

Abstract

This article provides the first substantial analysis of the genealogies prefixed to the King James Bible (1611), giving an unprecedented account of their contemporary significance and purpose, as well as an examination of the collaboration between the Hebraist Hugh Broughton and the cartographer John Speed that produced them. By placing the diagrams within the context of both Speed and Broughton's greater interests and projects, as well through the use of several previously unknown drafts, it will show that the genealogies had a very clear polemical function, emerged from a subsidiary of the thriving field of chronology, and can be placed within a longstanding visual tradition capable of explaining many of the peculiarities on which modern scholars have remained silent. Finally, it will argue that the genealogies were an innovative kind of 'reading technology' produced through a sophisticated synthesis of sacred and secular scholarship with the aim of distilling and transmitting the products of learned, Latinate scholarship to an unlearned, English readership.

The biblical genealogies of the King James Bible (1611): Their Purpose, Sources and Significance.

The biblical genealogies constituting seventeen of the thirty-seven prefatory leaves of the King James Version (henceforth AV) have not enjoyed much critical press. Thanks to

I would like to thank Peter McCullough, Joanna Weinberg, and Nicholas Hardy for commenting on versions of this article; Scott Mandelbrote and the other, anonymous reader for their detailed and insightful criticisms; and finally Will Poole for his feedback and encouragement. This work was supported by the AHRC-Polonsky Studentship.

comments by the seventeenth-century Hebraist John Lightfoot, we have long known that these diagrams were co-authored by the cartographer John Speed and the biblical scholar Hugh Broughton, and that Broughton's difficult relationship with the mainstream English ecclesiastical establishment, along with his omission from the AV translation committees, meant that they had to be published under Speed's name alone.¹ More recently, in the wake of the AV's quatercentury anniversary, there has been a tentative awakening of interest in the genealogies, but these studies have rarely moved beyond description.² As such, while few today would agree with A. W. Pollard's claim that the

¹ John Lightfoot, 'The Preface', in *The Works of the Great Albionean Divine: Renown'd in Many Nations for Rare Skill in Salems & Athens Tongues*, ed. by John Lightfoot (London: 1662), sig. A1r-C2v (sig. A1v-A2r).

² Katrin Ettenhuber, '“A comely gate to so rich and glorious a citie”: The Paratextual Architecture of the Rheims New Testament and the King James Bible', in *The Oxford Handbook of the Bible in Early Modern England, c.1530-1700*, ed. by Kevin Killeen, Helen Smith, and Rachel Willie (Oxford: University Press, 2015), pp. 54-70 (pp. 60-66); Lori Anne Ferrell, 'Page Techne: Interpreting Diagrams in Early Modern English “How to” Books', in *Printed Images in Early Modern England*, ed. by Michael Hunter (Farnham: Ashgate, 2010) pp.113-127 (pp. 116-123); Katherine Acheson, *Visual Rhetoric and Early Modern English Literature* (Surrey: Ashgate, 2013), pp. 53-56; Joan Taylor, 'John Speed's “Canaan” and British Travel to Palestine: A Journey with Maps', in *The King James Version at 400: Assessing its Genius as Bible Translation and its Literary Influence*, ed. by David Burke, John Kutsko, and Philip Towner (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2013), pp. 103-120 (pp. 104-6).

genealogies were ‘decoratively printed but useless’ creations, there is still not much concrete evidence, even over a century later, as to what else they might be.³

There are two related reasons why little progress has been made. The first is because the AV genealogies have been studied too much in purely visual and impressionistic terms, as if their only significance is as material and typographic artefacts. This is in fact not the case: the AV genealogies not only contained significant intellectual content which was easily accessible to contemporary readers, but were also far from neutral or nonpartisan illustrations. Instead, they presented a highly visible intervention into a longstanding and contested scholarly problem.⁴ This means that we cannot understand them by studying their form and appearance alone; we need rather to combine such analysis with an examination of their place within the history of ideas. The second reason is that, in the case of the AV genealogies, the context from which their argument derives is continental, Latinate and involves consideration of seemingly esoteric, technical problems and practices which are not commonly considered in relation to vernacular translation. It is only by engaging with such fields on their own terms that any sense can be made of the diagrams’ intellectual content.

