. Berkhout has identified a possible third contemporary Laurence Nowell.²⁰ However, as Raymond J. S. Grant points out, these complications do not diminish the excellent work in Flower's essay, and some of the biographical details must specifically pertain to the antiquarian.²¹ Nowell the antiquarian was employed by William Cecil in the 1560s as a tutor to first his son Thomas and then later to Richard de Vere, the seventeenth Earl of Oxford, who was a ward of Cecil. Nowell lived in Cecil's house on the Strand, and via Cecil's patronage he made transcript copies of numerous manuscripts.²² While most existing records suggest Nowell's primary occupation at this time was as a tutor in Cecil's household,

17 Sir William Dugdale, *The Antiquities of Warwickshire* (London, 1656), 670. A full recitation of Nowell's biography and the difficulties therein can be found in Raymond J. S. Grant, *Laurence Nowell, William Lambarde, and the Laws of the Anglo-Saxons* (Atlanta: Rodopi, 1996), 9–17.

18 Retha M. Warnicke, "Note on a Court of Requests Case of 1571," *English Language Notes*, 11 (1974), 250–56.

19 Robin Flower, "Laurence Nowell and the Discovery of England in Tudor Times," *Proceedings of the British Academy* 21 (1935): 47–73.

20 Carl T. Berkhout, "The Pedigree of Laurence Nowell the Antiquary," *English Language Notes* 23, no. 2 (1985): 15–26.

21 Grant, *Laurence Nowell, William Lambarde, and the Laws of the Anglo-Saxons*, 16–17.

22 Flower characterizes the transcripts as being of Anglo-Saxon manuscripts specifically. Flower also cites correspondence between Thomas Windebank and William Cecil in which Windebank recommends Nowell for the job of tutoring Thomas Cecil. See Flower, *Nowell and the Discovery of England*, 51.

Brackmann points out that many of Cecil's correspondents, notably including Matthew Parker, refer to Nowell as Cecil's secretary.²³ It seems likely that he performed both roles, affording Nowell a reliable income as well as access to medieval materials. It was during this time that Nowell became acquainted with William Lambarde, who was a law student at Lincoln's Inn. In an essay on Lambarde's reading practices, Neil Weijer notes a 1565 entry in Nowell's commonplace book indicating that the two men traveled together in the early 1560s to seek and copy material from medieval manuscripts in numerous collections.²⁴ Cecil's patronage also afforded access to manuscripts owned by contemporaries such as Matthew Parker. In the mid-1560s, Nowell produced a map of Britain and Ireland for Cecil. Nowell died around 1571 during his adventures on the European continent to seek additional sources for his study of English history. He bequeathed his papers to Lambarde, many of which would form the basis for Lambarde's published works on history and chorography. Lambarde would go on to become Deputy Keeper of the Rolls (1597) and then, shortly before his death, Keeper of the Tower Records (1601). Nowell and Lambarde formed a firm friendship and working relationship in which they together sought clues to the early English past but also, it would seem, the British past.

Rediscovery of that history was largely hampered by the dissolution of the monasteries, which decentralized archives of important historical and political documents. Destruction of materials deemed Catholic or papist amplified the later problem of recovery, but it was the concerted effort to separate from Rome that ultimately shaped the English archival project.²⁵ The great pioneers of this historical project were John Leland and John

23 Brackmann, *The Elizabethan Invention of Anglo-Saxon England*, 12. Brackmann rehearses a thorough history of Nowell and Lambarde's relationship in her introduction, 12–20.

24 Neil Weijer, "Gathering Places: William Lambarde's Reading," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 63 (2018): 133–53 at 141.

25 Nicholas Popper, "From Abbey to Archive: Managing Texts and Records in Early Modern England," *Archival Science* 10, no. 3 (2010): 249–66 at 251. F. J. Levy, *Tudor Historical Thought* (San Marino, CA: Huntington Library, 1967), 126.

Bale. During and after the Visitations, Leland and Bale traveled across the country to find and retrieve medieval manuscripts.²⁶ Leland, for example, visited at least 137 libraries while he served as the Royal Librarian for Henry VIII.²⁷ When Matthew Parker was consecrated as Archbishop of Canterbury (1559), Queen Elizabeth's Privy Council authorized Parker to solicit manuscripts and other important papers from private owners throughout the kingdom so that he might have copies made for the Royal Library.²⁸ Parker's assistants in this endeavor included Nowell and, later, Lambarde. While this work was initially for the specific purpose of gathering evidence for the early independence of the Anglican Church, the result was a massive collection of medieval manuscripts and early modern transcript copies of medieval documents. As Nicholas Popper writes, Parker "operated at the center of a thick network of correspondents and clients who supplied him with copies, extracts, and originals of texts that he then used to structure and support his Church settlement."²⁹

Parker's circle became a template for such antiquarian networks, the correspondence of which Yale refers to as a "complicated dance," that would persist up through the eighteenth century.³⁰ F. J. Levy describes these first two generations of antiquarian efforts as cycles of accumulation and loss.³¹ The collection Leland managed to build was subsequently largely dispersed. The same was true for the collections of both John Dee and William Cecil after their deaths. An illuminating example of such far-flung distributions can be found in an appendix to a cluster of articles about William Lambarde

