The Evolution of George Hakewill’s Apologie or Declaration of the Power and Providence of God, 1627-1637: Academic Contexts, and Some New Angles from Manuscripts

William Poole

George Hakewill’s An Apologie of the Power and Providence of God in the Government of the World stands in the first rank of philosophical and literary achievement in the early Caroline period. Hakewill first published his long text in 1627, but soon released a slightly expanded edition in 1630 and a greatly expanded one in 1635, adding or Declaration after An Apologie to the title of both new editions. (The revision in the title partially shifts the generic claim from apologia, literally a speech in defence, towards the more affirmative declaratio or declaration.) The first edition was printed by John Lichfield and William Turner, printers to the University of Oxford, and Turner printed the second and third editions too, to be sold by Robert Allott in London. Hakewill’s great work was therefore very much an Oxford publication, and he included in his later editions many testimonials from prominent Oxford academicians. The work grew by accretion from around 500 pages in 1627 to over 1000 in 1635. Discussions of The Apologie have always treated it as a solely vernacular and printed phenomenon, a text in the vein of Robert Burton’s Anatomy of Melancholy (1621), and a prompt for Sir Thomas Browne’s Pseudodoxia Epidemica (1646). All three texts, we may note, went through many authorial revisions. Hakewill proposed that in both the natural and human realms the world underwent cycles of decline and increase, and that therefore modern scholars and writers should not feel necessarily inferior to their ancient forbears. Hakewill is accordingly celebrated today as a modern against the ancients, an anti-Aristotelian, a herald of the new philosophy, and a champion of contemporary literary and intellectual achievement.¹

¹ The following abbreviations are used in the text and the notes:

1627 Hakewill, Apologie (Oxford: John Lichfield and William Turner, 1627) [STC 12611]
1630 Hakewill, Apologie (Oxford: William Turner [for Robert Allott, London], 1630) [STC 12612]
1635 Hakewill, Apologie (Oxford: William Turner [for Robert Allott, London], 1635) [STC 12613]
Sloane Hakewill, Apologie, partial Latin translation, British Library, Sloane MS. 2168

Below, details of publishers have been suppressed for text printed after 1700.

The Evolution of George Hakewill’s *Apologie or Declaration of the Power and Providence of God*, 1627–1637: Academic Contexts, and Some New Angles from Manuscripts

This is not the whole truth. The identification of Hakewill as a modern against the ancients is a somewhat blunt piece of retrospection. His stance on Aristotelianism, for instance, is of the usual complex variety, as Hakewill’s central thesis is a reaffirmation of the changeless Aristotelian heavens, under which sublunary human culture proceeds in cycles, not along unbroken vectors of decline or improvement. From a textual point of view, the assembling of Hakewill’s text was a complex and in places collaborative business; and commentary on Hakewill and his *Apologie* has neglected the evidence that may be gleaned from various extant manuscript portions of the *Apologie*, illuminating different stages in its evolution. The following article will not attempt a direct answer the historical and intellectual questions concerning Hakewill’s modernity, but it will address the immediate academic and political contexts of Hakewill’s work. I will then turn at greater length to the complex evidence for the evolution of the *Apologie* provided by a number of manuscript witnesses hitherto ignored by scholars, especially the abortive Latin translation of the work now in the Sloane manuscripts of the British Library. This article is therefore offered as one half of the textual foundation for a necessary reappraisal of Hakewill’s intellectual position, insofar as manuscript evidence can assist; but the other half, a full collation of the printed editions, is the job of Hakewill’s modern editor, and it is unlikely that Hakewill will find one.

I. Political and Academic Contexts

When George Hakewill (1578-1649) published the first edition of the *Apologie*, he was Archdeacon of Surrey and a benefactor of his old college, Exeter, to which he would be elected Rector in 1642. Hakewill was already a politically notorious figure, and a Calvinist of known volubility. While a student, he had travelled abroad to receive theological instruction at Heidelberg from the prominent Calvinists David Pareus and Abraham Scultetus. He later sent his *Scutum Regium* (1612) to the arch-Calvinist Thomas James, Bodley’s Librarian, with the request that James correct it and see it through the press; Bodley himself and Hakewill were related. Upon the death of Prince Henry in late 1612, Hakewill was appointed chaplain to Prince Charles, and in 1618 there were rumours that Hakewill was to be sent as one of the English delegates to the Synod of Dort. In the event this did not happen, but in the aftermath of the synod, Archbishop Abbot wrote to Sir Dudley Carelton that he wished Hakewill had been sent instead of the eventual Oxford choice, the ‘giddy’ Samuel Ward. But in 1622 Hakewill’s political career imploded when he

---


3 Hakewill to Thomas James, [1611], James’s copy at MS. Ballard 44, ff. 166v–67v. One of Bodley’s executors was George’s brother William Hakewill (1574–1655), the prominent lawyer and antiquary.

presented a manuscript tract against the Spanish Match to his young charge, and was imprisoned by King James as a result. Hakewill was one of a cadre of Calvinist contemporaries from Exeter College ranged around Prince Charles: Thomas Winniffe (1576-1654), John Prideaux (1578-1650), and Lewis Bayly (1575-1631) were all also doctrinal confreres from Exeter. In 1633 Hakewill edited the posthumous works of his friend and neighbour John Downe (1570?-1631), the nephew of John Jewel; he printed examples of Downe’s Latin verse in the *Apologie*. Hakewill acted as executor to his fellow collegian and Calvinist Richard Carpenter (1575-1627), and he encouraged the clergyman William Crompton (1599/1600-1642), who had a brush with Laud following his anti-Popish *St Austins Religion* (1624). Hakewill’s Exeter was thus a hub of Calvinist sentiment, as well as a site of significant linguistic, historical, geographical, and scientific scholarship in the period, as witness the names of Thomas Holland, Sir William Lower, George’s elder brother William Hakewill, Degory Wheare, Nathanael Carpenter, Nicholas Hunt, and Matthias Pasor.

Hakewill also later involved himself in extended controversy with the rising Laudian apologist Peter Heylyn (1600-1662). Heylyn, in the first edition of his *History of St George* (1631), had rubbished Hakewill’s remarks on the saint as a fraud and an Arian in the *Apologie*, Heylyn taking the occasion to swipe at Calvin and John Rainolds too. Heylyn’s support of St George inevitably involved him in some defence of medieval legend and piety, rank superstition to a man of Hakewill’s stamp. Hakewill accordingly took up his pen in response; as the intelligencer Samuel Hartlib slightly inaccurately heard in 1634, ‘Dr Hacket hase written against Heilen, the Historie of S. George and a defence of it but canot get it printed’. In fact, the work had been suppressed by Laud, tipped off by the Oxford Vice-chancellor. The manuscript has subsequently disappeared. But a second Hakewill

---

5 Hakewill’s manuscript is Bodleian MS. Rawlinson D 853, ‘The Wedding R[ing]’, ff. 11r-31r, scribal. Perhaps a tinge of encoded resentment made it into 1635, p. 137, where Hakewill recalls from John Foxe the appearance of an upside-down rainbow upon the Spanish Match – but that of 1554. This very section was noted by one contemporary reader: Sloane MS. 648, ff. 61v-62r, a 1636 paper on mock suns. Compare the notice at Sloane MS. 2927, f. 1r. For Hakewill circulating ‘The Wedding Ring’ to John Prideaux, Rector of Exeter College, ‘which I shall pray you to reade over and Correct as you see cause at your first leasure that soe a faire Copie may bee written out’, see the letter of 11 December 1618 edited in Milton, *British Delegation*, pp. 102-3.


7 1635, sg. c3rv, pp. 288-90, *pace ODNB*, ‘Downe, John’, where it is claimed that none of Downe’s own verse survives. I suspect the ironic verse on p. 15 is his too, as may be the verse inserted in manuscript into *Sloane*, insert to f. 14r (see Appendix). For Downe, see now Jean-Louis Quantin, *The Church of England and Christian Antiquity: The Construction of a Confessional Identity in the Seventeenth Century* (Oxford, 2009), pp. 203-5.

8 It is striking but perhaps coincidental that William Crompton’s (non-ironic) *A Wedding-Ring* (London: Edward Blount, 1632) imitates the title of Hakewill’s earlier (ironically titled) manuscript, and is dedicated to George’s brother William and his wife Elizabeth.


10 *Hartlib Papers* 29/2/5B.

A manuscript against Heylyn has survived, his ‘A dissertation with Dr Heylyn whither ye Eucharist bee a Sacrifice Properly soe termed, and ye according to ye doctrine & practise of the Church of England now in force’. This was written against Heylyn’s *Antidotum Lincolniense* (1637), and was itself finally printed in 1641 after the *de facto* relaxation of press censorship. Yet the printed edition lacks the manuscript’s final clause: ‘resolving with my selfe in things of this nature where lawfull authority Commands, not to dispute but obey’, and hence we may infer clandestine manuscript circulation in the last years of the Laudian regime.  

The Hakewill of the *Apologie*, then, was a Calvinist academician, an able and pugnacious controversialist, but by this date politically frustrated. It is not surprising, therefore, that his *Apologie* was also a controversialist text in origin, taking its cue from an older work written by a philosophically and theologically incompatible contemporary, Godfrey Goodman, raised to the See of Gloucester in 1625. 

A Cambridge-educated cleric in his mid-thirties, Godfrey Goodman (1583-1656) published his *The Fall of Man, or the Corruption of Nature* in 1616, based on sermons delivered at Stapleford Abbots, Essex, and dedicated to Queen Anne of Denmark, who resided at nearby Theobalds, and to whom Goodman was at the time a household chaplain. His medium-sized quarto was well received by its dedicatee, and was reissued in 1618 under the title *The Fall of Man Proved by Reason*, really a resale of the remainder of the 1616 imprint with a new title page, as the skeleton forms in both imprints are exactly the same, give or take some slight wear or movement during the press run, a near-impossibility if the text was actually reset. The much later edition of 1629, now titled *The Fall of Adam from Paradise*, was not quite unauthorized but certainly not encouraged by Goodman, or so he claimed. Nevertheless, as we shall see, there is good reason to suppose that the republication of Goodman in 1629 was a market reaction to Hakewill. But whose reaction was it? That of a canny Stationer, or of Goodman himself? The 1629 book bears a prefatory letter by one ‘R. P.’ – if genuine initials, their possessor remains elusive – in ‘West-Ildesley’ in Berkshire, i.e. West Ilsey, where Goodman had been rector since 1620, and which living he retained *in commendam* after his elevation to Gloucester five years later. R. P. addressed the London publisher ‘T. W.’, indeed the initials in the imprint, explaining that Goodman was willing neither to revise nor to acknowledge the work (‘the worke of a Country Parson, not of a Bishop’), but nor had he fully repudiated its argument. Following R. P.’s advice, T. W. therefore printed after R. P.’s own letter Goodman’s initial rejection to R. P., signed from ‘Wineyard’, 28 February 1629. This, so R. P. had said, would protect both men against the
Bishop’s ‘anger’ at the decision to go ahead with the edition. Goodman himself made no mention of Hakewill, and dismissed the stationer ‘to doe what he please’; the Bishop was now above such youthful diversions. Matters are, however, a little more complex. R. P. in his ‘Letter to the Stationer’ treats the 1629 venture as a new, i.e. reset edition, even though Goodman himself had declined to revise his actual text. But this republication again was really resale, as the skeletons of 1629 once more display exactly the same tiny breaks and fluctuations as 1616/1618, and the errata of 1616/1618 are repeated uncorrected.