This article will improve our knowledge by establishing preliminary answers to some fundamental questions about the AV genealogies. These include questions about their purpose and significance; their sources; their relationship to contemporary scholarship; the existence of manuscript drafts and finally the nature and extent of the

³ A. W. Pollard, *Records of the English Bible: the Documents Relating to the Translation and Publication of the Bible in English, 1525-1611* (London: 1911), p. 63.

⁴ The idea of reading such artefacts as ‘visual arguments’ has already been pioneered for scientific illustrations; see Sachiko Kusukawa, *Picturing the Book of Nature* (London: University of Chicago Press, 2012).

collaboration between Speed and Broughton that produced them. By studying such questions seriously I hope to demonstrate that, far from being purely ornamental or fuzziy providential, the AV genealogies were a fusion of secular and sacred scholarship with significant implications for the relationship between the learned culture that produced them and the lay readership for which they were designed.

1. The Intellectual Component: origins and development.

One of the most urgent questions within the early-modern study of biblical genealogy concerned the resolution of a crucial incoherence: the contradictory accounts of Christ's parentage given in Matthew 1:1-16 and Luke 3:23-38. Both Evangelists drew Christ through his father, Joseph, but otherwise they not only made him descend from two different sons of David (Nathan in Luke, Solomon in Matthew) but even from entirely different grandfathers and great-grandfathers (Eli and Matthat in Luke, and Jacob and Matthan in Matthew). The problem was devastating, for so long as the genealogy of Christ remained in doubt so too did his messianic status, as without proof of descent through the family of Abraham and royal line of David Jesus could not be said to have fulfilled biblical prophecy about the awaited Messiah.⁵

⁵ Most early modern scholars thought the main purpose of these genealogies was to prove Jesus's fulfilment of messianic prophecy: see Cumannus Flinspachius, *Genealogiae Christi et omnium populorum tabulae* (Basel: 1567), pp. 11-12, 15-16; Martin Chemnitz, *Harmonia evangelica* (Frankfurt: 1593), p. 107. See generally, Marshall Johnson, *The Purpose of the Biblical Genealogies: With Special Reference to the Setting of the Genealogies of Jesus* (Cambridge: University Press, 1988).

Unsurprisingly, much Christian effort and learning was poured into harmonisation of these genealogies.⁶ From the earliest days of Christianity until the medieval period such harmonisation was bound up chiefly in pagan-Christian and Jewish-Christian polemic, and developed through staged debates, missionary efforts and other related activities. And while some of this conversionary context persisted through to the sixteenth century, especially through the circulation of medieval Jewish refutations of Christianity such as the *Sefer Nizzahon*, by this time the study of biblical genealogy had established itself primarily as a sub-discipline of one of the most important pursuits of the century: chronology, the study of time.⁷

The reason for this connection between biblical genealogy and chronology was somewhat inevitable: harmonising the contrary numbers of generations in Matthew and Luke, which overlapped all the way from Abraham to Christ, was essential to create any coherent account of the years. Conversely any chronological manipulations of the

⁶ As Eusebius said, in Hanmer's translation, 'euery one of the faythfull through their ignoraunce in the trueth' has had to 'endeuour to commente on those places' in Matthew and Luke where they 'haue diuersly deliuered unto us the genealogie of Christ.' *The auncient ecclesiasticall histories of the first six hundred yeares after Christ: wrytten in the Greeke tongue by three learned historiographers, Eusebius, Socrates, and Euagrius*, ed. and trans. by Meredith Hanmer (London: Thomas Vautroullier, 1577), p. 10.