26 James P. Carley has extensively researched Leland's efforts to find and study medieval manuscripts from monastic libraries. See, for example, James P. Carley, "John Leland and the Contents of English Pre-Dissolution Libraries: Lincolnshire," *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society* 9, no. 4 (1989): 330–57; Carley, "John Leland and the foundations of the Royal Library: The Westminster Inventory of 1542," *Bulletin of the Society for Renaissance Studies* 7 (1989): 13–22; Carley, "Many Good Autors': Two of John Leland's Manuscripts and the Cambridge Connexion," *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society* 15, no. 3 (2014): 27–56.

27 May McKisack, *Medieval History in the Tudor Age* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971), 5.

28 McKisack, *Medieval History in the Tudor Age*, 27. Popper, "From Abbey to Archive," 255.

29 Popper, "From Abbey to Archive," 255.

30 Yale, *Sociable Knowledge*, 55.

31 Levy, *Tudor Historical Thought*, 128.

published in 2018 in the *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*. The appendix contains a list of manuscripts and books that were owned or annotated by Lambarde, which comprises numerous libraries across two continents.³² Sir Robert Bruce Cotton advocated for a national library, but such petitions came to nothing in his lifetime. It was only later, through the revival of university libraries, that manuscript collections settled. These generations, characterized by decentralization and wide distribution networks, fostered the largely medieval scribal mindset that characterized Nowell and Lambarde's collaboration.

Production of the Manuscript

It is courtesy of these massive antiquarian networks that Nowell and Lambarde were able to put together their own manuscript copies of some of the works of Giraldus. Just as a medieval scribe needed to make certain editorial decisions when it came to producing a copy of a text, so too did Nowell have to think about how best to represent his exemplars in the transcript copies. Does one produce a full and complete copy that is word for word exactly the same as the exemplar? Or are some adaptations necessary to make the text easier to use? Then, of course, there are the accidental changes that are inevitable when transcribing a work by hand, which contribute to the uniqueness of each iteration. These changes, whether intentional or mistaken, would ultimately be addressed by correctors, annotators, and readers. In the case of [La.], many such concerns would be raised in the margins or as interlinear glosses by Lambarde.

Medieval attitudes toward the practice of scribal production are, of course, drastically different from our modern idea of an edition. Alfred the Great's adaptation of Boethius's *Consolatio Philosophiae* is a popular example

32 The list, however, is not exhaustive. It enumerates the locations and libraries containing all the materials cited in the articles. See Frederic Clark et al., "List of Manuscripts and Books Cited in These Essays Which Were Owned or Annotated by William Lambarde," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 81 (2018): 209–10.

of the difference. We need only turn to the anonymous prefatory proem of the text:

Ælfred kuning wæs wealhstod ðisse bec, 7 hie of boclædene on eng-
lisc wende, swa hio nu is gedon. Hwilum he sette word be worde,
hwilum andgit of andgite³³

King Alfred was the translator of this book, and he changed it from
book-Latin into English, as it now is done. Sometimes he made [it]
word by word, sometimes sense by sense

“Sense by sense” is the key phrase here. The proem acknowledges that Alfred, as we know, often only translated by the sense of the text rather than literal word for word. He adapted the ideas of the *Consolatio* to make them applicable to his English audience. While this methodology would change in the seventeenth century, it was still much the same in the sixteenth. Massimiliano Morini writes that “the translators, even when they cut and add at their pleasure, can still claim they have been faithful to the ‘sentence’ of the original, to the ‘spirit’ embodied in the words rather than to the words themselves, vile ‘flesh’ that they are.”³⁴ Many early modern adaptations have notes similar to the anonymous proem in their “To the Reader” prefatory notes. For example, Thomas Wyatt prefaces his translation of Plutarch with the following comment: “I haue made now of late i[n] to our tong nat p[re]cisely (I co[n]fesse) w[ith]out error as one shulde haue done that had ben of perfite letnyng³⁵ / but after my rudenesse / seking rather the profite of the sentence than the nature of the wordes.”³⁶ So, again, the sense of the text is more important than the specific words of the

33 *King Alfred’s Old English Version of Boethius De Consolatione Philosophiae*, ed. Walter John Sedgefield (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1899), Proem at 1.1–15.

34 Massimiliano Morini, *Tudor Translation in Theory and Practice* (New York: Routledge, 2006), 5.

35 By “perfite letnyng,” Wyatt means “perfectly constructed in Latin.”

36 Thomas Wyatt, *Tho. Wyatis Translatyon of Plutarckes Boke, of the Quyetete of Mynd* (London: Richard Pynson, 1528), iii.

original. Of course, Wyatt was producing a translation, not a transcription, which is, theoretically, a straight copy of a text.