Fig. 1. Comparison of the upper section of a skeleton for Goodman in respectively 1616, 1618, 1629. There has been some wear in the course of the imprint, but that each sample was printed using the same skeleton is obvious, as the number of and positioning of the breaks in the inner frame remain constant. This means that a copy bearing the date 1629 may in fact have been printed before many ‘1616’ or ‘1618’ exemplars; likewise the ‘1618’ example below is more worn (the third segment of the inner horizontal rule has started to crack) than the ‘earlier’ and ‘later’ examples on either side. The inner vertical rule also shows significantly more signs of wear in the ‘1618’ example.

---

Goodman, *Fall of Adam* (1629), sgs A1v–2v. The title page of this edition exaggerated in its claim to be based on the text published ‘some twenty yeares since’. It is again a resale of the 1616 textblock, shorn of all material before sg. B and replaced instead with a new title page (A1), with a letter to the stationer on the verso and Goodman’s own letter on A2rv. This conjecture is borne out by the presence of stains in the British Library copy on sg. B1r not communicated to sg. A2v, indication that A and B originate from two separate stocks. That Goodman’s own epistle to the reader (sg. Ff7v) is also still dated 1616 and the errata it identifies uncorrected also suggest that this is a pretty low-effort resale. ‘T. W.’ is unidentified, but Stationer possibilities (from Plomer) are Thomas Walkley, freed 1618, and (from McKerrow) Thomas Weaver, freed 1627, or Thomas Wright, also freed 1627.
This may lead us to suppose that the whole business was booksellers’ sharp practice. But Goodman was indeed rector of West Ilsey, and the Wineyard is again the genuine early modern address for the Bishops of Gloucester. Nor is it likely that a publisher would dare to forge a letter by a living prelate. Goodman, I conclude, really was approached by R. P. from his old parish, whoever that may have been, and to the extent that he did not forbid the edition, he assisted its reappearance on the market two years after Hakewill had first published, and comfortably in time for Hakewill’s expanded second edition. Indeed, as we shall see, Goodman and Hakewill were soon to lock horns in literary combat precisely over their two opposing theses, and I rather suspect that Goodman was in on the whole business, protesting his disinterest but not preventing a fresh publication context for the impending intellectual skirmish. But those identically articulated skeletons suggest that the book did not sell well outside a niche market. The 1616 edition is not terribly rare: counting both its 1616 variants, there are over a dozen copies in the public domain. Yet ESTC is aware of only three copies of the 1618 and a sole copy of the 1629 reissues, so these later issues may be classed as very rare. Nevertheless, surviving copies are often carefully annotated, indication that the work was attentively received, at least in some quarters.

Goodman’s *Fall of Man* supposed that the universe was in decay in the physical, intellectual, and moral realms. The heavens are inconstant, as is man, and both slide daily towards final dissolution; the achievements of the moderns are naught when compared with those of the ancients. Goodman’s text was in origin and in substance a devotional rather than a controversial text. His own preface protested his aversion to print, and his pious hope was that modern printing would devote itself rather to establishing accurate texts of the Fathers than to producing new works (sg. [a7]v). His postscript lamented the typographical blemishes arising from the typesetter’s use of an intermediary scribal manuscript, before making the neat point that in a pamphlet about the necessarily entropic state of all things, textual decay was itself yet another proof of his thesis (sg. [Ff7]v). Goodman claimed to have been working partially from old notes (sg. [a6]r), but his book was not formally directed against any specific publication.

---

16 Two notable copies in the British Library, neither listed in R. C. Alston’s standard *Books with Manuscript* for the British Library (London, 1993): i) British Library 4255.bb.44 (1616 issue [reproduced by Early English Books Online]), ‘Hen: Powil his booke’, ‘Joh: Gough exchangd wth M[]^1 Henry Powell & Alsoe Diverse others [of Powell’s books]’, with frequent and interesting marginalia in Welsh and in English, a good example of a book handed between friends for reflection and annotation; from the dozens of annotations, particularly interesting samples may be found on pp. 1, 50-1, 149, 389, 400, 413, 427, 437-9; and ii) British Library 4256.aa.30 (1629 issue), manuscript verse in endpapers, and throughout many annotations identifying Latin sources or analogues to Goodman’s unreferenced English allusions, most frequently from Lucan, Horace, Juvenal, and Plautus; and the occasional intervention, e.g. ‘Like phantastic Chymists still pursue that, ye realitie whereof was neuer yet discouer’d to mortalitie’ (p. 153) or ‘No Eutopia in this Brittish climat’ (p. 169). The addition to p. 206, a direct emendation of Goodman’s opening prayer to his third part, is an intervention that almost leads one to wonder whether Goodman himself were not marking up this copy for a superior edition. But sourcing allusions was a schoolboy exercise, and the annotator’s verse in the endpapers is most unbishoply. *Inc*. ‘No no I T ell thee noe / Though from thee I must goe’, *expl*. ‘Nere to parte nere to parte / from my deare deare delight’, later set (though with some textual differences) in both John Wilson’s *Cheerful Ayres* (Oxford: Richard Davies, 1660) and Henry Lawes’s *Select Ayres and Dialogues* (London: John Playford, 1669); in both publications the setting is attributed to Nicholas Lanier.

17 Hakewill reversed this claim, countered that the ‘new kind of writing’ offered by the press liberated books from the monkish bondage of manuscript (*1635*, pp. 316-19).
Hakewill was primed to find Goodman’s person and thesis obnoxious. Goodman was not an academician of Hakewill’s stamp. His book was implicitly an attack on academic pride and innovation, and Goodman explicitly repudiated the referencing of other authors, a strategy contrary to Hakewill’s Burtonesque lists of scholars (sg. [a]7r). More importantly, Goodman was ecclesiastically suspect. Goodman was a known sacramentalist, an attitude that informed his anonymously published *The Creatures Praying God, or the Religion of Dumbe Creatures* (1622). His 1626 Passion Sunday sermon before court was ‘supposed to trench too near the borders of popery’ as Peter Heylyn recalled, and he was subsequently denounced by William Prynne.18 Goodman made friends with prominent Catholic converts, and in his own day he was widely suspected for his Catholic sympathies, and, although modern historians quibble the accuracy of the claim, he was said to have died reconciled to Rome.19

Goodman and Laud clashed repeatedly: Laud noted in his diary in May 1640 that Goodman ‘had long before been suspected as inclining to [Pop]ery’, and when Laud tried to dissuade him from protesting against a particularly anti-Catholic canon in the new ecclesiastical canons of 1640, Goodman responded bluntly that ‘he would be torn with wild horses before he would subscribe to that canon’ (he eventually did).20 Indeed, Goodman was so disillusioned that he announced his intention to resign his bishopric, an almost unheard-of notion. Despite modern scepticism, I think that Goodman did indeed die very close to being (until very recently) the only apostate Anglican Bishop since the Reformation. How else are we to understand this sentence in his will? ‘I do acknowledge the Church of Rome to be the Mother Church; and I do verily believe that no other Church hath any Salvation in it, but only so far it concurs with the Faith of the Church of Rome’.21 It may be that this formulation allows the Church of England some *subsidiary* claim to membership of the True Church, but it is obvious where for Goodman final authority lay. Goodman himself was far from anti-scholarly, of course: he borrowed manuscripts from Sir Robert Cotton and at least one from Cotton’s son, and in a rather enlightened move he tried to set up a regional borrowing library for his clergy.22 But it is easy to see that in the Goodman-Hakewill dispute there was much more at stake than merely a philosophical disagreement. Mordechai Feingold is right to call Hakewill’s *Apologie* a ‘bitter attack’.23 This is underscored by the bibliography of the affair: Goodman’s rather stylishly, even wittily written quarto, neither a loud nor a particularly successful venture, is quite flattened by the boisterous, often humourless tread of Hakewill’s heavy folios.

---

19 For some contemporary papers on the matter, see Appendix O of Newcome, *Memos ... of Godfrey Goodman*.
21 Goodman’s will is printed in Newcome, *Memoir ... of Godfrey Goodman*, Appendix P, and see Newcome’s commentary at pp. 84-6. Nicholas Cranfield in *ODNB* concludes his article perhaps overconfidently: ‘There is no evidence that he converted at his death, or earlier, to the Church of Rome.’ Goodman left his books to Trinity College, Cambridge, where some still are; and he desired ‘some Scholar’ to organize and print his literary remains.
Hakewill’s *Apologie* was largely compiled from Hakewill’s own notes, taken ‘longe since in my younger yeares ... for mine owne private exercise and satisfaction’ (1635, sg. b1r; we saw that Goodman made this conventional claim too). But in its printed form, Hakewill was keen to represent himself as a spokesman for a community of scholars. From his first edition, he stated:

*Philosophie* and the *Arts* I must account a part of mine owne profession; and for *Physicke* and the *Lawes*, I haue therein consulted the chiefe, as well in this *Vniuersity*, as out of it, of mine own acquaintance; nay in *History*, the *Mathematiques* and *Divinity* it selfe, I haue not onely had the approbation of the publique professours therein; for the maine points in my booke, which concerne their severall professions, but some pecaes I must acknowledge as receiued from them, which I haue made bold to insert into the body of my discourse. (1627, sg. c2v)

By 1630, he had enlisted testimonials from an extremely impressive roll-call of Oxbridge intellects, even magnanimously/insultingly including Goodman himself. Excerpts – as they had accumulated by 1635 – were printed from the testimonials of James Ussher, Archbishop of Armagh; Francis Godwin, Bishop of Hereford; Samuel Fell, Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity; John Morris, Regius Professor of Hebrew; Edward Lapworth, Sedleian Professor of Natural Philosophy; Thomas Clayton, Regius Professor of Medicine; John Bainbridge, Savilian Professor of Astronomy; Henry Briggs, Savilian Professor of Geometry; Degory Wheare, Camden Professor of History; and the grand old man of Oxford science, Thomas Allen, Principal of Gloucester Hall, at the time of writing in his nineties, and who would not live to see Hakewill’s third edition. From Cambridge Hakewill could muster commendatory verse from Roger Gosteyk or Gostwick, S.T.B., the translator of Amandus Polanus on predestination; and from John Downe, also S.T.B., Hakewill’s friend and neighbour. All of these testimonial and pieces of verse bespeak support for Hakewill’s work at the highest academic levels, and Hakewill obviously collected up sought and unsought epistolary testimonials for his new edition. Ussher, for one, certainly knew Hakewill personally. Francis Godwin had also sent along his own brief paper on the Roman sesterce, and Hakewill printed this, in different locations, in both 1630 (at the end) and 1635 (near the beginning). Fell of Christ Church was theologically congenial. Lapworth had probably been at Exeter with Hakewill. Wheare was a fellow there from 1602 to 1608. Some of these men indeed contributed to the main text of the *Apologie*: John Bainbridge provided a short paper in English on the ‘supposed removeall of the Sun’ (1635, pp. 107-8); Thomas Clayton wrote on Lemnian terra sigillata (p. 167; cf. p. 229, and the Appendix here, insert 24); Henry Briggs contributed a Latin paper on inventions discovered by the moderns and unknown to

---


25 See the letter in Ussher, *Works*, vol. xv, p. 417 (Hakewill to Ussher, 16 July 1628). It should also be stated that Goodman and Ussher corresponded too: see Ussher, *Works*, vol. xvi, pp. 154-5.

