A Question of Plagiarism: The 'Harrison Chapters' in Sir Thomas Smith's *De Republica Anglorum*

Author(s): Mary Dewar

Source: *The Historical Journal*, Vol. 22, No. 4 (Dec., 1979), pp. 921-929

Published by: [Cambridge University Press](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2638693>

Accessed: 31/01/2014 10:26

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Cambridge University Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Historical Journal*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

COMMUNICATIONS

A QUESTION OF PLAGIARISM: THE 'HARRISON CHAPTERS' IN SIR THOMAS SMITH'S *DE REPUBLICA ANGLORUM*

MARY DEWAR

University of Texas at Austin

The *De republica Anglorum* was written by Sir Thomas Smith during his embassy to France in the years 1562–5. He dates the book in the last chapter: 'I have declared summarily as it were in a chart or mappe . . . the forme and manner of the government of Englande . . . as Englande standeth and is governed at this day the xxviii of March Anno 1565.' In April 1565 he wrote to his friend Walter Haddon that the work, divided into three books, was 'unfinished'; 'they still lie among the rough scrawls of my notebooks; when they have been fully written out and given to the world in book form, I shall send them to you'. There were, he continues, 'gaps and a few points not filled in, because I brought with me not a single book and had no men of law to consult. Accordingly I have written only as much as was supplied by my memory, for the time being, of matters I had seen or read. Those parts that are imperfect I shall be able to complete at my leisure when I have returned home.'¹ Despite these good intentions the book was not published until 1583, six years after Sir Thomas's death and eighteen years after it had been written. During that time it had circulated in manuscript; the publisher in his preface commented ruefully that the text had suffered from the 'errors and rashnes of Scribes, appearing in the contrarietie and corruption of coppies, happening both by the length of time sithens the first making, as also by the often transcribing'.

One reader in particular was ready to point out more than errors. Four years later, in 1587, William Harrison published the second edition of his *Description of England*, which had first appeared in Holinshed's *Chronicles* in 1577. In this second edition Harrison adds a chapter on parliament, borrowing freely from the relevant chapter in the *De republica Anglorum* and stating pointedly that he was describing parliamentary procedures 'as Sir Thomas Smith doth deliver and set them down, whose only direction I use, and almost word for word, in this chapter, requiting him with the like borrowage as he hath used toward me in his discourse of the sundry degrees of estates in the commonwealth of England,

¹ The letter, written in Latin, is printed in Haddon's *Lucubrationes*. It is translated in L. Alston's introduction to his edition of the *De republica Anglorum* (Cambridge, 1906), xiii–iv. Page references to the *De republica* will be to this edition which gives the text of the first printed edition of 1583. The Alston edition was reproduced in photolithographic facsimile by the Irish University Press, 1972.

which (as I hope) shall be no discredit to his travail'.² The section from which Harrison accused Smith of borrowing was Harrison's chapter v, 'of degrees of People in the Commonwealth of England', which appears in an unquestionably recognizable form as chapters 17–24 of Book I of the *De republica Anglorum*. That one author has borrowed from the other is clear but it has been difficult to establish the exact circumstances in which this piece of literary piracy could have taken place. The accepted story has been that of Alston, that Smith or even 'the editorial hand that prepared the work for publication after Smith's death', added these Harrison chapters to an existing Book I after reading the newly published *Description* in 1577, that he abandoned some original chapters and took 'unusual trouble in the rearrangement' of the work, weaving the additional material into the original MS with 'considerable literary ability' and 'occasional literary improvements'.³ These possibilities put forward in 1906 were more or less followed by the most recent Harrison editor in 1968 who suggested that Smith 'revised the work during the lingering illness that terminated in his death on August 12, 1577. He may have survived long enough to see Holinshed in print, or Harrison may have showed him a draft of the chapter, since he was Chancellor of the Order of the Garter on which Harrison here discourses at length'.⁴