The collocation of the codex itself is an adaptation. Nowell brought together two texts specifically based on either author or subject (Wales). Since Giraldus is the only prominent writer to describe the topography of Wales in the Middle Ages, the principle of Nowell's compilation is debatable.³⁷ [La.] has several features that suggest the conscious effort to pair these two works. There are corrections and errors throughout the two primary texts, including interlinear insertions, marginal corrections, deletions via cross-outs, misreadings of specific words, and the occasional occurrence of dittography. Such defects suggest that Nowell did not first produce copies elsewhere and then later recopy them into this manuscript.³⁸ Whether reflective of the order of access or personal preference, Nowell placed *Descriptio* first in his manuscript with *Itinerarium* after it. Evidence from London, British Library, Harley MS 359, suggests this might be a preference since (Hc.), which Nowell had prepared for John Dee, is ordered in the same way.³⁹ Out of the thirty-one surviving copies of *Itinerarium* and *Descriptio*, the two texts are paired in twelve of the manuscripts. Of those twelve, the texts are in chronological order (that is, *Itinerarium* followed by *Descriptio*) in nine of the manuscripts. The two cases of nonchronological order beyond [La.] are (Hc.) and a composite codex containing copies of texts dating from the twelfth to sixteenth centuries. This latter manuscript (Cambridge University Library, MS Ff.1.27) contains a copy of *Itinerarium*

37 Erik Kwakkel recently argued that author-centric composition was a popular organizational scheme for late medieval manuscripts. He used examples from Middle Dutch collections of manuscripts. See Erik Kwakkel, "Late Medieval Text Collections: A Codicological Typology Based on Single-Author Manuscripts," *Author, Reader, Book: Medieval Authorship in Theory and Practice*, ed. Stephen Partridge and Erik Kwakkel (Buffalo: University of Toronto Press, 2012), 56–79.

38 Henry FitzAlan (1512–1580) made a transcript copy and then later prepared a revised and elegant edition of the same, preserving both versions of *Itinerarium* and *Descriptio* in the same manuscript. The "edition" of the two texts comes before the transcript copies. See London, British Library, Royal MS 13 B.xii.

39 Following Dimock, I abbreviate London, British Library, Harley MS 359 to (Hc.) throughout the remainder of this article.

dating to the thirteenth century and a copy of *Descriptio* from the sixteenth century, which makes it an outlier when thinking about collocation of Giraldus's works.⁴⁰ If we discount CUL MS Ff.1.27, then Nowell is the only compiler to actively disregard chronological ordering of these two Geraldine texts. Nowell's colophon further suggests his intention to pair the two texts in this disrupted order:

Topographia Walliae Mag(ist)ri Gerald
Cambrensis
Eiusdem Itinerarium Walliae.
Laurentii Nouelli.
1562.⁴¹

[The Topography of Wales by Master Gerald
of Wales
and his Itinerary of Wales.
Laurence Nowell.
1562.]

While both possible exemplars for Nowell's copy of *Descriptio* also identify the text as "Topographia Walliae," they each received the title at a point after Nowell's death. This seems to be the largely accepted title of the work, as it appears in numerous manuscript copies.⁴² While Lambarde's own manuscript copy agrees with these titles, he apparently disagreed with the order of the texts.⁴³ Lambarde places *Itinerarium* before *Descriptio*, although he also abridged both works. Several chapters are out of order, summarized, or excerpted. Lambarde does not leave a comment anywhere in [La.] about the order of the works, but Nowell stands alone in his apparent decision to place *Descriptio* before *Itinerarium*.

40 Further, the two texts are not together in the manuscript.

41 London, British Library, Additional MS 43706, fol. 1r.

42 However, the first printing of the work by David Powell in 1585 identifies the text as "Cambriae Descriptio."

43 Oxford, Bodleian Library, Rawlinson MS B.471.

Tracing Nowell's exemplars for [La.] demonstrates the range and complexity of the antiquarian networks in the sixteenth century. Most of the earliest copies of Giraldus's two texts about Wales resided in monasteries up until the Dissolution, after which they were rescued by many prominent figures such as Parker and Cecil via their correspondents like Leland. Nowell's manuscript has at least two exemplars, which further emphasizes the extent of the medieval documents that were involved in these networks. Antiquarians from all over Britain borrowed, copied, and annotated the fragments of the past collected by others in their circles. A tremendous number of extant letters demonstrates this active correspondence.⁴⁴ [La.]'s copy of *Itinerarium* appears to derive from the thirteenth-century manuscript London, British Library, Additional MS 34762.⁴⁵ This attribution, which the British Library's catalogue takes as a matter of fact, is credible in part because ((Add.)) is the only known copy of the first recension that predates [La.]. The contemporary owner of ((Add.)) was Sir John Prise of Wales (1502–1555), who had died by the time Nowell saw the manuscript.⁴⁶ However, there is reason to suspect that ((Add.)) reached Parker. Someone marked out all of the saints' names in the manuscript with a red crayon rather like the one belonging to Parker. Regardless of whether it actually was Parker, the act of crossing out saints' names demonstrates both the concern with Catholic content in Giraldus's work as well as the willingness

44 The Early Modern Letters Online database is especially illustrative of this activity. See <http://emlo.bodleian.ox.ac.uk>.