⁷ For the circulation of medieval Jewish polemics among early-modern Christians see Stephen Burnett, 'Spokesmen for Judaism: Medieval Jewish Polemicists and their Christian Readers in the reformation Era', in *Reuchlin Und Seine Erben: Forscher, Denker, Ideologen Und Spinner*, ed. by Peter Schäfer and Irina Wandrey (Ostfildern: Thorbecke, 2005), pp. 41-51; William Horbury, 'The Basle Nizzahon', in *Jews and Christians in Contact and Controversy*, ed. by William Horbury (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998), pp. 244-262.

succession of the Davidic line would have ramifications for the state of the harmonised genealogy of Christ. The connection was, moreover, reinforced by the fact that one of the period's best-known chronological sources also contained its most influential attempt at genealogical harmonisation. Appended to Annius of Viterbo's infamous and often-cited forged work of Philo, *Breviarium de temporibus*, was a lengthy commentary with an explicitly-stated purpose: to counter the objections heretics set against Christ's lineage.⁸ Annius's solution was both original and (relatively) simple. Based on the suggestion that Eli, grandfather of Christ according to Luke, was an abbreviated form of the name 'Eliachim' which itself was a variant of 'Joachim', the name of Mary's father according to the (apocryphal) Protoevangelium of James, Annius proposed that Matthew and Luke gave different accounts of Christ's parentage because they each followed a different parent.⁹ Matthew gave the descent of Joseph from David via Solomon; and Luke gave the descent of Mary from David via Nathan (henceforth referred to as the 'Marian-Lucan' solution).

⁸ For more on the reception and influence of Annius see R. T. John, 'Fictive Ancient History and National Consciousness in Early Modern Europe: The Influence of Annius of Viterbo's *Antiquitates*' (Unpublished doctoral thesis, Warburg Institute, 1994), p. 19; Anthony Grafton, *Forgers and Critics: Creativity and Duplicity in Western Scholarship* (London: 1990), pp. 100-123; C. R. Ligota, 'Annius of Viterbo and Historical Method', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 50 (1987), 44-56; Walter Stephens, 'From Berossos to Berosus Chaldeus: The Forgeries of Annius of Viterbo and Their Fortune', in *The World of Berossos*, ed. by Johannes Haubold, Giovanni B. Lanfranchi, Robert Rollinger, and John Steele (Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz Verlag, 2013), pp. 277-289.

⁹ Annius of Viterbo, *Commentaria super opera diuersorum auctorum de antiquitatibus loquentium confecta* (Rome: 1498), sig. H5r.

Around this basic division, Annius created a complicated account of how the lines of dynastic inheritance and physical progeny split across the Gospels. To ensure that Jesus inherited the throne of David through Mary (since Joseph was not technically Christ's father), Annius contended that the Davidic line of Solomon as traced in Matthew ended at Ochozias (also called Joachaz, son of Joram), after whom the line of succession diverged to the offspring of Nathan (David's other son), as traced in Luke.¹⁰ To cope with this abrupt end of the blood-line in Matthew Annius used an intricate system of bi- and trinomials which meant that after this point the two gospel genealogies actually represented the same descent until Zerrubabel, after whom Matthew's genealogy followed the line of his one son Abiud to give the lineage of Joseph, while Luke's genealogy followed his other son Rhesa to give the lineage of Mary.¹¹ The only potential objection to such an account (if Luke reported Mary's descent why was Joseph mentioned in her place?) could be quickly demolished by patristic testimony: Jewish genealogies were patrilineal, and so – to command the respect of Jewish readers - Mary had to be named through reference to her husband.¹²

Despite its complexity to modern eyes, the Marian-Lucan solution as found in Annius' commentary was rapidly integrated into a diverse range of scholarship. Aspects of it appeared everywhere from the exercise in Hebrew pronunciation beginning Reuchlin's Hebrew Grammar (which consisted of the Annian genealogy of Mary) to Erasmus's New Testament annotations, to (less surprisingly) the popular mid-sixteenth century chronological treatise by Giovanni Maria Tolosani, printed under the pseudonym

¹⁰ Ibid., sig. G4v-Hr.

¹¹ Ibid., sig. Hv-H8r.

¹² See, e.g., the testimony in *Ioannis Chrysostomi...in...evangelium secundum Matthaem commentarii...opus perfectum*, ed. by Anianus Celedensis (Paris: 1545), fol. 10v.