None of these scenarios can be sustained. However early in 1577 *The description of England* was published; it is scarcely feasible to imagine Smith improving the Harrison passages and weaving them into a revised manuscript in the few months before his death on 12 August. Throughout the previous year the fatal illness, which had forced his reluctant retirement from public life in the spring of 1576, took an increasing and disabling hold. His usual prolific letter writing ceased and there are no letters to be found after a bleak short note to his friend Thynne in September 1576. Here he says that he has found 'no ease at all to any part of my grief', and it is clear that he was in constant pain and weakness, still unable to speak or sleep.⁵ It is almost impossible to imagine him six or more months later busily revising the *De republica*. What energies he had were occupied with defending his title to his property and safeguarding his affairs against legal troubles which tormented his last enfeebled year. It was over a year earlier, in the spring of 1576, that he had contemplated revising some of his old books 'made in my youth' and since 'lost'.⁶ There are a few pages in a notebook of that year pointing to an effort to revise a little treatise on the wages of a Roman footsoldier, and there is a strong possibility that he revised another work of his sometime in the early 1570s,⁷ but no trace exists anywhere in his papers of any revision of the *De republica Anglorum*.

There is moreover overwhelming textual evidence that the *De republica* was never revised by Smith. When Alston suggested that such a revision may have taken place only two manuscript copies of the work were known.⁸ The discovery

² William Harrison, *The description of England*, 2nd edn, 1587 (ed. Georges Edelen, Ithaca, N.Y., 1968), 152.

³ Alston, op. cit. xvii.

⁴ *The description of England* (ed. Edelen), 94, n. 1.

⁵ M. Dewar, *Sir Thomas Smith: A Tudor intellectual in office* (London, 1964), ch. xvi.

⁶ Ibid. 188.

⁷ M. Dewar (ed.), *A discourse of the commonweal of this realm of England* (Charlottesville, 1969), xxvi.

⁸ BL. Harl. 1130 and Trinity College, Cambridge, MS 1504.

of others⁹ has thrown new light on the text. All the manuscripts can be shown to pre-date the first published edition of 1583. None of them has the Table of Contents printed in the 1583 edition, nor any of the later 'new additions' of the 1589 edition, nor the frequent marginalia found in all the printed editions. None shows all the extremely numerous textual additions, omissions, corrections and re-phrasings only found in the 1583 edition. All these manuscripts however share certain readings not found in the printed edition which reveal unmistakable signs of deriving from a rough, unfinished, unrevised original manuscript. They all, for example, leave several blank spaces in the text or leave the same sentences unfinished at places where the original manuscript must have been left blank by Smith when he was unsure of exact information. One such example can be found in chapter 12, Book II, where the printed edition of 1583 finishes a paragraph on the judges with the words: '...and others to the number of sixe or more, which have each an ordinarie fee or stipend of the Prince'. All the MSS read: '...and others to the nombre of.... These hath eche an ordinarie fee or stipende of the Prince, the two the chiefe th' one to the some of..., th'other to the summe of... The rest... a piece.' Clearly Smith meant to fill in the details of the judges' fees later and never did so. The editor of the printed edition of 1583 did not know the information and abandoned the sentence midway. There are many similar blanks in the text common to all these early manuscripts. Occasionally the editor of the 1583 edition fills in the missing information; more often the sentence is fudged and phrases are omitted to conceal the gaps. It is obvious that the most superficial attempts by Smith to revise the work would have dealt with these blank spaces in the text. Moreover, all these early manuscripts share the same slipshod errors, mistakes of the pen, and muddled sentences which were promptly altered in the printed edition where an unmistakably recognizable hand is at work throughout, tidying up the text in a very consistent fashion. These manuscripts vary widely from one another at many points; the clerks transcribed freely, often carelessly, sometimes greatly altering the text. Where, however, all these manuscripts share a common reading, which in turn is not found in the 1583 edition, it is proper to assume that they agree because they are all copying, at one or more removes, the original wording of Smith's manuscript. It is here that the manuscripts throw a new light on the Harrison-Smith 'borrowage', for all these early manuscripts, and therefore Smith's original text of 1565, have these 'Harrison Chapters', which were first printed in Harrison's book in 1577.