45 Following Catherine Rooney, I abbreviate this manuscript as ((Add.)) throughout the article. See Catherine M. Rooney, "The Manuscripts of the Works of Gerald of Wales" (Ph.D. diss., University of Cambridge, 2005).

46 John Prise likely obtained the manuscript during the visitations of the monasteries after the dissolution. Authorized commissioners would visit ecclesiastical institutions to ensure conformance to the Church of England and, in the case of some commissioners like Prise, collect up old manuscripts. See Rooney, *The Manuscripts of Gerald of Wales*, 112 n. 584. See also Ceri Davies's biography of Sir John Prise in *John Prise: Historiae Britannicae Defensio, A Defense of the British History*, ed. and trans. Ceri Davies (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 2015), xvii–xix.

After Nowell's death, the manuscript would end up in the possession of John Browne of Bury. He left an ownership mark in the flyleaves that is dated to 1586. Since Parker died in 1575, the manuscript could have changed hands after the disposition of his library.

to alter a medieval manuscript. That effort is not particular to Parker's (or other antiquarians') study of Giraldus, but rather a common practice in the sixteenth century. Madeline McMahon discovered specific evidence of Parker directing Lambarde in marginal annotations to alter the primary text of a twelfth-century compilation of early English laws and cathedral registers.⁴⁷ McMahon's article specifically examines the working relationship between Parker and Lambarde after Nowell's death. Just as he had done with Nowell, Lambarde later passed medieval manuscripts back and forth with Parker as well as drafts and revisions of his own work. The prominence of early modern hands modifying the text in ((Add.)) therefore seems representative of the era in which Nowell and Lambarde worked. They treated these manuscripts as documents subject to further alteration depending on the needs of the reader.

((Add.)), which James F. Dimock was unaware of when compiling his edition of Giraldus's Welsh works, differs from other manuscript copies of *Itinerarium* in its ordering of front matter. The second preface, which was dedicated to Hugh of Lincoln, appears first and without any heading distinguishing the text as a copy of *Itinerarium*. The scribe then placed Book 2, Chapter 14, immediately after the preface.⁴⁸ This chapter, which is a brief biography of Archbishop Baldwin of Canterbury, is the last section of *Itinerarium*. It paints a commendable portrait of the archbishop going off to the Third Crusade and dying in Acre. It is unclear why the scribe of ((Add.)) decided to reposition this last chapter of the work, but Nowell followed suit and placed his II.14 in the same location. The ((Add.)) scribe chose not to copy the table of contents, which perhaps was not in his exemplar. He instead moves directly to the second preface, and Nowell again does the same. Nowell is largely faithful to the text preserved in ((Add.)), except that he truncates or summarizes the work in selected places. He additionally Anglicizes some Latin terms, such as "Northwallia" for "Norwallia."⁴⁹ In

47 Madeline McMahon, "Licking the 'Beare Whelpe': William Lambarde and Matthew Parker Revise the *Perambulation of Kent*," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 81 (2018): 154–71 at 156.

48 London, British Library, Additional MS 34762, fols. 98v–100r.

49 London, British Library, Additional MS 43706, fol. 55v.

one case, a chapter heading is missing in the exemplar, so Nowell composes his own.⁵⁰

The exemplar for [La.]’s copy of *Descriptio* is less concrete. It must be either London, British Library, Cotton Vitellius MS C.x (V), or London, British Library, Cotton Nero MS D.viii (N.),⁵¹ both of which contain fourteenth-century copies of the first version of the *Descriptio*. These two manuscripts agree in orthography, abbreviations, and completeness of the text. However, I am inclined to believe that Nowell made his copy from (N.) because his patron, William Cecil, had a working relationship with the manuscript’s contemporary owner Robert Glover (1544–1588).⁵² It seems likely that Nowell benefited from that relationship when he was making transcripts of medieval texts. It is, of course, possible that Nowell had access to (V), but I cannot find any evidence of such a connection.⁵³ Regardless, Nowell’s transcription differs in one significant way from these two possible exemplars. All surviving copies of the first version of *Descriptio* are largely corrupted, including misplacement of a section of the second preface in the middle of Book 2, Chapter 7, and a lacuna of eight chapters from Book 1. Nowell must have noticed the nonsensical insertion of the second preface, because he removed it from his transcript of Book 2, Chapter 7.⁵⁴ It is possible that he

50 Book 2, Chapter 8, “De Cunewe fluvio navigio transcurso, et Dynas Emereis, cum notabilibus suis” becomes in Nowell’s copy “De Bangor et Notab(ilibus).” See London, British Library, Additional MS 34762, fol. 160v, and London, British Library, Additional MS 43706, fol. 59v.

51 Following Dimock, I abbreviate London, British Library, Cotton Vitellius MS C.x to (V.) and Cotton Nero MS D.viii to (N.) throughout the remainder of this article.