Johannes Lucidus.¹³ Furthermore, Annius's solution benefited from the fact that the basic etymological connection between Eli and Joachim which facilitated it was evidenced by another testimony which, though also forged, was less well-known and therefore less doubted, respectable enough to be used by more discerning scholars: the 'ancient' 'rabbinic' texts published in 1487/8 by Paulus de Heredia, a converted Aragonese Jew.¹⁴ The evidence from de Heredia enabled the Marian-Lucan solution to be advocated without reliance on the dubious Annius. By the mid-late sixteenth century the Marian-Lucan solution in its most essential form had become a commonplace of continental scholarship, and refinements and revisions of it were attempted by many figures including major reformers such as Calvin and Luther.¹⁵

¹³ Johannes Reuchlin, *De rudimentis Hebraicis* (Pforzheim: 1506), pp. 19-20; Desiderius Erasmus, *Novum instrumentum omne...cum annotationibus* (Basel: 1516), pp. 325-327; Johannes Lucidus, *Opusculum de emendationibus temporum* (Venice: 1546), fols. 50r-52v.

Given that the author of this work has traditionally been referred to as 'Johannes Lucidus' even since the discovery of his identity, I will retain use of the pseudonym.

¹⁴ Paulus de Heredia, *The Epistle of Secrets*, ed. and trans. by J. Coakley and Rodney Dennis (Oxford: 1998), p. 14; p. 34. Note though that some scholars, such as Isaac Casaubon, did suspect the forgery, see Anthony Grafton and Joanna Weinberg, *"I have always loved the holy tongue": Isaac Casaubon, the Jews, and a Forgotten Chapter in Renaissance Scholarship* (Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press, 2011), pp. 39-42.

¹⁵ See for example Petrus Galatinus, *Opus...de arcanis catholicae veritatis* (Ortona: 1518), fols. 213v-216r; Andreas Osiander, *In euangelium secundum Matthaenum, Marcum, et Lucam commentarii ex ecclesiasticis scriptoribus collecti* (Geneva: 1553), fol. 2r, fol. 246r; Martin Luther, 'Von Schem Hamphoras und vom Geschlecht Christi', in *The Jew in Christian Theology: Martin Luther's Anti-Jewish Vom Schem Hamphoras, Previously Unpublished in English, and Other*

A large number of lesser-known names, however, also tried their hand at resolving Christ's genealogical quandary. One such figure was the biblical scholar Hugh Broughton (1549-1612), who at some point in the late 1580s began work on what he would later call his 'little book of great pains', the brief pamphlet titled *A concent of Scripture* which aimed to demonstrate the harmony of the entire chronology of scripture. Broughton would later view this work as his magnum opus, but the controversy that followed it would effectively end his English career and force him into near-permanent exile. It is not clear what first stimulated Broughton's chronological ambitions, and in the aftermath of the controversy he gave a variety of reasons from wishing to calm the anxieties raised by the publication of the classical scholar Joseph Scaliger's brilliant but contentious *De emendatione temporum*, to being personally asked by the theologian John Rainolds to clarify the chronology of the Old Testament.¹⁶ What concerns us more than these issues of reception and genesis, however, is the fact that it was in preparing the *Concent* that Broughton first began to engage seriously with the field of biblical genealogy.¹⁷

Milestones in Church Doctrine Concerning Judaism, ed. and trans. by G. Falk (Jefferson, NC: 1992), p. 191, §83-85; Jean Calvin, *Harmonia ex tribus euangelistis composita* (Geneva: 1555), p. 24.

¹⁶ Hugh Broughton, *Sundry workes, defending the certayntie of the holy Chronicle* (London: 1594), sig. Lv; idem, *An apologie to my Lorde Treasurer* (Middelburg: 1597) sig. A3v-A4r; idem, *A require of agreement to the groundes of divinitie studie* (Middelberg: 1611), sig. Nr; idem, *A defence of the booke entitled A co[n]cent of Scripture* (Middelberg: 1609), sig. A2r, A4r.