That Smith should have had the Harrison material so early is doubly surprising. We have Smith's own comment that he lacked books and other sources in France and also Harrison's dedication to his book in 1577, which refers to it having only recently been written. However, we know that Harrison took his *Description* from an earlier larger work, his *Chronology*, and we have evidence from his own statements that he was working on this as early as the 1560s.¹⁰

We can dismiss promptly any suggestion that Harrison may have copied the

⁹ Notably: BL Add. 44047, fos. 1-51; P.R.O., S.P. 15/12/47 fos. 106-40; BL Lansd. 121, fos. 30-33 (incomplete); Bodleian Library, Tanner MS 253, fos. 1-46, and Rawlinson MS D 96; MS belonging to the Earl of St Germans, Port Eliot, in a book belonging to Sir John Eliot, fos. 97-129; MS belonging to Mr Moir (incomplete). These MSS have been collated for a study of the *De republica Anglorum* that in these stringent times has not yet been published.

¹⁰ Edelen, op. cit. xviii; 5; 23, n. 17; 70, n. 10.

section on the social classes from an early manuscript of Smith's.¹¹ The question of priority remains unchanged; for a detailed examination of the Harrison material and of the *De republica* chapters shows beyond doubt that Smith took the Harrison text from a manuscript, before the first printed edition of 1577, and added to it himself. Not only do the changes show unmistakable stylistic signs of Smith's own hand, but there are several passages which he and he alone with his particular interests would insert and on which he would be tempted to elaborate.¹² In several instances this is merely a question of Smith qualifying an original Harrison sentence with further legal or technical information, e.g. in chapter 17, Book I, Harrison, discussing the creation of honours, writes: '... which with the title of that honour, is alwaies given to him and his herres, males onely'. All the *De republica* manuscripts¹² and the 1583 edition have a cautious qualification: '... which with the title of that honour is commonly (but not alwayes) given to him and his heires, males onely'. Sometimes Smith adds an extra informative detail. Thus in the same chapter Harrison has the general statement: '... no man is created baron except he maie fullie mainteine and beare out his countenance and port'. The *De republica* manuscripts and the 1583 edition add the more specific '... no man is created barron excepte he may dispend of yearley revenue,¹³ one thousand poundes or one thousand marks at the least'. This particular sentence can serve to illustrate a further conclusion for which there is much other evidence, namely that Harrison never saw any of Smith's emendations in manuscript before the publication of *The description* in 1577. The 1577 edition has none of the Smith additions found in the manuscripts, but as soon as Harrison saw the published 1583 edition of the *De republica* he approved of many of Smith's emendations and they duly appear in his 1587 edition. Thus this particular minor sentence appears in the 1587 edition in an extended version: 'Also in England no man is commonly created baron except he may dispend of yearly revenue £1,000, or so much as may fully maintain and bear out his countenance and port.'

Harrison's priority is even more apparent in those sections where Smith produces an elaborate sentence which has been clearly triggered by a shorter comment of Harrison. In the passage on yeomen, Harrison ends with the telling phrase, 'these were they that in times past made all France afraid'. Smith gives a much lengthier analysis of yeoman status and in his account of their military prowess writes: 'These were the good archers in times past, and the stable troupe of footmen that affraide all France, that would rather die all, than once abandon the knight or gentleman their Captaine. . . .' Equally when the second edition of Harrison is compared with the first we find that after 'These were they that made all France afraid' Harrison in 1587 adds 'And albeit they be not called master as gentlemen are or sir, as to knights appertaineth, but only John and Thomas

¹¹ A suggestion which Alston considered but qualified as 'Possibly but not probably'.

¹² All extracts from the *De republica* which follow are from my unpublished text reflecting the agreement of all the manuscripts and therefore, as has been argued, Smith's original MS, not the amended printed version of the 1583 edition. All extracts from the second edition of *The description* are from Edelen's edition. Most of the extracts from the first edition of *The description* can be found in Alston's Appendix B or in the edition by F. J. Furnivall for the New Shakespere Society (4 parts, 1877-1908) where most of the changes made in the second edition can also be conveniently followed.