26 ‘He contributed Latin poems to collective university and college volumes, mainly celebrating royal occasions, but otherwise published only a professorial address and a sermon, *Primitiae, sive, Oratio habita Oxoniæ in schola theologica nono Novembris, et concio latina ad baccalaureos die cinerum*, in 1627. In the address he claimed the professor should fight the sworn enemies of the church, including the reigning Antichrist, the raging Jesuit and the plotting Pelagian.’ (*ODNB*)
the ancients (pp. 301–2); Hakewill also included a letter on phlebotomy from John Diodati to Sir Richard Anderson; and an anonymous letter on Gloucestriersh fossils from around 1634 was included too (pp. 228–9, 242–3).27

Perhaps not all of these men were exactly aligned with Hakewill. Bainbridge, for instance, as Adam Apt notes, ‘clearly accepted the modern view that comets were supra-lunar, and condemned “Those Philosophers, who still walke in the way of the Gentiles, are afraide to induce generation, or any other mutation into the heavens, rather choosing to follow their blinde guide [Aristotle].” […]’; he was not a proponent of Ptolemy’s geocentric universe; and he maintained an ambivalent view of astrology, for the early book contains certain “Morall prognosticks of applications of the late comet or blazing-starre”.28 Whereas Goodman was impressed by the appearance of new stars in the firmament, Hakewill bluntly countered that such stars were either due to the supernatural intervention of God for the purpose of warning, or were atmospheric (therefore sub-lunar) phenomena wrongly interpreted. Hence the famous 1572 nova was for Hakewill a divine portent of the St Bartholomew’s Day Massacre (1635, pp. 87–8); but the Star of Bethlehem was a sublunary phenomenon merely in the likeness of a star. In these matters, Hakewill was resolutely Aristotelian, and anti-Copernican. In 1635, Hakewill supplied two testimonials before the new Book Five, one signed by J. E., ‘a Revered Prelate of this Church, well knowne for his many and excellent workes published to the view of the world’; and the other by K. D., a ‘Noble Knight’ famous abroad and at home (1635, sg. Aaaa3r). These testimonials make it clear that Hakewill had circulated substantial portions of the new books in manuscript, soliciting comment and advice. J. E. is most probably John Everard (1584–1640/41), whose notorious Arriereban (1618), a sermon against the Spanish interest, and his subsequent imprisonment, would have endeared him to the similarly-disgraced Hakewill; K. D. is obviously Sir Kenelm Digby (1603–65). Yet Digby’s extant letter to Hakewill, though extremely supportive of his labours, is scarcely a document of unequivocal intellectual support. Digby argued against Hakewill that the earth was slowly drying out under the heat of the sun, and would at length ignite by natural causes at the Conflagration.29 Hakewill also explicitly included an ‘objection’ sent by a ‘friend’ concerning the Roman monarchy, which he then answered; and later he printed and answered another letter of a ‘worthy friend’ on the interpretation of Romans 8, possibly John Downe again, as the redacted letter is signed ‘I. D.’ (1635, pp. 201–2, 574–80).30 But despite such examples, the overwhelming impression Hakewill’s text gives, and was intended to give, is of heavyweight academic solidarity – this was the early Caroline Vindiciæ Academiarum, writ on a massive scale.

27 Briggs’s insert was picked up on and discussed by John Pell in a letter to Charles Cavendish in 1648 (Noel Malcolm and Jacqueline Stedall, John Pell (1611–1685) and His Correspondence with Sir Charles Cavendish: The Mental World of an Early Modern Mathematician (Oxford, 2005), pp. 517–18). See also Feingold, Mathematician’s Apprenticeship, pp. 57, 72, 137 n. 82, 141, 148.


30 Downe also refers to Hakewill’s arguments ‘partly in your printed Apology, partly in your manuscript against Suares’ (1635, p. 574).
The reception of the Apologie lies largely outside the scope of this article. But the Apologie made a significant enough impression to merit substantial augmentation and republication. The major augmentation occurred between 1630 and 1635, as Hakewill added two very substantial books to the four of 1627 and 1630. 1635 was rightly felt by Hakewill to have superseded previous editions, and it was this edition, therefore, which he presented to the Bodleian, with an inscription emphasizing his blood relation to Bodley himself. 1635 thereafter in many libraries gradually replaced the earlier editions, although copies of 1630 remained relatively popular. The new, separately paginated Book Five consisted of objections in italic by G. G., and responses in roman by G. H., i.e. Goodman and Hakewill (pp. 1–226). Book Six was a similarly miscellaneous collection, consisting of answers to five specific questions, but this time not in the form of attributed animadversions, and containing a great deal of long, verbatim reedition from other sources.

Goodman and Hakewill both supplied prefaces to Hakewill’s fifth book, and these shed light upon the chronology of their manuscript exchanges. Goodman explains that he read Hakewill’s book and wrote to him ‘a little complaining, [whereupon] Mr Archdeacon did invite me very lovingly to reply’. Goodman did so, and Hakewill subsequently split Goodman’s responses up into ‘Sections’, ‘which caused mee to add marginal notes’. Goodman here means the superscript numeration that Hakewill added to Goodman’s paragraphs, to which he then replied by number; Goodman’s marginal notes supply clarifying glosses. Hakewill’s preface offers a more complex narrative. Hakewill invited Goodman’s rebuttal as a private scholarly exchange. But twelve months after his initial invitation, he received ‘neare about the time that my second impression was finished’ ‘a long treatise’, which he desired to be published with Hakewill’s comments. After Hakewill had set to work composing his half of the debate Goodman suddenly ‘cancell[ed]’ his original text, ‘as being of little moment’. Goodman was not backing out altogether: indeed, he

31 For some useful notes on expansions between 1627 and 1630, and between 1630 and 1635, see Harris, All Coherence Gone, p. 209, nn. 2, 3. As a bibliographical side-note, printer’s copy and proof-sheets of fragments of Hakewill have survived: see J. K. Moore, Primary Materials Relating to Copy and Print in English Books of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries (Oxford, 1992), locations at pp. 17, 73, 78.

32 O 2.12 Th, inscribed in Hakewill’s hand on the verso of the fly-leaf, ‘Bibliotheca publica Oxoniensis, fundatoris Conterraneus, Conciuis et Consanguineus libri huius author D. D.’ Hakewill also donated to the Bodleian ‘the Jesuits Pyramis’ in 1632 (W. D. Macray, Annals of the Bodleian Library, 2nd edn (Oxford, 1890), p. 76). This was presumably some kind of obelisk, for looking at the accounts for 1631–2 we can see an expense of 6d for ‘a table for the Jesuits Pyramis giuen by D’ Hakewyle’ (Bodleian MS. Lib. recs. c. 8, f. 73r). Here we may note the following local examples of Hakewill’s autograph: Hakewill to Prideaux, 1618, Exeter College Archives A.II.19; MS. Tanner 314, f. 204r (undated donum dedit inscription); MS. Rawlinson D 933 (Album Amicorum of Johannes Hoffman), p. 66: ‘Durate et vosmet rebus servate secundis’, ‘scribebam Oxoniij in testimoniu benevolentia erga honestum et doctum Juuenem a patria exulantem. 1624. Georgius Hakewill.’ He has a rather distinctive italic ‘e’.

33 For example British Library C.111.g.2 (1630) bears the note that it was sold by New College Library, Oxford, for 5s to one of the fellows, Richard Traffles, in 1692; whereas New College still holds 1635 (BT 3.81.17). But Cambridge University Library holds no fewer than five editions of 1630, as opposed to one of 1627 and two of 1635. Some of the Cambridge University Library 1630 editions are diocesan library copies, and one such copy of 1635 was donated to Ely Cathedral Library by a canon there in as late as 1732 (Ely b. 45).
immediately sent ‘fresh supplies three or four several times’, which Hakewill replied to and returned. Goodman suggested that Hakewill publish some of their exchanges, and he acquiesced when Hakewill said he would publish all – all, that is, that appears in 1635. If Hakewill is to be believed, then, Goodman formalized his initial epistolary animadversions into one text around 1629–30. Hakewill had already formulated matching objections to the initial epistles. Goodman then abandoned this stabilization, reverting to piecemeal exchanges in three or four main packets. So Goodman’s input switched from distinct objections gathered in letters, to formalized tract, and then back to objections in letters. Although the exchange is apparently polite – ‘pij Adversarij’ – the combatants could not resist a dig or two: Goodman protested that he was confuting that most notorious Aristotelian heresy, ‘the eternity of the world’, thereby implying that Hakewill’s Apologie tended in no other direction; and Hakewill, rebuffing this, disingenuously thanked the rather pompous Goodman for ‘stooping so low’ as to enter the lists with a mere Archdeacon (all quotations from sgs. Aaaa1r–Aaaa2r).

III. Manuscripts

It is obvious from what has been said above that manuscript exchange played an important part in the development of Hakewill’s Apologie. Hakewill asked for and received several expert opinions, which he printed. He solicited and collected epistolary reactions to his work at all stages, and included a selection of extracts in the later printed editions. He sustained a long correspondence with Goodman himself, and redacted a good deal of it in 1635. But it is also obvious that not everything he received went into 1635. His testimonials were mere snippets, and he claimed he had received others. He also stated that he had cut some of the Goodman–Hakewill material at Goodman’s request ‘or by vertue of a generall Commission’, whatever that ambiguous statement covers (sg. Aaaa2v). The letters of Everard and Digby too show that Hakewill circulated Books Four and Five in manuscript, and as we know he received Goodman’s animadversions in three or four packets (and this after the abortive first strain of their correspondence), it is reasonable to enquire if any of these documents still exist.

Further testimonials to Hakewill have not come to light, with the exception of that of the obscure alchemical scribe Theodoricus Gravius, to be discussed below. But three manuscripts of parts of the Apologie do survive, and they cast new light on the nature and fortunes of Hakewill’s text. I shall appraise these three manuscripts separately, but in sum they are: 1) Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS. Ashmole 1284, a fair text of six exchanges between ‘G’ and ‘H’; 2) Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS. Ashmole 1510, a fair text of the first section of the published Book Five; 3) London, British Library, Sloane MS. 2168, an incomplete Latin translation of the Apologie. These are increasingly complex documents.

1. **MS. Ashmole 1284.** This manuscript contains three items, originally distinct, but bound together in one volume in Elias Ashmole’s time (many other Ashmole manuscripts, conversely, are nineteenth-century gatherings of originally disbound or dissociated materials). The first and second items (John Rainolds’s ‘A defence of the judgment of the reformed Churches that a man may lawfully not only put away his wife for adulterye but also marrye an other’; and an anonymous ‘De Regula theologicae veritatis’) are in different hands,
neither belonging to the scribe of the third and shortest item, ‘An Appendix of D’ Hackwells Anwere to the Bpp of Glocesters Reasons’ (ff. 148r-61v). This text consists of six exchanges, numbered 14-19, and arranged as ‘G’ versus ‘H’ paragraphs. The numeration is interesting, because the manuscript is fair, scribal, and therefore working from an exemplar that either included or respected the existence of a prior set of exchanges numbered 1-13 (and possibly 20 onwards). But 1635 contains no numeration of exchanges at all, nor upon counting up the extant sections does any obvious hiatus open at a fourteenth point. The mere numeration of this manuscript, therefore, points to a complex manuscript tradition behind or alongside 1635 now only partially visible, and the absence of any material in 1635 corresponding to the contents of this ‘Appendix’ confirms that the content of the fifth book of 1635, as I earlier proposed, does not represent the entirety of the Goodman-Hakewill exchanges. These Ashmole exchanges, therefore, embody either a stage from the original set of exchanges that Goodman worked into a treatise and then scrapped; or a later stage, either received but not included by Hakewill before 1635, or received after publication. At any rate, this manuscript, scribe unknown, may be added to the sum of Hakewill’s text, but there is not much more that can be said for sure.