52 Robert Glover borrowed manuscripts from William Cecil, including Aberystwyth, National Library of Wales MS 3024C. Cecil received some of Glover’s manuscripts after his death in 1588. Additionally, see May McKisack, *Medieval History in the Tudor Age* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971), and Retha M. Warnicke, “The Laurence Nowell Manuscripts in the British Library,” *British Library Journal* 5, no. 2 (1979), 201–2.

53 There is no evidence to suggest that Nowell knew the other owners of the manuscript Henry Savile of Banke, who was much younger than him, and Robert Cotton, who was born around the time that Nowell died on the European continent.

54 Archbishop James Ussher of Armagh likely had access to [La.] because his own transcript copy follows suit in removing this misplaced section of text. See Dublin, Trinity College Library, MS 574.

compared his exemplar against other manuscript copies, but there is no evidence to suggest that he noticed the absence of eight chapters in Book 1, which is a shame since Giraldus quotes three lines of early Middle English poetry in Book 1, Chapter 12.⁵⁵ The passage is a comparative study of poetry in English, Latin, and Welsh. This trilingual analysis of medieval British literature would likely have been of great interest to Nowell. Regardless of which manuscripts were the exemplars for the transcript in [La.], it is apparent that Nowell and Lambarde were greatly indebted to both William Cecil and Matthew Parker for access to medieval manuscripts.

Conflicts in the Margins

While Lambarde's contributions to the production of the transcripts of the primary texts in [La.] are unclear, his role as a collaborator and research assistant are most evident in the numerous annotations throughout the manuscript. I described that working relationship as a coterie above and will now elaborate on that point. There appear to be a few stages in the production of the annotations. The first consists of a series of incredulous and disdainful comments from Nowell, which Lambarde largely crosses out and corrects when he encounters them in the manuscript. These annotations from Nowell, which take the form of "fabulae," "ridiculum," "superstitio," and "impia," among others, serve two functions in our understanding of the process and the cultural moment of the mid-sixteenth century. This running commentary is largely applied to cases of miracles and marvels. In one such case, Giraldus describes a famine that occurred at Margam Abbey. The desperate monks considered reaching out to Bristol for aid, but then by a miracle from God their fields were suddenly well provisioned and ready for reaping.⁵⁶ Nowell simply remarked in the margin, "Fabulae," which Lambarde later crossed out and corrected to "monachorum hystoriae" (history of

55 *Descriptio Cambriae*, in *Giraldi Cambrensis Opera vol. vi*, 188. Nowell's patron Cecil owned the earliest, most complete copy of Giraldus's two works about Wales that contains the last versions of each text—Aberystwyth, National Library of Wales MS 3024C.

56 *Itinerarium Cambriae*, in *Giraldi Cambrensis Opera vol. vi*, 68–69.

the monastery).⁵⁷ While this is perhaps not the most accurate description of the passage, it does indicate the kinds of finding aids that the antiquarians together were building for their own use. If we read “monachorum hystoriae” as a category, then the passage becomes part of a collection of material that could be gathered from the primary text to develop a better understanding of the history of monasteries in the twelfth century. On the nature of anecdotes in medieval works and their repurposing in early modern histories, Annabel Patterson explains that the typical story is “short enough to be emblematic, independent enough of its surroundings to be portable, that is to say, relocatable from one chronicle to another, from a chronological to an achronological spot, from one style or even one ideological perspective to another.”⁵⁸ Lambarde would later repurpose many of the anecdotes he annotated in [La.] and other manuscripts for inclusion in his own printed works.⁵⁹ In a similar case, Giraldus details a variety of anecdotes about Flemish immigrants in Wales who used ram bones for divination purposes.⁶⁰ Nowell criticized these tales as “Ridiculu(m),” whereas Lambarde followed up with “Diuinatio ex ensis inspectione” (Divination from inspection of a sword).⁶¹ While “ensis” is technically incorrect here, “ensis” is a corruption in the primary text deriving from the exemplar ((Add.)).⁶² Other manuscript witnesses provide “ossis” here.⁶³ Despite the corruption of the term, Lambarde is again expanding on Nowell’s commentary with more descriptive information that could later serve as a finding aid. Further, Lambarde recounts this description of Flemish divination in his *Dictionarium*, in

57 London, British Library, Additional MS 43706, fol. 37r.

58 Annabel Patterson, “Foul, His Wife, the Mayor, and Foul’s Mare: The Power of Anecdote in Tudor Historiography,” *The Historical Imagination in Early Modern Britain: History, Rhetoric, and Fiction, 1500–1800*, ed. Donald R. Kelley and David Harris Sacks (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 159–78 at 165.

59 Frederic Clark, “Reading the Life Cycle: History, Antiquity and *Fides* in Lambarde’s *Perambulation* and Beyond,” *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 81 (2018): 191–208 at 206–7.

60 *Itinerarium Kambriae*, in *Giraldi Cambrensis Opera vol. vi*, 87–89.