¹³ The Trinity MS reads 'valewe' for 'revenue'.

etc.', which is a brief summary of Smith's long-winded passage beginning 'These be not called masters. . .',¹⁴ inserted into the original Harrison version.

Smith's wider knowledge of classical law and authors tempted him frequently to expand or qualify a Harrison sentence. When Harrison is comparing English titles to Roman ones he says simply, 'the title of nobilitie as we use to call it in England "corresponds" to the *Roman Patricii*'. Smith, in chapter 17, elaborates: '... *Patricii*: When patricii did betoken *Senatores aut senatorium filios*. Afterwards they were called *clarissimi*. *Census Senatorius* was in Rome at diverse times diverse....' Frequently Smith parallels a Latin phrase of Harrison's with the Greek equivalent. Often large sections are added by Smith, elaborating in lengthy academic fashion certain linguistic details (which always tempted his ready pen), giving more historical information, interpolating comment on monetary matters (which always preoccupied him), giving references to his own past writings or referring to forthcoming passages in the *De republica* itself. A passage which illustrates almost all these ways in which Smith added to the Harrison text can be found in chapter 18. In the *Description* Harrison writes: 'The number of the knights in Rome was uncerteine: and so it is of knights with us as at the pleasure of the prince. We call him knight in English that the French calleth Chevalier.' The corresponding passage in the *De republica* reads:

The number of Equites was uncertaine, and so is¹⁵ of knightes, at the pleasure of the prince. *Equites Romani* had *equum publicum*. The knightes of England have not so, but finde their own horse themselves in peace-time.¹⁶ *Census equester* was among the Romans at¹⁷ diverse times at diverse valewe;¹⁸ whosoever may dispende of his free landes 40 sterling of yearely renew, by an olde law of Englande either at the coronation of the prince¹⁹ or mariage²⁰ of his daughter, or at the making²¹ of the prince, knight, or some such great occasion, may be by the King compelled to take that order and honour, or to pay a fine, which many not so desirous of honour as of riches, had rather do.²² Some who for causes be²³ not thought worthy of that honour and yet have abilitie,²⁴ neither be made knightes though they would and yet pay the fine. XL sterling, at that time when this order began, maketh now CXX²⁵ of currant mony of Englande: as I have more at large declared in my booke of the diversitie of Standardes or the valor of monies.

When the Romanes did write *senatus populusque Romanus*, they seemed to make but two orders, that is of the Senate and of the people of Rome, and so in the name of the people they contained *equites* and *plebem*: so we in England do say the Lordes and the commons, the knights, esquires, and other gentlemen, with citizens, burgesses and yeomen be accounted to make the commons. In making²⁶ of lawes the senate of Lordes of England is one house, where the Archbishoppes and Bishops also be, and the king or Queene for the time being as chiefe: the Knights and all the rest of the gentlemen,²⁷ citizens and burgesses which be admitted to consult upon the greatest affaires of the Realme be in an other house by themselves, and that is called the house of the commons, as we shal more clearly describe when we shall²⁸ speake of the parliament. Whereupon this worde knightie is derived and whether it do betoken no more but that which *miles* doth in latine which is a souldier.²⁹ The word souldier now seemeth to come of sould and payment, and more

¹⁴ Alston, 43.

¹⁶ and most usually in warres (added 1583).

¹⁸ but in England (added 1583).

²⁰ at the marriage (1583).

²² disburse (1583).

²⁴ that abilitie (1583).

²⁶ ordaining (1583).

²⁸ shall *omitted* (1583).

²⁹ might be moved as a question (added 1583).

¹⁵ it is (1583 edn).

¹⁷ of (1583).

¹⁹ king (1583).

²¹ dubbing (1583).

²³ ar[e] (1583).

²⁵ an CXX (1583).