2. MS. Ashmole 1510. We can infer more from this next manuscript, not least because its scribe can be identified. This calf-bound folio contains a fair text in a fine hand of the Goodman-Hakewill exchanges largely corresponding to the first section of the published Book Five. The text occupies only the first 101 pages of the manuscript (following the original inked pagination), roughly a quarter of the available paper; the rest of the manuscript is blank. Various factors show that this manuscript represents a separate and earlier text from the one finally printed, and that the scribe was nonetheless working from an exemplar that was itself a complete literary document. There are a number of simple errors of transcription. The manuscript also omits one entire exchange relatively early on in the printed set. Most importantly the animadversion ending ‘of the elements or elementarie bodies’ (MS, p. 99; 1635, p. 67) is immediately followed in 1635 by the next animadversion from G.G., ‘As to my former reasons ...’, itself followed by Hakewill’s very long response, which concludes this section of Book Five. But in the manuscript, it is placed after a closing paragraph which commences ‘I have now done with mine answere to your Arguments, soe as I may truly profess I have satisfied my selfe & I hope your Lordship if you will be satisfied with reason.’ This MS postscript is deferred in 1635 until the end of Hakewill’s answer to the ‘new’ G. G. objection tacked on after this conclusion in the

34 Hakewill was a fan of Rainolds, however, praising him as ‘a living librarie, or third university’ on account of his prodigious skill in the art of memory (1635, p. 254). Rainold’s text here is another example of parallel economies in manuscript and print: it is a scribal text made from a printed edition of Rainolds’s controversial pamphlet in favour of divorce on the grounds of adultery (see ODNB).

35 It is theoretically possible, but unlikely, that this manuscript is a literary imitation of the Goodman-Hakewill debate.

36 E.g. ‘That the heavens are the circumference of this world we see ...’ (1635, p. 16) is truncated to ‘The heavens are the circumference of the world we see ...’ (MS, p. 21); and the heading ‘Out of the Metaphysics ...’ (1635, p. 11) becomes ‘But of the Metaphysicks’ (MS, p. 13).

37 1635’s exchange ‘G. G. / As in Logick ...’ to [G.H.]: ‘... then humane art can reach unto’ (pp. 7-9) is absent in MS.
manuscript, but there lacking Hakewill’s long retort. So the manuscript version represents the first section of the 1635 Book Five in a state just prior to that represented by the printed version, lacking one incidental exchange, and originally concluding one exchange earlier. That the scribe could acquire Goodman’s next animadversion but not Hakewill’s long answer – and Hakewill was effectively the editor of the correspondence – presents us with a further problem, to which a solution will be suggested below.

What is the date of this manuscript, and can its provenance be established? First, as this manuscript contains an early version of the first section of Book Five, and as Hakewill makes it clear that this was also the first section to be composed, its exemplar must date from the point after Goodman scrapped his first set of notes to Hakewill and supplied fresh ones, and after Hakewill had composed his responses. We may place this in or just after 1631. The text in hand must therefore have been copied from an original manuscript between then and 1635. The scribe must then have had access to a subsequent piece of the correspondence, which he started to write at the end of his text. He either lacked Hakewill’s response, or never got round to writing it down. At any rate, the scribe stopped just short of the ‘complete’ set of initial exchanges, although he had omitted an earlier exchange too.

The scribe of Ashmole 1510 has been identified as Theodoricus Gravius. As Gravius spent most of his adult life in England working as a chymist, scribe, and ecclesiastic, it is a shame that he has been overlooked by all biographical dictionaries, and I have accordingly assembled a short biography elsewhere, and the reader is referred there for fuller detail. Here we can summarize that Theodoricus Gravius (fl. 1600-61), German by birth and education, a refugee of the Thirty Years War, sought personal and intellectual sanctuary in England, where he worked as a laboratory assistant to the physician and astrologer Richard Napier (1559-1634), rector of Great Linford. Gravius was in the end to succeed to Napier’s post. Napier and Hakewill were acquainted – both were Exeter men – and Napier sent Gravius to Oxford for a visit with a recommendation letter addressed to Hakewill. Gravius therefore presumably became aware of Hakewill and his Apology through Napier some time around 1630. He read the book and then opened a correspondence with Hakewill himself, planning a trip to Oxford. We do not know what became of his meeting with Hakewill, but it is reasonable to conjecture that this was the conduit through which Gravius obtained access to Hakewill’s version of the Goodman-Hakewill correspondence in the form edited by Hakewill himself for circulation. Gravius may even have copied the contents of this manuscript during his visit to Oxford, as this would explain why he could conclude with one Goodman objection but no Hakewill response. Hakewill had only just received Goodman’s letter, and Gravius was given access to it before Hakewill had prepared his reply.

Gravius’s own interest here was primarily chymical. He saw in Hakewill an ally against a common (Aristotelian) enemy. But Hakewill was an ally not entirely aligned with Gravius’s own interests: the former indeed praised some aspects of the modern ‘Chymiques, Hermetiques, or Paracelsians’, but criticized their arrogance, and their over-confident

rejection of ancient authority (1635, p. 276). Gravius styled himself in his exile in England as an academic nomad who had long rejected his Aristotelian origins, and he interpreted this as Hakewill’s intellectual position too; they were moderns against the ancients, even if their modernity slightly differed. So while Gravius’s text does not shed much light on the argumentation of 1635, it does prove that Hakewill, as we inferred from 1635 above, had edited the Goodman-Hakewill exchanges (arriving in ‘three or four’ segments from Goodman) into a coherent literary document, conscious of its opening and of its conclusion. Certain readers who obtained this text obtained subsequent pieces of the correspondence too. So ‘Book Five’ circulated before the publication of 1635, and in (various?) provisional forms, as opposed to fragments.

3. Sloane MS. 2168. The most interesting and complex manuscript is a large folio in the Sloane collection comprising a translation of the Apologie into Latin, breaking off towards the end of Book Four.41 (I will call this manuscript Sloane from now on.) Indeed, the ‘vernacular’ Apologie was so stuffed with Latin quotation from both ancient and modern authors, usually then translated into English and hence offering the same data twice, that the exercise of rendering a uniformly Latin text was in one sense an economizing move. Sloane comprises a fair text in a good but unknown scribal hand, emended in many places by a second hand. The manuscript also contains many additional slips pasted onto the sides of various folios. These slips are mainly in the second hand too, and comparison between this hand and the extant samples of Hakewill’s autograph shows that the second hand is that of Hakewill himself. Indeed, Hakewill takes over from his scribe on a page-turn and mid-sentence (f. 359rv). This hitherto unnoticed fact renders Sloane a crucial document for the elucidation of Hakewill’s developing intentions for the Apologie.

We know from a letter to Archbishop Ussher that such a Latin text once existed: Henry Bourchier, the fifth Earl of Bath, told Ussher in 1653 that Hakewill’s nephew and ‘Neighbour Minister’ ‘Willett’ had translated the Apologie into Latin at some unspecified date.

41 The manuscript has been mounted leaf by leaf on stubs by modern curators and bound (1974) in the standard modern Sloane MS. style, so the codicology of the original manuscript would be troublesome to establish. The watermark is unsurprising, a standard French pot, but the paper stock varies slightly, the pot now surmounted by a half moon, now by grapes. Sloane’s original accession protocols are on f. π1v, being MS. 2021, then MS. A 538. We can use the initial MS. number to find the original entry for the manuscript in Sloane’s own accession register, now Sloane MS. 3972B, where it is listed on f. 165v by title, but with no identification of author or any further information. Sloane’s manuscript acquisitions were only entered in batches, but we may note a large number of medical and chemical acquisitions in this vicinity, many by the Elizabethan and Jacobean writer Sir Hugh Plat. Now Plat’s manuscripts went through the hands of Thomas Hodges, Dean of Hereford, before being acquired by Sloane, so it is just possible that the Hakewill MS. may have come via Hodges too, although I can see no obvious connection between the Hakewills and Hodges. Thomas Hodges died in 1672, and Sloane presumably acquired his manuscripts through his son Nathaniel Hodges, a sometime member of the Oxford experimental philosophy club and in the Restoration a well-known F.R.C.P.; Nathaniel, however, died in 1688, so there may have been a further intermediary between the younger Hodges and Sloane. At any rate, Hodges’s ownership of the Plat manuscripts is beyond doubt, as his own autograph indexes to the latter survive in the Sloane manuscripts too (Sloane MSS 2242, 2243).
date, ‘and desyres that it may be printed’. 42 (Willett presumably lived by Hakewill in Heanton Punchardon, or nearby larger Barnstaple, to the south–west.) Bourchier had asked the London entrepreneur Cornelius Bee, ‘who is now the greatest undertaker in that kinde’, to take on the work, and requested Ussher to lend his support, but the venture, despite Bee’s prominence as a publisher in the 1650s, never saw the light. 43 It is tempting to identify the Willett in question as also son or a nephew of the prominent controversialist and biblical commentator Andrew Willet (1561/2–1621); certainly Hakewill and Willet senior would have found each other theologically and politically congenial. But Willet senior’s children appear to have taken up livings in the eastern counties, and could not be described as neighbours let alone nephews–by–marriage to Hakewill. 44 Far more plausible is Henry Willett, born in Exeter and matriculated at Exeter College in 1625 aged 17; he was a fellow of the college from 1624 to 1652, proceeding through B.A., M.A., and B.D. 45 This supposition is all but confirmed by Hakewill’s will, in which he bequeathed to ‘my Nephew Henry Willett’ six pounds, the remainder of another sum due to Hakewill, the ‘reparacions of the Vicarige house of Kidlington’, minus debts to Exeter College, a separate bequest of twenty pounds, and, most interestingly, ‘all the bookes and bedding with all the furniture of the Chamber which lately belonged to my deere Sonne John Hackwill Fellow of Execter Colledge, And all other such things as were his and left in the said Colledge’. Hakewill therefore lost a cherished son, and transferred some of his affection to his nephew. 46 Willett,
therefore, was a favoured son of one of Hakewill’s sisters. The pedigree established for the Hakewills in the heraldic Visitation of Devon in 1620 furnishes the required genealogy: in addition to his brothers William and John, George had a sister Elizabeth, who first married one Nicholas Chappell in 1601/2 and subsequently one ‘Henry Willet of Exeter’. (These Willets or Willetts were not themselves armigerous.)\(^47\) Now ‘Ellyzabethe Chappell’ had married ‘Henrye Wyllett’ on 28 September 1605, in St Kerrian’s, Exeter, and to them was subsequently born a son ‘Hendry Willit’, baptized 5 November 1607, again in St Kerrian’s.\(^48\) This boy is the Hendry or Henry who inherited a large sum of money and his cousin’s books, who also apparently translated, or at least assisted with the translation of, his uncle’s \emph{Apologie}, and who was trying to get it printed in the 1650s.