61 London, British Library, Additional MS 43706, fol. 44v.

62 London, British Library, Additional MS 34762, fol. 139v.

63 See, for example, Aberystwyth, National Library of Wales, MS 3024C, fol. 36v.

which he has corrected to “ossis.” He does not add further comment on whether this practice is superstition or strange beyond a simple note of “sayeth *Gyrald.*”⁶⁴ However, by providing that attribution, Lambarde distances himself from an anecdote that could be construed as Catholic or superstitious.

Nowell and Lambarde together develop such finding aids for topographical descriptions, place names, personal names, and historical information. While many of Lambarde’s improvements on Nowell’s annotations are correctives for derisive commentary, many others are simple elaborations. For example, when Giraldus identifies two Merlins in *Itinerarium* and explains the distinctions between them, Nowell writes in the margin, “Merlini duo / Ambrosius et / Calidonus vel Siluestris” (Two Merlins, Ambrosius and Calidonus or Silvester).⁶⁵ Lambarde struck out all the text after “Merlini duo” and then expanded the annotation to include: “Merlin[us] Ambrosi[us] ab / incubo procreat[us] / Merlin[us] Calidoni[us] / Syluestris Scot[us]” (Merlin Ambrosius, generated from an incubus; Merlin Calidonus, of the Scottish woods). Lambarde preserved the comment that there are two Merlins, but elaborated on the distinctions between them. Above these Merlinian annotations, there are place-name notes regarding the mountains of Snowdonia. Nowell noted a river name and a place name, then also wrote “Ereri montes.” *Ereri* is Giraldus’s Latinization of *Eryri*, the Welsh vernacular term for Snowdonia.⁶⁶ In an effort to correctly render the Welsh term, Lambarde wrote just above Nowell’s annotation, “yryi.”⁶⁷ Like the efforts at spelling “Tewdur” noted above, there are several occurrences throughout the manuscript of Nowell and Lambarde together trying to arrive at correct

64 Lambarde, *Dictionarium*, 147.

65 *Itinerarium Cambriae*, in *Giraldi Cambrensis Opera vol. vi*, 133. London, British Library, Additional MS 43706, fol. 59v.

66 “Snowdonia” derives from Old English for “snow hill.” “Eryri” is related to the Welsh term for “eagle.”

67 Neil Weijer notes in his discussion of Lambarde’s reading habits that annotations on place names and etymologies are common across numerous manuscripts and printed books in his collections. See Weijer, “Gathering Places: William Lambarde’s Reading,” 140.

vernacular spellings of place names. Giraldus offers little by way of assistance in this area since he tends to Latinize vernacular spellings or simply use available Latin terminology where possible. These efforts provide a window into their process of collocating corresponding information across a broader spectrum of manuscripts seen or gathered. Nowell and Lambarde appear to seek out the vernaculars elsewhere and apply them to the margins of [La.]. Such practices evade our modern assumptions regarding the division between medieval and early modern textual production, a bias that James Simpson suggests was propagated by sixteenth-century scholars themselves. Simpson argues that “when we draw lines sharply between periods whole unto themselves *wherever we draw the line*, we are already falling victim to the logic of the revolutionary moment” of sixteenth-century antiquarians.⁶⁸ As Brackmann argues, these assumptions are further complicated by the biased notion that manuscripts are medieval and that the printed text was the medium of the Renaissance.⁶⁹ [La.] navigates the in-between, incorporating information from printed works and other manuscripts alike into the margins of a medieval text adapted by Nowell himself.

Nowell would later use these researched vernacular terms for his production of the British map for Cecil.⁷⁰ In that map, Nowell freely mixes Anglicized and vernacular place names. The lack of a visually discernable border between Wales and England emphasizes the English nationalist perception of a united Britain. Nowell separates Scotland by specifically naming it in large red letters.⁷¹ Lambarde also found use for much of the material they gathered from Giraldus for his *Dictionarium*. While the apparent focus

68 James Simpson, “Diachronic History and the Shortcomings of Medieval Studies,” *Reading the Medieval in Early Modern England*, ed. David Matthews and Gordon McMullan (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 17–30 at 26.

69 Brackmann, *The Elizabethan Invention of England*, 7.

70 London, British Library, Additional MS 62540, fols. 3v–4r.

71 For a more detailed description of the map, see Peter Barber, “A Tudor Mystery: Laurence Nowell’s Map of England and Ireland,” *Map Collector* 22 (1983): 16–21. Of particular interest is the depiction of two figures in the bottom corners of the map, believed to be Nowell and his patron William Cecil.

of Lambarde's scribal work in [La.] is the cultivation of finding aids and the categorization of information, he expresses his own irritation with Giraldus's frequent digressions on miracles and saints in the *Dictionarium*. For example, in Lambarde's description of Llandewi, he writes:

When the great Synode was in *Wales* for the Suppression of the Heresy of *Pelagius*, (which after thopinion of many was of the College of *Bangor*) *David* then Byshop of *Meneven*. (now St. *Davides* of his owne Name) stoade upon a litle Hylle and preached, and during the Sermon the Hill grew sensiblye under his Feete, (sayethe *Gyrald*, for I meane neyther to be Auctor nor Fautor to suche Poetrye) and lifted him up on highe. At which Miracle the hole Company standing amased, elected him tharchebyshop; and *Dubritius*, which was archebyshop of *Caerleon* before, surrendred that Honour to *David*. *Gyrald* that told this Tale had not learned the Lesson, *Mendacem memorem esse oportet*; for the same Itenerarye, wheare he reportethe this, he sayethe, that *Dubritius* resigned to *David* for his Infirmitie, beinge an olde decrepite Man, and that the Honour was translated to *Meneven*. by Favour of Kinge *Arthur*, whose Uncle *David* was, and that was no Miracle at all. I wis his Booke was no so longe that he neaded any mery Tale to refreshe the Reader.⁷²

The Latin "lesson" Lambarde mentions translates to "It is necessary for a liar to have a good memory." Lambarde's irritation here is not just with the Catholic "superstitious" nature of Giraldus's text, but also with the length of *Itinerarium* because of his repetition of anecdotes that often diverge in narrative detail or purpose. Regarding the staff of St. Curig mentioned at the beginning of this article, Lambarde criticizes Giraldus in the *Dictionarium* for so loving such "superstitious Folie" and then laments, "Happie had it bene for *Gyralde*, and profitable to the State of Learninge, if God of his Goodnes had eyther reserved him for these Tymes, or preserved him

⁷² Lambarde, *Dictionarium*, 198.

from those.”⁷³ These are exactly the kinds of comments Nowell leaves in the margins of [La.], where Lambarde remains more narrowly focused on the task of categorization. The conflicts in the margins of [La.] have less to do therefore with disagreement about Giraldus’s Catholic worldview than with the utility of the genre of marginal annotations. Instead, the “superstitious” anecdotes found in Giraldus’s texts about Wales ultimately serve Lambarde’s and Nowell’s own descriptions of space in their other works. The marginal annotations are largely place names, but the anecdotes themselves become mnemonic descriptors for specific locations.

Lambarde’s stringent adherence to categorization and description is indicative of a broader movement in contemporary antiquarian studies. William Keith Hall notes that one of the critical differences between the antiquarians and later historians is the hyper-focused attention to the “discovery and description of the material remains of ancient Britain.”⁷⁴ Such studies arose out of a tradition of chronicle-writing, which was, of course, organized chronologically. Antiquarians such as Nowell and Lambarde transitioned from that model to yet another rigid structure in which evidence was grouped around a place, historical figure, or, again, a year. For Nowell and Lambarde, this meant accumulating lots of information about a specific topic in a narrowly focused way. Chorographical writing saw a resurgence in this period, including Lambarde’s own *Perambulation of Kent* (1576). Even as print technologies advanced, antiquarian historical studies were still largely governed by medieval concepts of space and time as well as medieval usage of manuscripts.

Beyond place names, Nowell and Lambarde gathered historical factual information in the margins. Early in the text of *Descriptio*, Giraldus supplies the numbers of cantrefs and cathedral sees in Wales.⁷⁵ Again making an effort at including vernacular terminology, Nowell wrote “ychelwir” in the

73 Lambarde, *Dictionarium*, 448.

74 William Keith Hall, “From Chronicle to Chorography: Truth, Narrative, and the Antiquarian Enterprise in Renaissance England” (Ph.D. diss., University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1995), 14.

75 *Descriptio Kambriae*, in *Giraldi Cambrensis Opera vol. vi*, 169–70.

margin, which Lambarde then struck out. Apparently misunderstanding that “uchelwyr” is a Welsh term for the assembly of medieval landowners who adjudicated legal disputes in a cantref, Lambarde wrote “Cantharedus quid.”⁷⁶ Lambarde also corrected the number of cantrefs in the primary text to “47,” whereas Nowell did get it right the first time with “54.”⁷⁷ Below these notes, Lambarde also annotated the passage with “Episcopatus . 4 / Meneue[n]sis archiepis: / copatus.” It is unclear whether Lambarde accepted Giraldus at his word that Menevia (the cathedral of St. David’s) was once an archbishopric, but Lambarde did separate it out as an archbishopric without any further comment on the matter. Altogether it is clear that Nowell, in cooperation with Lambarde, attempted to collect useful historical data in the margins for later use.

To this point the examples provided merely hint at a unidirectional workflow. There is substantial evidence to suggest the manuscript went back and forth between the two antiquarians as they more fully developed the marginalia and corrected the primary text. For example, on folio 20r, there are overlaps in an annotation of the descenders on the “p” in “Radulphus” and the “G” in “Glanvill,” both of which are in Nowell’s hand, with an additional annotation from Lambarde identifying the “Iusticier[us] Anglia” (Justiciar of England). Nowell added to Lambarde’s annotation with the name of the justiciar, writing just above it and in such close proximity that he left the overlaps. In other words, the manuscript may have originated with Nowell, but it was then passed to Lambarde, who marked it up and then returned it to Nowell. The manuscript likely moved between them multiple times. Weijer made note of similar marginal and primary text conflicts in other manuscripts shared by these two antiquarians, often over attributions or spellings, and for the sake of cross-referencing with other texts.⁷⁸ Some of Lambarde’s corrections were made after Nowell’s

76 London, British Library, Additional MS 43706, fol. 4v. See Adam Chapman, “Rebels, Uchelwyr and Parvenu: Welsh Knights in the Fourteenth Century,” in *The Soldier Experience in the Fourteenth Century*, ed. Adrian R. Bell and Anne Curry (Rochester, NY: Boydell & Brewer, 2017), 145–56.