²⁷ and (added 1583).

to betoken a waged or hyred man to fight than otherwise, yet *Cesar* in his Commentaries called *soldures* in the tongue gallois, men who devoted and swore themselves to a certaine band or othe, one to another and the captaine,³⁰ which order if the Almaines did follow, it may be that they who were not hyred but being of the nation, uppon their owne charges and for their advauncement, and by such common oth, execration³¹ or band did follow the warres, were possibly called knightes or milites. Nowe³² among the Almaines some are called lance knight as souldiers of their band not hyred, although now³³ they be fore the most part hirelings. Or peradventure it may be that they which were next about the prince as his garde or ³⁴ servauntes picked and chosen men out of the rest being called in the Almaine language, *knighten*, which is as much to say as servantes: these men being found of good service, the word afterward was taken for an honor, and for him who maketh profession of armes. Our language is so changed that I dare make no judgement thereof. Now we call him knight in english that the french calleth chevalier . . .

This long insertion, so unmistakably from Smith's own pen, emerges much condensed, with all the personal references to his own writings, etc., removed and none of the long-winded digression, in the 1587 Harrison edition between the two original sentences of the Harrison first edition as:

And whereas the *equites Romani* had *equum publicum* of custom bestowed upon them, the knights of England have not so but bear their own charges in that also, as in other kind of furniture, as armory meet for their defense and service. This nevertheless is certain, that whoso may dispend £40 by the year of free land, either at the coronation of the King or marriage of his daughter or time of his dubbing, may be enforced unto the taking of that degree or otherwise pay the revenues of his land for one year which is only £40 by an old proportion and so for a time be acquitted of that title.

It should be noted that here, as everywhere else, Harrison is obviously condensing from the printed 1583 *De republica*, using words found there which were not in Smith's original manuscript but which were substituted by the 1583 editor, as for instance 'dubbing' for 'making' and 'king' for 'prince'.

This particular long insertion was at least informative, but frequently Smith padded out the Harrison sentences with turgid platitudinous moralizing of the type so frequently encountered in his letters. In this same chapter, Harrison had two brief sentences: 'This order seemeth to answer in part to that which the Romans called *Equitum Romanorum*. For as *Equites Romani* were chosen *Ex censu*, that is according to their substance and riches; so be the knights in England.' Smith, never loathe to make ten words do the work of one, elaborated the passage as follows:

That³⁵ order seemeth to aunswere in part to that which the Romanes called *Equites Romanos*, differing in some pointes, and agreeing in other, as their commonwealth and ours do differ and agree; for never in all pointes one commonwealth doth agree with another, no nor long time any one commonwealth with it selfe. For al chaungeth continually to more or lesse, and still to diverse and diverse orders, as the diversitie of times do present occasion, and the mutabilitie of mens wittes doth invent and assay newe ways, to reforme and amende that wherein they do find fault. *Equites Romani* were chosen *ex censu*, that is according to their substance and riches.

When meeting this type of addition to his original text, Harrison invariably ignored it: we do not find this passage, condensed or otherwise, in Harrison's second edition.

³⁰ to the captaine (1583).

³² milites and nowe (1583).

³⁴ and (1583).

³¹ execration omitted (1583).

³³ at this daye for now (1583).

³⁵ And that (1583).

In chapters 20 and 21 of the *De republica* Smith added enormously to the Harrison text and adapted it more freely than elsewhere. In turn in the 1587 edition, Harrison altered his original passages rather more than usual and incorporated many of the Smith additions. The passages are too long to quote in full from each of the three texts,³⁶ but the following examples may be noted. It is here that Smith adds 'Appios' to Harrison's 1577 list of Latin names, an addition which appears in the 1587 edition, though others, added by Smith, are ignored. It is here that the well-known *De republica* passage occurs:

For whosoever studieth the lawes of the realme, who studieth in the universities, who professeth liberall sciences, and to be shorte who can live idly and without manuell labour, and will beare the port, charge and countenance of a gentleman he shall be called master, for that is the title which men give to esquires and other gentlemen, and shall be taken for a gentleman. . .

This echoes the 1577 Harrison text very closely:

Whosoever studieth the lawes of the realme, who so studieth in the Universitie or professeth Physicke and the liberall Sciences, or beside his service in the rowme of a capitaine in the warres, can live ydely and without manuell labour, and thereto is able and will beare the port, charge and countenance of a gentleman, he shall be called Master (which is the title that men give to Esquires and Gentlemenne) and reputed for a Gentleman. . .