The relation of \emph{Sloane} to Willett’s translation cannot be established with certainty, but a few conjectures will be presented later. But first, an exhaustive analysis of the relation of the inserts to the text of 1635 will help us to work out where \emph{Sloane} fits in the history of the text of the \emph{Apologie}.

What is the relation of \emph{Sloane} to the printed English texts of the \emph{Apologie}? The first thing to note is that \emph{Sloane} commences as a translation of 1630. If it were a simple translation of 1635, then there would be no need for many of the additions. But this is an incomplete translation, breaking off in Book Four, Chapter Eleven, section nine; a substantial portion of Book Four is therefore missing, as well as all of the lengthy Books Five and Six added to 1635. The translation also concludes with a later note stating how far the translation had progressed, and the page numbers cited in that note correspond to 1635.\(^49\) This note, as it is in a hand other than that of the main scribe of \emph{Sloane}, cannot of itself prove that the Latin translator himself had at some point switched from 1630 to 1635 as his base text, but it shows that a near-contemporary appraiser of the state of \emph{Sloane} examined it in relation to 1635, not to 1630.

The first hypothesis, then, might be that \emph{Sloane} represents a base text translated from 1630 but with the additions made for 1635 translated from English into Latin and pasted in. This would signal that this manuscript represents the abortive attempt to publish a Latin text of the \emph{Apologie} for an international audience, and that the translation effort straddled the publication of 1635. About half of the inserts might support this interpretation (from now on bold numbers are keyed to the list in the appendix, where full explanations are given): nos 1, 10, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 20, 22, 25, 29, 31, 33, 35, 36, 37, 40, 41, 42, 44, 45, 46, 49, 51, 52, 53, 54, 56, 57, 58 (30 in total). But why only half of the inserts, if \emph{Sloane}’s reviser was tied to the English text of 1635? If the revision of \emph{Sloane} was undertaken solely to coordinate it with the new 1635, then all of the inserts should perform that task.

The next logical hypothesis is that only a half-showing of additions suggests that \emph{Sloane} in its revised state represents a text more advanced than 1635, descending from it but with subsequent additions. But this immediately involves us in a further problem: if \emph{Sloane} descended from 1635, why does its organization show traces of the obsolete 1630, and not exclusively of 1635?

Before we grasp that nettle, it might be that \emph{Sloane} in its revised form represents a stage between 1630 and 1635, as it is of course predictable that an intermediary text would contain


\(^{48}\) Data from the \emph{International Genealogical Index} (http://www.familysearch.org/eng/default.asp).

\(^{49}\) \emph{Sloane}, ff. 362v–63r (‘S27: pag.’).
only some of 1635’s additions. Again there is a quantity of evidence that might support this new hypothesis. 3-5a, b, for instance, show a series of additions that are then emended by 1635, which deletes one but adds two new texts. 6 and 8 can also be enlisted for such a model. 30 is an example of an addition that was also incorporated by 1635, but very slightly repositioned in the printed text. So 1635 in these cases appears to post-date Sloane. But the problem here is the same as before: what are we to do with all the other additions that supersede 1635? Nevertheless, that such seemingly intermediary additions exist at all is problematic: there are at least some cases where the inserts have not progressed as far as the final 1635 text, and this is puzzling if the additions as an entire class cannot sustain the intermediary hypothesis.

On balance it would seem that Sloane is a later, not an earlier, text than 1635. Many of the remaining additions support this third hypothesis. If we consider 2, for example, the insert adds material that does not appear in 1635, which does however mirror the base text of Sloane. The marginales likewise makes no English appearance in 1635. Insert 26 stands next to material in the base text not included in 1635 and then adds to it material on Old Parr explicitly dated 1635 in the margin of the insert; that both the base text and the insert diverge from 1635 in this way is very close to a proof that the both systems must post-date 1635. Indeed, that Old Parr died only in mid-November of this year and that Hakewill acknowledges the death renders this conclusion irresistible. Other examples of additions that have no representation in 1635 are 9, 11, 13, 18, 28, 39, 43, 50, some complex, as the individual analyses presented in the appendix show.

The question then, is why Sloane contains additions that are unaware of further additions made for 1635; and additions that are themselves additions to 1635? In order to consider this problem, we will need to examine the remaining exceptions with care. Two cautionary predictions may be made: first, we are dealing with a Latin text, and the switch in language may itself have dictated revision to any English base text; and secondly, we are dealing with a lengthy work, and it is quite plausible that the transition to Latin overlapped with the transformation of the English text, and that Sloane therefore can have no simple linear relationship to the English texts of the Apologie. A stemmatic treatment in this case is therefore unlikely to succeed.

The examples unsatisfied above elaborate such predictions. 21, for instance, details English verse suppressed and replaced with a bland Latin prose filler, exactly the behaviour one might expect from a translator converting English prose with some vernacular poetic embellishments into Latin prose for an audience who could not be counted on to understand English verse. In complement, 38 adds a Graecismus unavailable in English. 19 is a marginales that is an insertion nested in a series of fair-copy insertions, none of which appear in 1635, so not only the insertion but the base text itself of Sloane is here more advanced than 1635. 23 affords us a useful fact: 1630 cannot be the base text of (all of) Sloane, because in 1630 there is no such chapter to which such an addition could be made. And, to make matters more complex, 1635 itself does not follow the ordering of the insert itself, so not only must both Sloane and its inserts at this point represent a state of the Apologie later than 1630, but also one (in this locale at least) earlier than or at least ignored by 1635. 24 again is added at a point that does not exist in 1630. 27 shows a decision to split up one section into two, a decision not followed by 1635. 47 causes some fascinating problems. Here, 1635 incorporates this insert in English, but not a good deal of the surrounding material in Sloane – an indication that 1635 had advanced beyond 1630, but that Sloane simultaneously rejected such advances and yet adopted the addition. This is further evidence that monolinear models for this text’s development are not going to meet with success. 48 offers ambiguous evidence, where the names of the chronologers Wolphius and Petavius have been added as an interlinear annotation to Sloane, and were also included in 1635 as additions to the list found in 1630. This may reflect on-the-spot revision to Sloane by collation with 1635 or its subtending manuscript/marked-up 1630; or independent revision to Sloane which was then subsequently transferred to 1635. Some discrepancies are merely puzzling, for instance 32, where the addition to Sloane is mirrored by 1635 which nonetheless fails to mention the octo
The only additions not discussed above are **40** (ripped out), **59** (unkeyed and apparently not included in 1635), and **60** (the continuation in Hakewill’s hand until the manuscript breaks off).

**pedes** of the insert – something that can only mean either that 1635 dropped the detail for no good reason, or that **Sloane** rechecked the reference and added it.

In short, the total field of evidence is in excess of any one ‘clean’ hypothesis that describes the relation of **Sloane** to 1635, and this must mean that **Sloane** was raised from a text that was itself unstable. Nevertheless, the bulk of the evidence presented above suggests that **Sloane** is a later and an improved version of the **Apologie** than 1635. Two final pieces of evidence corroborate this. In 1635 the letter sent to Hakewill by a certain friend on the giants’ bones found near Gloucester is undated. But in **Sloane** insert 34 the bones were found ‘circa annum 1634’, a date that places **Sloane** either uncomfortably close to the printing of 1635, or subsequent to it. That the final additions to **Sloane** must largely be subsequent is proved by **55**, where an entire section taken from Henry Welby, but unwitnessed in 1635, is added to the base text. Now the pamphlet from which this derives was only published in 1637, *The Phoenix of these Late Times, or, The Life of Mr Henry Welby Esq.* (cited as ‘Phænix nostrorum temporum’ in **Sloane**, and it seems unlikely that we are dealing with a further manuscript here).

Some individual pieces of evidence presented above are ambiguous. But when all the inserts are considered as an assemblage, certain conclusions are unavoidable. First, **Sloane** does not stand in any simple linear relation to any of the printed texts of the **Apologie**. Rather, it was a manuscript active from some time before the publication of 1635 to some time after it. We know that it was commenced before, as many of the inserts parallel material that was added to 1630 to produce 1635; and we know that it was abandoned after 1635 as it incorporates material printed in as late as 1637. The final additions to **Sloane** would surely have made it into the next planned edition. Turning to external considerations, we also know that a Latin text was undertaken by Henry Willett. This text was known to exist in 1653 and believed to be complete. It is reasonable to assume that Willett, close at hand, was working at Hakewill’s request or permission, and given the size and complexity of the task and hence the inherent implausibility of two independent ventures, I propose that this is indeed some version of Willett’s text, and that he was translating under the supervision of Hakewill. As we noted, the additions to **Sloane** are largely in Hakewill’s own hand, and so Willett most probably commenced a basic translation working from printed copies, and Hakewill tinkered with his evolving manuscript. It is also possible, we must concede, that this manuscript is not Willett’s attempt, because it is not complete, although it is worth speculating that Hakewill may have planned a text for continental consumption shorn of the Goodman–Hakewill disputes. But as the reviser is certainly Hakewill, **Sloane** represents the most advanced text of most of Books One to Four of Hakewill’s **Apologie** that has survived. Hakewill also had a hand in translating his own text, and it is possible that Willett or whoever wrote out the base text of **Sloane** was merely a scribe; that the manuscript concludes in Hakewill’s hand – taking over on a page-break mid-sentence, indeed rather odd if the scribe was also the translator – supports this alternative hypothesis. Perhaps Willett later exaggerated his own input? **Sloane** also proves that Hakewill’s **Apologie** metamorphosed into a Latin text while it was also assuming its final, slightly independent vernacular form. It appears that Hakewill eventually added solely in Latin and solely to the Latin version, and this can only point to his alas unrealized intention to publish a final Latin text for an international audience. It is unlikely that a modern edition of Hakewill will be attempted, but **Sloane** must now be considered as a crucial witness to the textual evolution of the **Apologie**, and the best record of Hakewill’s final intentions for that text to survive. The **Apologie**, so long celebrated as one of the finest achievements of early Caroline philosophy and a monument of English prose, must now also be recognized as a contribution to bilingual Anglophone/Latinate culture – not simply Hakewill’s **Apologie**, then, but his **Apologia**,
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*sive Declaratio Potentiae ac Providentiae Divinae in Regimine Mundi*. What is puzzling, as Bourchier was complaining in the 1650s, is why the *Apologia* was not published, and possibly not even completed. Perhaps, nearing the conclusion of the fourth version of a massive text, Hakewill, nearing his sixtieth birthday, tired. Or perhaps *Sloane* represents the text in an iteration just prior to the (complete) text held later by Cornelius Bee in the 1650s, and the fault lies with the publisher, not the author. But that a Latin text of a ‘modernist’ work was undertaken and almost completed should not surprise us, and we may compare an interesting moment within the *Apologie* itself where on the same page Hakewill both wishes that someone would translate Richard Hakluyt’s *Principall Navigations* into Latin for a learned audience, and that a public (and presumably vernacular) lecture be set up in London for the training of actual seafaring navigators.51