77 This number is consistent across manuscript copies of the *Descriptio*.

78 Weijer, “Gathering Places: William Lambarde’s Reading,” 141–44.

death, but many more in [La.] demonstrate that the manuscript was an active working copy shared between them. On folio 24v, Lambarde added the annotations “*Diuina vindicta / in posteros*” and “*mulieru[m] malicia*” as well as interlinear corrections to the primary text. Nowell struck out both annotations, though it is unclear why. Both are adequate identifications of the complicated dynastic drama detailed in the primary text, in which the Welsh woman Nest deprived her son of his inheritance because he caught her with a lover and then had the knight beaten and dismissed. Giraldus cites Nest’s actions as demonstrative of the inherent malice of womanly nature.⁷⁹ Nowell additionally struck out one of Lambarde’s interlinear insertions of “*et Gulielmus*” (and William), which is an apparent redundancy of the abbreviated “Guills” (expands to “Guilielmus”) that is already in the line. Lambarde must not have noticed that this was already in the text. Nowell further underlined “Guills, et” for emphasis, probably after striking the interlinear insertion.

These annotations and the back-and-forth revisions to them highlight a critical moment in early modern antiquarian studies. Post-Dissolution, these English scholars were collecting the scraps of the past in order to piece together a coherent history of Britain. Nowell did not limit himself to Old English sources, but instead gathered together a variety of kinds of texts. Together Nowell and Lambarde reached beyond even Giraldus’s works to seek out the Welsh vernacular terminology and spellings for personal names, legal terms, and place names. The fruits of this labor are apparent in the map Nowell prepared for Cecil, in which Wales is not its own country but instead a region within the domain of England. Nowell’s work on historical topography would later be superseded by William Camden’s expansive chorographical work *Britannia*, but Nowell’s manuscripts demonstrate that he was thinking transhistorically and spatially at an early point in antiquarian studies. Despite the incredulity of annotations such as “superstitio” and “ridiculum,” it is evident that Nowell and Lambarde recognized the value of Giraldus’s marvelous anecdotes precisely because they function

79 *Itinerarium Kambriae*, in *Giraldi Cambrensis Opera vol. vi*, 28–30. This narrative history must have attracted Lambarde’s attention in the long term. He included it in his *Dictionarium* with his notes on Brecon. See p. 41 in Fletcher Gyles’s print edition.

as descriptors of space in Wales. The dismissive attitude points to Nowell distancing himself not from the Middle Ages exactly, but from the biblical timeline that informs the construction of medieval histories. Together this thinking forward toward spatial history and rejection of earlier religiously-inflected histories reflect Nowell's transitional position between the earliest antiquarians and the seventeenth-century evolutions of the genre.⁸⁰ Many of his contemporaries, such as William Salesbury and Matthew Parker, focused their efforts on Roman and Celtic sources, but Nowell united those studies with his own interests in Old English materials to cultivate a broader understanding of medieval history. Genealogy and topography guided such humanist efforts at reconstructing the past, and [La.] demonstrates a step in that process.

This composite manuscript reveals not only the continuance of the text, but the continuance of the manuscript tradition and scribal practices associated with it. Nowell and Lambarde act as scribes, annotators, and readers, contributing their reading of Giraldus as an authority to their textual interpretation in [La.]. They adapt and alter the primary texts as necessary for their process of cultivating a history of Britain. While Nowell is best known for his work on Old English, it is evident from [La.] that he sought more broadly a history of the whole island. Nowell and Lambarde were part of the burgeoning antiquarian tradition, but they straddle two periods by juxtaposing medieval scribal practices with early modern perceptions of the past. The historians and antiquarians of the sixteenth century cultivated the idea of a medieval past, which largely came to define their own early modern present. This concept of a medieval period is defined less by temporal distance or a difference in material scholarly methodologies, but instead more so by the break from Rome. All that is pre-Tudor and Catholic received the label of "medieval" in Britain. However, the evidence of [La.] demonstrates sixteenth-century material practices of scholarship had not yet changed in a meaningful way despite the advent of the printing press.

80 The first generation of antiquarians includes Polydore Vergil (1470–1555), John Leland (1503–1552), and John Bale (1495–1563).

Attention to Nowell's and Lambarde's shared efforts at developing the Geraldine texts through numerous revisions reveals not only how their working relationship operated, but also the living nature of Giraldus's work. The *Itinerarium* and *Descriptio* were not yet static products to be studied, but instead working documents to be adapted and enhanced.