It is just before this passage, which he copied so closely, that Smith originated the famous phrase, 'for as for gentlemen, they be made good cheape in England', a phrase which Harrison clearly noted with approval as in 1587 he himself added some words about gentlemen 'being made so good cheap'. In this chapter Smith had also added a scornful passage detailing the role which heralds played in the making of new gentlemen: '(and if neede be) a king of Heraulds shal also give him for mony, armes newly made and invented, which the title shall beare that the said Herauld hath perused and seen olde Registers where his auncestors in times past had borne the same'.³⁷ This passage Harrison inserted in his 1587 edition in a condensed and altered form: 'he shall for money have a coat and arms bestowed upon him by heralds (who in the charter of the same do of custom pretend antiquity and service)'. Not only can there be no doubt from many examples such as these that the Smith text lies mid-way between the two Harrison texts, with Harrison frequently profiting, though, as we have seen, with discretion, from Smith's amendments, but a close examination of all three texts shows that Smith's 'original' manuscript was much closer to Harrison's 1577 wording than was the 1583 printed edition of the *De republica*. Whoever prepared the 1583 edition went through these 'Harrison Chapters' in exactly the same way as he altered the rest of Smith's manuscript, tidying up sentences, omitting words and phrases which he felt to be unnecessary, adding the occasional explanatory or qualifying phrase if he felt the text called for it, substituting his more favoured longer latinized word, if he preferred it to Smith's original one, all alterations which are found consistently throughout the *De republica* and reveal a very recognizable 'improving' hand with its own

³⁶ Cf. *De republica*, Book I, chs 20–21 (Alston, 38–41), the 1577 Harrison version (ibid., App. B, 171–2), and the 1587 Harrison text (Edelen, pp. 113–14).

³⁷ The 1583 edition reads 'the title whereof shall pretende to have been found by the sayd Herauld in perusing and viewing of olde registers' and has 'bin recorded to beare' for 'borne' (Alston, p. 40).

characteristic style. There are many examples of this closeness of Smith's original manuscript reading to the Harrison text, a few of which may be cited:

(1) P.³⁸ 31, l. 11. All the *De republica* MSS have the Harrison 'or burgesses' after 'citizens', which is omitted in the 1583 edition.

(2) P. 31, l. 20. All the MSS read, as does Harrison, 'or highest in succession'. Only the 1583 edition has 'as highest and next'.

(3) P. 32, l. 11. All the MSS have the Harrison 'degree' for the 'dignitie' of the 1583 edition.

(4) P. 32, l. 8. All the MSS have the Harrison '... to none of lower degree than barrons, yet by law and use these be not esteemed barons'. Only the 1583 edition adds after 'than barrons' the phrase 'excepting such onely, as be thereunto by some speciall office called'.

(5) P. 32, l. 12. After 'nobilitie', all the MSS have the Harrison phrase 'as we use to call it in England', which is omitted by the 1583 edition.

(6) P. 46, l. 11. All the MSS have after 'yeomen' the phrase 'thei are faine to make their enquests', copying the Harrison 'they are faine to make up their inquests'. The 1583 edition alone reads 'enquests and Juries are impaneled'.

(7) P. 38, l. 2. In the section 'Of Esquires', the *De republica* MSS all have the phrase 'being taught in armes' echoing the Harrison phrase 'being instructed in armes', which is omitted by the 1583 edition.

There is therefore no doubt that Smith, writing in the 1560s, was drawing, and drawing heavily, on an early manuscript of Harrison's *Description of England*. This conclusion disposes of one minor difficulty which has been raised in the discussion of this problem, namely the 'strange fact' that Smith should have copied Harrison's account of the Order of the Garter so faithfully when Smith as Chancellor of the Order 'presumably knew more about it than Harrison'.³⁹ Smith was not Chancellor till the '70s and in the '60s would have had no particular knowledge of the subject and no reason not to copy Harrison on this point as he had on so many others.