¹⁷ The genesis and reception of Broughton's chronological work are complex: for a full account see Kirsten Macfarlane, 'Hugh Broughton (1549-1612): Scholarship,

As explained earlier, this engagement was required by the fact that the study of chronology and genealogy were so deeply intertwined: this was even truer of chronologies that, like Broughton's, relied on biblical data alone. As such, the first edition of Broughton's *Concent*, published sometime between 1588 and 1589, contained a page-long digression on Christ's lineage, presenting Broughton's harmonisation as well as explanations for some trickier parts of the genealogy.¹⁸ The second edition (1590) of the *Concent* provided even more detail, expanding the 1588/9 comments with discussions of the classical precedents for the ambiguous use of kin terms, as well as connections to Old Testament prophecy.¹⁹ All in all, the digressions show that from 1588-1590 Broughton was becoming increasingly preoccupied by biblical genealogy and, moreover, had already at this point settled on the solution that would later be enshrined, under Speed's name, in the AV genealogies.

In many ways, this solution was not very original. Broughton had read Lucidus's *Opusculum de emendationibus temporum*, which provided him with a summary of Annianus's solution, handily packaged in tabular form and supported with the additional 'rabbinic' testimony from de Heredia.²⁰ He accepted, like most of his contemporaries, the broad

Controversy and the English Bible' (Unpublished Doctoral Thesis, Oxford University, 2017), pp. 20-101.

¹⁸ Hugh Broughton, *A Concent of Scripture* (London: 1588/9), sig. Cv (STC (2nd ed.), 3850).

¹⁹ Idem, *A Concent of Scripture* (London: 1590), sig. Dr-v (STC (2nd ed.), 3851). This dating of the two editions of the *Concent* is based on the timing and development of the controversy compared with information in the Register of the Company of Stationers. See Macfarlane, 'Hugh Broughton (1549-1612)', pp. 34-37, pp. 84-85.

²⁰ Lucidus, *Opusculum*, fols. 50v-52r. For evidence of Broughton's reading of Lucidus, see Broughton, *A defence of the holy Genealogies* (London: 1595), sig. Cv-C4r.

outline of the Marian-Lucan harmonisation this represented, but he did take issue with one aspect of it: the ending of Solomon's line in Ochozias, which was not only contradicted by the many biblical places that referred to existence of Ochozias's biological son, Joas, but also sat uneasily with the prophecy of Jeremiah 22:24 that Solomon's house would end at 'Choniah.'²¹ Lucidus, following Anniius, had given Ochozias a second name to enable him to fulfil this prophecy, but without this binomial the prophesised 'Choniah' more naturally seemed to signify Jechoniah several generations later. Citing both Jeremiah and the existence of Joas as evidence against Anniius, Broughton argued that the particular circumstances around the captivity of Jechoniah had forced Solomon's line of inheritance to cede to his brother, Nathan. Manipulating the flexibility of the Hebrew words for 'brother' and 'son', Broughton explained how after Jechoniah was dethroned by Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon and kept in captivity, Zedekiah his uncle was made his successor. Therefore, when Zedekiah died before Jechoniah's release from prison, Jechoniah, being childless and imprisoned without his wife by necessity 'declared Salathiel [next of Nathan's line] his heyre.'²²

Much of this detail was not Broughton's own but came rather from the major intellectual model for his *Concent*: the 1575 *Chronicum Scripturae Sacrae autoritate constitutum* of the Genevan Hebraist Matthieu Béroalde.²³ While Béroalde had not explicitly framed his arguments as a harmonisation of Christ's genealogy, his criticism of Anniius in this work (specifically of his ending of Solomon's house in Ochozias) and his analysis of the true end of Solomon's line in Jechoniah had clear repercussions for the Marian-Lucan

²¹ Broughton, *Concent* (1590), sig. Dr-v.

²² *Ibid.*, sig. Dr.