IV. Some conclusions

This article has first canvassed the political and academic circumstances of the initial publication of the *Apologie*, and secondly meditated upon the implications of treating this work as a partially printed, partially manuscript, partially English, partially Latin phenomenon. While some of my conclusions are based on non-exhaustive study – *Sloane* really needs to be retranslated word-for-word against 1630 and 1635, a head-breaking undertaking – I hope that a few are firm enough. First, Hakewill’s *Apologie* obviously developed out of an academic, polemic context that encouraged Hakewill to display his text as a heavily ‘sponsored’ venture, one inviting the attention or participation of other prominent academicians. Secondly, this development entailed a complex interplay of printed texts and manuscript letters, commentaries, and revisions, and some of these manuscript materials are still visible today. Thirdly, Hakewill’s decision to print his subsequent debate with Goodman forced him to freeze into one state what was in reality a set of different exchanges, including aborted and excised trajectories, again witnessed by manuscript survivals. Finally, the Latin version preserved in the uncompleted, perhaps abandoned *Sloane*, replete with cancellations, interlinear and marginal additions, and paste-ins, shows in one manuscript the gradual metamorphosis of a Latin text from the status of translation to the status of prime witness. And this in a quintessentially ‘modern’ text! In this, the bilingual textual complexity of Hakewill’s *Apologie* may be compared to Bacon’s own *Advancement of Learning/De augmentis scientiarum*. All the scattered evidences that in concert comprise Hakewill’s *Apologie/Apologia*, in conclusion, show us, more than most analogous texts do, the importance of models of process over product when we are analysing encyclopedic texts, and this is also an observation about the inevitable textual instabilities that certain genres provoke.52

51 1635, p. 311.
52 Hakewill’s *Apologie* is not the last English philosophical text to evince such characteristics. Leaving aside examples from Hobbes, Locke, and Newton, Thomas Burnet’s *Telluris Theoria Sacra/Theory of the Earth* (1681–90) was again a Latin/English production in which the two texts are not coextensive, underwent unpublished manuscript revision, was published in augmented versions, and which had some manuscript circulation prior to publication (see M. C. Jacob and J. A. Lockwood, ‘Political Millenarianism and Burnet’s Sacred Theory’, *Science Studies*, ii (1972), pp. 265–69). We may also note that one of the scholarly grandchildren of Hakewill’s *Apologie*, William Wotton’s *Reflections upon Ancient and Modern Learning* (1694), likewise included commissioned chapters, from Edmond Halley on astronomy and optics, and from John Craige on geometry and arithmetic (see Richard Nash, *John Craige’s ‘Mathematical Principles of Christian Theology’* (Carbondale and Edwardsville, 1991), p. 14).
APPENDIX: Register of Additions to Sloane

George Hakewill, ‘Apologia, sive Declaratio Potentiae ac Providentiae Divinae in Regimine Mundi’ (Sloane MS. 2168)

Paper folio, many pasted-on inserts. Old Sloane marks: MS. 2021; MS. A 538 (f. π1v); 2168 NG [i.e. North Gallery] (f. 2r). For further remarks on the manuscript, see pp. 12-19 above.

Inscriptions on MS:
‘Hakewells apology for the power & providence of God &c. translated into Latin’, contemporary hand (1r).
‘Philip Jacob non est vearus [sic] possessor huius libri [rule] est paruis homo: sed bonus homo’ [rule] (f. 364r, cancelled page numbering of 577 shows it was indeed originally with the rest of the manuscript).
Another hand has added occasional irrelevant notes (e.g. ‘Si uis Si non uis’ (f. 2r)).

This is an incomplete translation, breaking off in Book Four, Chapter Eleven, section nine; a substantial portion of Book Four is therefore missing, as well as all of the lengthy Books Five and Six. But it is not known whether the Latin version was envisaged as including the final two adversarial books.

INSERTS

The statistical division by book of the inserts is Book 1: 1-13; Book 2: 14-24; Book 3: 25-52; Book 4: 53-60. There is therefore no indication that the inserts were added seriatim, but rather were pasted in as and when Hakewill encountered relevant material.

Note: There is also a good deal of incidental correction, often in the hand of Hakewill. All the inserts are foliated as part of the main sequence of the manuscript, and are typically written on one side alone, so ‘(7)’ refers to the insert marked ‘7’ by the manuscript foliator, and will commonly precede numerically the folio to which it is added. Marginal additions, in the minority, are signalled by ‘marginale’.

Book One

1. ‘Mare divino miraculo coërcitum esse ne terram superflueret. ... nominatim a Pererio Com: in Genesin.’ (3)

Inserted between: ‘... pugnat cum historia Johannis Evangelistæ’ and ‘Quod quattuor illæ Monarchiæ’ (2v) = p. 2 of 1630, and also p. 2 of 1635.

This mirrors 1635, p. 2, but is not in 1630.

2. ‘Septuaginta illos interpretes qui/ iussu Ptolomæi ... suorum annalium. Jacobi prophetiam’ (4)

Inserted between: ‘... meliores tamen illæ fuerunt secundæ cogitationes.’ and ‘Jacobi prophetiam illam. Non deficiet ...’ (2v)

This appears not to have been inserted into 1635, where ‘yet afterward upon better advice he changed it.’ is followed directly by ‘That the Prophecie of old Iacob...’ (p. 3).
3. [3-5 on three overlapping pieces gummed together; they also contain many deletions and emendations]

‘Tempestatem vernam mundi creati primum fuisse ... ait Pererius, atqui ipse obnixè contendit Autumnalem incepisse.’ (7)

Inserted between: ‘... et militaris ordinis omnissi celeberrimi patronus.’ and ‘Magos illos ...’ (8r)

4.

‘St Hieronymum presbyterum fuisse Cardinalem ... instituto et scriptis adversam. Sanctum Jacobum.’ (7)

Inserted between insert 3 and insert 5

5a, b.

a) ‘S. Jacobum Apostolum majorem in Hispaniam venisse ... et pro monstro haberent. Christum’ (7), in Hakewill’s hand.

b) ‘Christum passum fuisse anno ætatis suæ trigesimo tertio ... ex evangelistis probare serio contendit. Magos’ (7), in the scribal hand.

Inserted between insert 4 and ‘Magos illos ...’ (8r)

The relations between the texts here are complex. The order of paragraphs in each is:

1630: paragraphs on Simon Magus; the Sybils; St George; the Three Wise Men.

MS: base text as above; four manuscript additions to be inserted between the third and fourth paragraphs: 1) on Pererius and the season of Creation; 2) Baronius on the myth that Jerome was a cardinal; 3) Baronius on James evangelizing the Spanish; 4) Scaliger on the age of Christ at his death.

1635: two more insertions, one on Kepler, preceding Pererius on the season of Creation; on the LXX translators, following Scaliger on the age of Christ at his death.

An added complexity here is that 1635 cuts a paragraph present in 1630 and in MS, i.e. a paragraph between the Sybils and the Three Wise Men, ‘That Saint George was a holy Martyr ... the most honorable order of Knighthood in the World’ (p. 7). The reason for the cut is uncertain, but we may note its potentially unpatriotic character, as John Rainolds is cited to show that St George was ‘both a wicked man, and an Arrian’. We have seen above how Hakewill was attacked by Peter Heylyn for this sentiment.

So 1635 follows MS with its additions, but with one deletion and two additions. MS therefore represents a stage in the textual evolution of the Apologie between 1630 and 1635, and is therefore not simply a translation of either, but a partially independent working text.

6.

‘Sat. 2 a/ vel (vti Juvenalis) non vnvm.
— vbi tota cohors pede non est alterior uno

Ibid b/ Et a quibus in altum rapiuntur.
— Raptusque per aera curvis
Vnguibus a sæva fertur grue.’

Inserted to provide sources for ‘duos aut tres pedes non superantæ’ and ‘in quos prælijs instructis profisciscunturb’ (8v)
This mirrors 1635, but in the latter text, the source is *Satire 13*, and ‘greatest enemies’ (1630, p. 9) is followed by ‘and that being griped fast in their talons, they are by them carried through the aire.’ (p. 10) before the second quotation, ‘—raptusque ...’. So 1635 has incorporated addition 6, but with a further touch of embellishment.

7. *marginale.*

‘Atque inde fortassis eadem avis ab Æliano et Plinio Platea nominatur a græco vocabulo πλατὺς quod latum significat.’ (12r, perpendicular in margin, hand of the amanuensis)

Inserted after the paragraph on the pelican, concluding ‘in libro de erroribus popularibus’; and before the discussion of the inundation of the Nile commencing ‘Nili inundationem...’ (18r)

This was not included in 1635, where it would have appeared on p. 14.

8. ‘Cui rei alludens hos mihi versiculós transmisit amicus ... credere nolle scelus.’ (13)

Inserted at the conclusion of Chapter 1, section 6 (14r)

1630 ends ‘notwithstanding the observation thereof conduce so much to the publique good’ (p. 14), corresponding to the conclusion of the section in *MS*; 1635 then inserts after this ‘and from hence saith the Glosse in the Canon Law, dicunt hodie pro fornicatione neminem esse deponendum, quia fragiliora sunt corpora nostra, quam olim erant; upon which occasion a worthy friend sent me these verses. [etc]’ (p. 15). So *MS* has inserted to it the verses included (and then translated) in 1635, but lacks 1635’s additional insertion from the Canon Law.

9. ‘Sed volupe est quod Justiniani Imperatoris tempore ... velut impendentis timore mundum liberavit.’ (19)

Inserted between ‘tam periculosum est diem iudicij prædeterminare, aut naturæ periodum statuere.’ and ‘Certissimum quidem est multis annorum centurijs propriorem iam esse mundi dissolutionem ...’ (18v)

1635 has the texts prior and posterior to the insert, but not the insert itself, a combination of texts from Procopius and Leonardus Aretinus (p. 24).

10. ‘Fœminam poetam alicubi memorat satyricus ... Propter mille annos.’ (22)

Inserted between ‘excusare sese alter, atq[ue] errorem agnoscer.’ and ‘Est hoc antiquitatis privilegium ...’ (24r)

This addition appears in 1635, p. 28.

11. ‘Juven: Sat. 14. ... trahit orbita culpæ’ (23)

Inserted, contiguous to no. 10, between ‘illud non posse non esse eximium iudicamus:’ and ‘quiminó ideo putamus transcendere...’ (24r)

1635 has ‘... or if with any thing that is ancient, it cannot but excel: Nay, therefore we thinke it excelles, because we thinke it ancient, though it be not so.’ (p. 28). Therefore 1635 does not incorporate this insertion.
12. ‘Ante Cæsarem solebant Romani sacerdotes ad emendandam anni computationem ... futurus (ait [C]æsaris mandato’ (26)

Inserted between ‘et his nos obrui, illis instruim credimus.’ and ‘Quod at meipsum attinet cum Plinio iunio ...’ (25v)

This addition appears in 1635, p. 31.

13. ‘Teste Justino in initio libri quarti ... ornere illuc vehitur.’ (29)

Inserted between ‘vt Sicilia ab Italia divisa’ and ‘Hæc loca vi quondam ...’ (28v)

1635 has the texts prior and posterior to the insert, but not the insert from Justin itself (p. 35).

Book Two


Inserted between ‘et frangitur potius quàm cogatur in contrarium.’ and ‘Qui inter Tropicos navigant ...’ (54r)

This addition appears in 1635, p. 76.