We are left with the still unanswered question of the way in which Smith came to have this Harrison manuscript in the 1560s and still need to explain why he felt so free to incorporate such a large section of it in his own book. Smith clearly had all or part of the early Chronology manuscript from which *The description* came,⁴⁰ despite his complaint that he lacked 'books' in France. We know that it was customary for such unpublished manuscripts to circulate among people with similar interests, for them to be copied, and frequently to be incorporated in other works with or without acknowledgement. Harrison himself had incorporated into *The description* much material from Jewel's *Apology of the Church of England*, for which in turn he may well have been the unacknowledged author of the Appendix.⁴¹ Indeed the geniality of Harrison's comment on Smith's 'borrowage' reveals the ease with which such usage prevailed. It is quite possible that Harrison himself had offered Smith the manuscript. They lived very close to one another; Harrison was rector of Radwinter in Essex from 1558 to his death and

³⁸ Page and line references to Alston.

³⁹ Alston, xxi.

⁴⁰ Professor Elton informs me that a manuscript of the Chronology, until recently thought lost (Edelen, xviii, n. 3), has been discovered by Mr Glyn Parry, Cambridge University, England, who is currently at work on it.

⁴¹ Ibid. 23, n. 17.

from 1571 was also vicar of Wimbish, both parishes being near to Smith's Essex house at Theydon Mount, near Saffron Walden. In the '60s and '70s Harrison was an official of the Archdeacon of Colchester's court, which met regularly either at Saffron Walden or Radwinter.⁴² Smith served as a justice of the peace on Essex commissions with great regularity and took part in local activities in Saffron Walden where his family had for long been prominent. The two men had friends in common and shared the same antiquarian interests. Above all it is very likely that Smith as well as Harrison knew the London printer, Reginald Wolfe, who originally planned the Holinshed *Chronicles* in which *The description* appeared. Wolfe had spent over twenty-five years before his death in 1573 gathering contributors and collecting manuscripts for a great project which he had envisaged, entitled *The universall cosmographie of the whole world*. Harrison knew Wolfe personally,⁴³ and we have Holinshed's testimony that Wolfe sent manuscripts to him and other authors when they were writing scripts which Wolfe intended to use in his *Cosmographie*. Indeed, as Mr Edelen has pointed out, Harrison expressly states that 'he had access to the materials which Wolfe had assembled for this project: in *The description of Britain* he mentions a map 'which I had sometime of Reginald Wolfe' and Wolfe's 'great card, not yet finished nor likely to be published'.⁴⁴ Wolfe was one of Queen Elizabeth's printers and a master of the stationers' company. Smith must have been acquainted with Wolfe and his project. He had nephews and other close relatives in the stationers' company. The publisher of Smith's book on Ireland in 1572 was one of Wolfe's leading apprentices and co-publishers. It should be remembered that there is a hint in the *De republica* that it too was originally intended to be part of a later, larger work. At the end of the book, Smith notes that he has described the commonwealth of England; now 'Let us compare it with commonwealthes, which be at this day in *esse*, or doe remaine discribed in true histories, especially in such pointes wherein the one differeth from the other.'⁴⁵ Perhaps Smith had Wolfe's much publicized larger canvas in mind. He may well have been one of the many writers to whom Wolfe sent other works both in print and manuscript to assist them with their own writings. Since Smith never revised his work and was dead when it was published, any failure to acknowledge such a debt, which appears in sad contrast to Harrison's scrupulous generosity, must be laid at the door of the 1583 editor who, as we have seen, appears to have been totally unaware of Harrison's recently published work and of any necessity to account for the close likeness found in these particular chapters.

⁴² Edelen, p. 25, n. 19.

⁴³ Ibid. p. 416.

⁴⁴ Ibid. p. 404, n. 9.

⁴⁵ The *De republica Anglorum* did appear as part of another larger study in 1592, when Giovanni Botero incorporated it in his *Relatio de regno Angliae*, Part ii of the *Relationi universali* (Ferrara, 1592).