15. ‘ingratiam facti sunt, præferendi sunt cœli; ... Cælesti longe sanctior et divinior habetur.’ (56, 57 [two pieces of paper gummed together, linked by continuous text])

Inserted between ‘... proculdubio hoc respectu homini ipsi cuius’ [followed by some cancelled material which the insert replaces and augments] and ‘Hæc omnia eorum opinioni refragantur qui ex igne ...’ (58r)

This corresponds to 1635 (pp. 79–80). The termination of the MS paragraph has been cancelled and an interlinear insert added by the annotator. This has itself been cancelled, and transferred to the insert, which therefore revises the end of the MS paragraph before going on to add the section from Pico.

16. ‘Hæ vices mundi sunt ... legem et fœdus positum clementis servans’, with reference to Grynaeus on Aristotle (81)

Inserted at end of Chapter 6, section 1 (80v)

1630 ends ‘Who at the first did (of mere nothing) make them.’ (p. 112); 1635 continues ‘Hæ vices ... observing the law and covenant made with the Elements.’ (p. 119); hence MS mirrors 1635.

17. ‘Sicut Lyra, constitutio quædam est tonorum consonantium ... ad perpetuandam incolunitatem) egregiè faciat’, with reference to John Dee, De præstantia Naturæ, aphorism 12 (84)

Inserted between ‘ad pristinum statum et puritatem revertuntur.’ and ‘Iterum, si ignem in sphæra propria consideremus’ (83v–85r)
This addition appears in 1635, pp. 122-3. Note that in 1630 this chapter was set as one paragraph (pp. 115-16); then the MS insertion caused 1635 to be set as three paragraphs.

18, marginale

Tanta sævijt in Damiata pestis ... [Eusebius:] 1000 fērmè mortuorum hominum referrentur.'

Inserted between ‘et animalia carnivora a cadaveribus abstinuerint’ and ‘Circiter annos a Christo ducentos sub Imperatoribus Vitio Gallo ...’ (89r)

This is not in 1635, where it would have appeared on p. 128.

19, marginale

A note on the earthquake in Naples, dated 1632, inserted after the quotation from Ovid (... Collis habet speciem, longoque induruit ævo.) and into the middle of the following sentence ‘Quæ có lubentius recensui ... videatur [insert] quod in Annalibus suis accidisse narrat Camdenus ...’, insert in Hakewill’s hand (93r)

The entire end of this section (2.7.5) is more extensive than 1635. 1635 (p. 135) concludes the section on Delos and Rhodes. But MS then continues to quote from Pliny, Ovid (at length), and then a long section from Camden on the Herefordshire earthquake of 1571. This insertion is itself nested in a series of fair-copy insertions, none of which appeared in the English 1635.

20.

‘Doctissimus Zanchius. Lib. 4 de operibus creationis ... tandem totum Oceanum exiccatum iri.’ (100)

Inserted between ‘in creationis primordio faciem terræ obtexerunt aquæ, de illis prius disseram.’ and ‘Aquarum mater profundus oceanus ...’ (101r)

This addition appears in 1635, pp. 139-40.

21, marginale

The paragraph of 2.8.2 beginning with ‘Sin paulisper oculos aperientes’ concludes at the foot of the folio with the addition ‘A prima Creatione in hodiernum vsque diem ... æquè verum fuit, natare’, in Hakewill’s hand (103r)

In 1635 (p. 144) this paragraph finishes with some lines from Sylvester’s Du Bartas – but here they are left out and replaced with this Latin sentence. Now the Sylvester verses appear in 1630 (p. 135), so perhaps this is an example of suppressing English verse for the Latin text.

22.

‘Sect. 3. [/] Respondetur objectioni ex tertio Geneseos’ ... ‘Dracones, Crocodilos, aut hujusmodi animalia, in mundo fuisse creditur’ [This is an entire interpolated section, and its explicit is itself an insertion. The subsequent section numbers of this chapter have been cancelled and renumerated to respect the interpolated section.]

Inserted between the previous sections 2 and 3 of Chapter 9.

This addition appears in 1635, pp. 152-3.
23.
’Suffragatur etiam Dr. Jordanus libro non ita pridem edito de thermis naturalibus ...
Cæterum quomodo id fiat difficile dictu est’ (116)

Inserted between ‘Item docet Ruvio [...] et ijsem fere verbis.’ and ‘Quibus attexere minime piget quæ Richardus Carewus noster ...’ (117r)

The insert corresponds to 1635, pp. 164-5. But its positioning is complex. In 1630 there is no such chapter, the decay or growth of metals comprising merely the concluding section of section 5 (pp. 150-1). Therefore although 1635 includes this ‘insert’, the whole base text of this section in MS represents a later stage in the text of the work than 1630. In 1635 Richard Carew ends up mentioned before rather than after the insert, so some reorganization of material between MS and 1635 took place too. The insert also cites John Johnston’s Thaumatographia, which dates it to after 1632, the year in which that work was first published, in Amsterdam. See 24 too.

24.
‘De Terra sigillatâ sive Lemnia ... et tapetijs Turcorum opus esse.’ (118)

Inserted at the conclusion of Chapter 9, section 8 (117v); this is the communication from Thomas Clayton, and Johnston’s recent Thaumatographia is cited once more.

In 1630 this chapter concludes on section 6. This section corresponds to 1635 (pp. 166-7), where the previous paragraph concludes ‘nihil penè excisum videatur.’ (p. 166). So again the base text is not 1630 at this point, but the text at a later stage. See 23 too.

Book Three

25.
‘Tacitus in vita Agricolæ ... et populo suo electo specialiter indulta videatur.’ (126)

Inserted between ‘etiam centum et quindecim vixerit:’ and ‘quippe quod si ubique et semper Patriarcharum diuturnitatem’, itself following a deleted sentence replaced by the lengthier insert. (125r)

This appears in 1635, p. 178, but in MS the sentence following the insert has had its first half cancelled in order to accommodate the insert. 1635 follows this cancellation.

26.
‘Nos ipsi vidimus (ait Bellarminus) senem annorum 105 ... Westmonasterij sepultus est.’ (130)

Inserted between ‘aliqui fortassë incertæ famæ.’ and ‘Anno 1605 Robertus Constantinus’ (129r)

1630, p. 166, goes straight from a paragraph on Buchanan to one on the Indians. 1635 inserts four paragraphs between these, from Bellarmine, Willet, Thuanus, and Vassæus (pp. 183-4). MS base text discusses Pawlet and Sands, as 1635, but then also Edmund Rainolds at the end of the paragraph, omitted by 1635. MS then inserts from Bellarmine, but there is no subsequent mention of a burial at Westminster. However, the insert subsequently details the story of Thomas Parr, ‘Old Parr’, and in the margin Hakewill has written ‘Anno D 1635’, dating the insert conclusively to that year or later. The inclusion in the base text of material not in 1635 and then the addition to it of events taking place in 1635 itself date this insert to after that point.
The Evolution of George Hakewill’s *Apologie or Declaration of the Power and Providence of God*, 1627–1637: Academic Contexts, and Some New Angles from Manuscripts

27. ‘Sect. 8. Exempla hujusmodi remotioribus in terris, præsertim in Indijs’ (131)
Inserted against the paragraph beginning ‘Longinquius prospicere libet? Ad hodiernum vsque diem Indi ...’ (129v)
This insert described the paragraph starting ‘And if wee please a little to cast our eyes farther abroad, wee shall likewise finde that even at this day the Indians ...’ (1635, p. 184). This is part of section 7 in 1635, so this insert indicates that Hakewill considered the section now too long with its inserts, and was planning to separate the text at this point and annex the discussion of the Indians to a new section. This did not take place in the printed text.

28. ‘Narratio itineris Comitis Arundellij ... et filiam gemellos enixa est.’ (138)
Inserted between ‘inauditum non est sed propemodum vulgare.’ and ‘Non sum ignarus vulgò quæri, idque forsan non prorsus ...’ (137v)
1635 has the texts prior and posterior to the insert, but not the insert from Arundel itself (p. 195).

29. ‘Sect. 4. Amici cujusdam argumento de Regibus Romanis sætisfit.’ (142). This is an entire new section, with the previous ‘Cap. 3.’ Heading (141rv) cancelled and rewritten on the verso of the insert.
This addition appears in 1635, pp. 201-3.

30. ‘Theutobocchum memorat Florus ... fides ei adhibenda plane nescio. ’ (146)
Inserted between ‘qui modum aliorum plurimum excederent.’ And ‘Instantias tantummodo notabiliores referam ...’ (145v)
1635 has the texts prior and posterior to the insert, but the insert itself has been postponed by a sentence (pp. 207–8).

31. ‘Si Josepho confidenter asserenti fides, Cum Vitellius ... septem cubitos longus.’ (147)
Inserted between ‘exactè proportionantur qui suorum pedum sex superet’ (itself an addition in the manuscript) (145v) and ‘Sed ad nostra tempora proprius accedamus’ (148r)
This addition appears in 1635, p. 208.

32. ‘Johannes Fredericus Dux Saxoniæ ... in aulam Galliam transmiserunt.’ (149)
Inserted between ‘... sit eum octo pedes excessurum.’ and ‘Fieri autem potest vt in hisce orbis ... ’ (148v)
This mirrors 1635 (p. 209), except that in 1635, the preceding paragraph concludes ‘... as any man of an ordinary stature might goe upright betwixt his legges when he did stride.’, with no mention of *eight feet.*
33. ‘Sepulchrum Sebbæ ... consideres mensurarum pusillam.’ (157)
Inserted between ‘illis non inæquales omnino sunt.’ and ‘Nec herele ignarus sum Edwardi tertij gladium’ (156r)
This addition appears in 1635, p. 220.

34. ‘Sect. 2. De hujusmodi ossibus quæ in aliquibus Ecclesijs Londini conspiciuntur.’
Inserted at the end of Chapter 5, section 2, after ‘... teste oculato historiam hanc copiose refert, nihil eiusmodi memorat.’ (163r)
This mirrors 3.5.2 of 1635 (pp. 227-9). Importantly, though, the translation does not date the letter sent to him by a certain friend on the giants’ bones found near Gloucester. But in MS the bones were dug up ‘circiter annum 1634’, thereby dating MS as emended by Hakewill extremely close to the setting of 1635 itself. The first section of the insert is from Stow in the 1633 edition, and we may note how common entries from Stow on other inserts are, also presumably drawn from this edition.

35. ‘Quippe quod Ortelius in descriptione Moraviæ ... Quid obstat quo minus etiam humanas effigies componat.’ (164)
Inserted between ‘in quibusdam terræ venis cælesti influentia generari posse:’ and ‘Prodigiosa hæc artificialibus potius et supernaturalibus quàm ordinarijs et naturalibus causis tribunt alij’ (163v)
This addition appears in 1635, pp. 229-30. Again, the insertion has triggered a splitting up of the one original into a string of paragraphs in 1635.

36. ‘Et quanquam Ezeckielis. 27. 11. reddat vulgaris Latina Pygmæi errant in turribus tuis ... vt scribit Plinius. Lib. 2. nat. histor. Cap. 91.’ (169)
Inserted between ‘cognitæ nusquam tamen aut regio huiusmodi aut gens reperiri potuit;’ and ‘Et quantam ad præsens quæsitum, non solummodo obijcit Goropius...’ (168v)
This mirrors 1635 (p. 237).

37. ‘De Babone Comite Abenspergio ... Justitiarios Assisarum Eboracum deduxit.’ (180)
Inserted between ‘supra omnes quos legi antiquos fæcundorum;’ and ‘Patrum nostrorum memoria (inquit Vives ...’ (179r)
This mirrors 1635 (p. 252).

38, marginale
‘Ita vt merito cum appellet Adr. Turnebus portentosi ingenij juvenem’, written perpendicular in margin and keyed to text, by Hakewill (184r)
Inserted after Petrus Scrivervius's verses on Scaliger (184r)
3.6.2 here, but corresponds to 3.6.1 in 1635, where it is added to p. 256. But there the next paragraph is phrased slightly different from MS; compare 1635 ‘And least these testimonies may happily seeme partiall I will hereunto annex that of Iulius Cæsar Bulengerus’ with MS’s ‘Ac ne forsan videatur Causabonus προτοπολφιας reus subnectam et id quod Julius Caesar Bulingerus ...’

39. ‘Nec dissonus Pererius; Vir sane (inquit) ... et magnis Doctoribus meritò annumerandus.’ (185)

Inserted between ‘ex illis proceribus ecclesiæ antiques nunc incideremus.’ and ‘Addit Possevinus in apparatu suo’ (185v)

1635 has the texts prior and posterior to the insert, but not the insert itself (p. 256).

40. ‘Asserit S. Gregorius in Moralibus, Vergente mundi fine superna scientia proficit ... tanto nobis æternæ scientiæ aditus largius aperitur.’ (195)

Unkeyed, but probably inserted between ‘tales subtilitates quas discipulis tuendas obstruserunt.’ and ‘Mihi verò maximum videtur mirum tot partum errore Chiliastarum ...’ (194r)

This mirrors 1635 (pp. 264-5).

[40*]
This insert has been ripped away and cancelled, but its stub, with keyed symbol, is still visible. It was an addition to the end of Chapter 7, section 2.]

41. ‘Narrat Vignierus in Hist: Eccles: Gerbertum ... ejusdem in ætatis Historiographi.’ (197)

Inserted between ‘Paulum non Latinè sed Græcè scripsisse.’ and ‘Testatur Alfredus Rex Angliæ ...’ (196v)

This mirrors 1635, p. 266.

42. ‘Morus noster in Epistolâ ad Academiam Oxoniensem ... omnes liberales artes blatteravit.’ (198)

Inserted between ‘commensationes, iurgia, vaniloqua sectentur.’ and ‘Ex papæ Zachariae rescripto ad Bonifacium ...’ (196v)

This mirrors 1635, pp. 266-67. The insert itself must have been made between 1633 and 1635, as it describes Thomas More’s letter to the University of Oxford as nuper typis mandatâ, presumably a reference to the 1633 edition.

43. ‘quod ipsum hoc nostro sæculo ex proxime elapso Dei ... est elapsum videatur posse anteponi’ (201, in the hand of the main scribe)

Inserted at the end of Chapter 7, section 2, after ‘ita dispensante revertuntur fœliciora tempora.’ (200v)
This insert should follow 1635 ‘and then by Gods blessing for the better againe.’ (p. 269) and precede insert 39. But only insert 39 was incorporated into 1635.

44.
‘Verbis Platinæ in vita Pauli secundi ... si legere et scribere didicissent.’ (201)
Inserted at the end of the previous insert, but in the hand of Hakewill, and supplied with ‘Sect. 3.’ as a linking catchword.
This mirrors 1635, pp. 269-70.

45, marginale
‘Narrat insuper, reliquo Pyrrhi corpore in cineres redacto pedis pollicem quo solebat spleneticos curare integrum mansisse.’ Written perpendicular in margin and keyed to text, by inserter (202v)
Inserted between ‘quia scilicet autumabant earum carnes magis vinctuosas esse’ and ‘Quin ultra, si Græcis visitata fuisse anatome vtique huiusmodi aliquid medici et anatomici ...’
This addition appears in 1635, p. 272.

46.
‘Superioribus Herbariæ scientiæ promotoribus ... superiorem neminem vsquam extisset.’ (206)
Inserted at the end of Chapter 7, section 4, after ‘nunquam vel fando audiverunt.’ (205r)
This mirrors 1635 (p. 275).

47.
‘Non hæsitat Baronius circa finem Apparatus Animalium ... Genebrardus ... prope finem libri primi.’ (209)
Inserted near the beginning of Chapter 8, section 1, after ‘Sulpicius Severus ... Mundus a Domino constitutus est ab hinc annos iam penè sex millia’ and ‘Verum e contrario quantà cum dexteritate caliginem et tenebras istas dispellerunt Neoterici.’ (208r)
This has some relation to 1630 (p. 246) and 1635 (pp. 278-9). MS reflects a later text than 1630, however. MS therefore names in order Nicephoras, Lactantius, Augustine, Johannes Langus on Nicephoras, Sulpicius Severus, Scaliger, Casaubon. But 1630 only starts with the Scaliger and Casaubon anecdotes. 1635, to make matters complex, returns to the text of 1630, but does incorporate insert 47. Again, MS represents a stage of revision between 1630 and 1635 that was not fully captured by 1635, another indication that the Latin and English texts were splitting apart.

48.
‘Cui locupletissimo Caesar<u>boni testimonio planè consonat illud ipsius Scaligeri ... sed et longè meliora effecerunt’, in the hand of the scribe. (210)
Inserted a few sentences after 47, after ‘... in nostra praesertim Gallia et Germania præstiterunt’ and ‘Et quantam <heroes> illie asseruit<erunt> ...’ (208r)
See 47. This mirrors 1635 (pp. 278-9). 1635 also adds to the following list of chronologers Wolphius and Petavius, an interlinear addition to MS by the amanuensis.
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49. ‘Integram vero Historiam nostram laudatissima diligentia et magnis sumptibus edidit Johannes Speed ... opus ... acceptatione et laudibus dignissimum’ (217)

Inserted in Chapter 8 section 2, after ‘... Elizabethæ a Camdeno latinè primum scripti sunt annales qui postea in vernaculam linguam translati.’ and ‘Nec defuerunt qui laudabili industria virorum particularium virtute, doctrinâ...’ (216r)

This mirrors *1635* (p. 286).

50, marginale
‘Quibus addere licet Georgium Vassarium illarum alterutro non imparem, Thuano iudice’, written perpendicular in margin and keyed to text, by inserter (231r)

Inserted between ‘vbi a Benedicto Varchio publicè laudatus et conditus est.’ and ‘E gente nostrâ claruerunt nonnulli nominatim Helardus Exoniâ orundus...’

This addition appears in *1635*, p. 303, but *1635* lacks the former sentence on Varchi.

51, marginale
‘Quin et Clemens in Epistola ad Corinthios ... receptum vti ex commentarijs liquet’ (233v), in the hand of the inserter.

Inserted between ‘vt videatur eos tunc temporis oceanum minimè nosse’ and ‘Et quantumvis ingens navigandi decus in historijs adepti sint Phœnicis’ (233v)

This addition appears in *1635*, p. 307.

52. ‘Deniqique nusquam apud antiquos legisse me memini homines sine manibus natos supplevisse ... Natura ipsa negat, perficiat ingenium.’ (240)

Inserted in Chapter 10, section 1, unkeyed, but presumably to follow the termination of the chapter on the epigram of Grotius concluding ‘Typhij tuum fuerat, nec Jovis istud opus.’ (239r)

This mirrors *1635* (p. 315).

Book 4

53. ‘Consonans huic Solinus. Galli detestabili ... deos fas habebant.’ (262)

Inserted in Chapter 1, section 7, after Lucan’s verses ending ‘Et Taranis Scythicae, non mitior ara Dianæ.’ and before ‘Nec ab horrendo istoc impietatis...’ (262v)

This is within section 6 in *1635*, and corresponds to p. 350.

54. ‘In vnâ Ægypto (quantula Romani imperij particula?) ... Æra Martyrum nuncuparetur.’, from Scaliger (279)

Inserted in Chapter 4, section 3, at the conclusion, following Lactantius, ‘... Luctus, ubique pavor et plurima mortis imago.’ (278r)

This mirrors *1635* (p. 375).
Chapter Seven, section 10, an entirely new section, inserted after section 9, the new section recounting the anecdote of Henry Welby (312rv)

Inserted after previous section and before the new Chapter 8 (311v)

This entire section is missing from 1635. But 1635 does obey the cancellation in MS, where section 9 concluded with ‘Sed ad veteres Romanos redeo et eorum in ædificando luxuriam’ (311v), a lead-in to Chapter 8. This sentence is cut in 1635, which has therefore been prepared to receive the new section 10, but in the event this did not happen. The new section was culled from the pamphlet of 1637, translated here as Phœnix nostrorum temporum. This provides the terminus ad quem for the activity of this manuscript, namely 1637, and proves that the Latin text surpassed the English one.

‘Cui alludit Epigrammatista … Itidem et Satyricus … Vexatus toties rauci Theseide Codri.’ (329)

Inserted near the beginning of ‘Chapter 8’ [really Chapter 10, falling between Chapters marked 9 and 11 in MS], section 1, after ‘præcipuè in carminibus atque historijs’ and ‘Horum recitatio vsu iam recepta est’ (328r)

This mirrors 1635 (p. 474).

‘Nec alià de causa Judæis inævijt … vti testatur Josephus libro De Legatione ad Caium’ (331)

Inserted in Chapter 10, section 2, after ‘ultra processit Caligula ad facta [del], Divumque sibi poscebat honores.’ and ‘Simulachra numinum religione et arte praeclera inter quæ Olympici Jovis …’ (331v)

MS sections 1 and 2 have been amalgamated into section 1 in 1635, and this mirrors p. 475.

‘Nec non Ortelius Cosmographus … nequaquam dubitat anteferre Romano’ (335)

Inserted in Chapter 10, section 4, after Macrobius, ‘… a nostri generis hominibus possidetur;’ and ‘Quid tamen excogitari … iactavit Propertius …’ (335v)

This mirrors 1635, p. 482, where it is part of section 3.

‘Et de Claudio Seneca … Et rursus. En qui ora Tamesis posuit jugum.’ (357)

Inserted in Chapter 11, section 8, not keyed but alongside Cicero, ‘in Oratione pro Murœna, Virtus militaris populo Romano nomen …’ (357v)

This insert is unkeyed, and appears not to have found inclusion here or nearby.

f. 359r is in the hand of the amanuensis; f. 359v and forwards is in the hand of the inserter, i.e. Hakewill himself. The break occurs in Chapter 11, section 9, the amanuensis concluding with the paragraph ‘Testatur ipse Cæsar sæpissimæ quaestos fuisset Gallos de sua bellica …
Quisnam magis mirabitur populum hunc a Romanis devictum fuisse, quàm’ [breaks off on page-turn]. ‘Caribes populum quidem nudum sed fortitudine ...’ is then in the hand of Hakewill. Section 9 is concluded in his hand, and section 10 follows, as far as the paragraph opening ‘Maltam deinde tentavit ...’, and then breaking off at ‘Vēni, vidi, non potuit cum eodem addere et Vici’, followed by the note in a different hand ‘Deest maxima pars hujus Sectionis. Desunt etiam Capita 12. 13. 14.’