²³ For biographical information on Béroalde, see Eugène Haag and Émile Haag, *La France Protestante*, 6 vols (Paris: Sandoz et Fischbacher, 1877-1888), II (1879), pp. 394-406.

solution.²⁴ Broughton's analysis in the *Concent*, even the 1590 version, did little more than develop these repercussions: in this solution, Matthew's genealogy represented not direct blood descent but rather the line of dynastic succession, tracing the transmission of the title of King of the Jews to prove that Jesus inherited it through Joseph. Since this succession switched to the posterity of Nathan after Salathiel, in physical terms Matthew's genealogy was composed of two bloodlines. Luke alone therefore gave the natural genealogy of Christ through Mary, and as in Annius this made Mary and Joseph distant relations through Zerrubabel, Mary being descendent of his son Rhesa and Joseph of his other son Abiud.

Much of this work so far, it must be admitted, is rather abstruse, entangled in chronological problems regarding Old Testament dynasties, and seems far removed indeed from issues relating to the English Bible. However, connections between the two fields appear when we move beyond the abstract harmonisations as presented in the *Concent's* printed texts and examine instead what was going on behind the scenes. It has already been mentioned how the changes between these two printed editions of the *Concent* testify to Broughton's growing interest in biblical genealogy as a subject in its own right and indeed, according to his biographer John Lightfoot, at this point Broughton was already working with John Speed to gather 'all the *Genealogies* of the *Bible* into *one View*' and publish them.²⁵ Lightfoot's comments can be corroborated by print evidence: Speed first published the genealogies in their AV format in 1592, and so it

²⁴ Matthieu Béroalde, *Chronicvm, Scriptvrae Sacrae Avtoritate Constitvtvm* (Geneva: 1575), pp. 130-131; pp. 146-147.

²⁵ Lightfoot, 'Preface', sig. Av; A2v.

must have been from 1588-1592 that the two men collaborated to produce the genealogical diagrams later reproduced in the AV.²⁶

It was probably during this period that Broughton explored alternative solutions to the genealogical contradiction, reading Lucidus and Béroalde as well as dealing with the problems presented by other parts of Christ's genealogy. Unfortunately there are no drafts of these workings: Lightfoot claims that Broughton left his manuscripts from this

²⁶ The 1592 date for Speed's *Genealogies Recorded in the Sacred Scriptures* comes from his ODNB article, but I have not found a physical copy to confirm this date (Sarah Bendall, 'John Speed (1551/2–1629)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, ed. by H. C. G. Matthew and B. Harrison <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/index/101026095/John-Speed>> [accessed 10 February 2015]). The work must have been published by 1595, when Broughton published an index for it, as well as a page-long distillation of his solution. An early publication date seems likely, since from approximately 1591 Broughton was rarely in England and, as Speed lacked the linguistic/philological skills to harmonise the biblical genealogies himself, the project was probably nearly or entirely complete by Broughton's departure. These 1592 diagrams must have been very close to the AV diagrams, as the 1595 index Broughton published for them presumes the same diagrammatic structure and very similar content as the 1616 index Speed published for the AV diagrams. Hugh Broughton, *A direction to finde all those names expressed in that large table of genealogies of Scripture lately gathered by I.S.* (London: 1595); idem, *Our Lord His Line of Fathers from Adam: And His Predecessours in the Kingdome from Salomon to Iechonias, in Whome Ended the House: and from Abiud to Ioseph the Husband of Marie: with Fit Notation of Their Names* (London: Gabriel Simson and William White, 1595); John Speed, *An alphabetical table serving for the readie finding of any name contained in the Genealogies prefixed before the Bibles of the new Translation* (London: 1616).

early period with Speed who 'burnt them all' for unknown reasons.²⁷ Even if Lightfoot's account here is true, the subsequent history of Speed's genealogical publications suggests that some of this evidence has survived. Speed profited tremendously from the financial success of the biblical genealogies, which were not only required by royal privilege to be printed with every AV edition from 1611 to 1624 but also printed as standalone volumes, running through at least 33 editions before 1640.²⁸ Indeed, so popular were the genealogies that after Speed's death the patent was fought over by the Stationers' Company and Speed's heirs: Dr John Speed (Jnr) eventually sold it to the Company in 1638 for the substantial sum of £600.²⁹

This significant success prompted Speed to produce several spin-off works for profit and prestige, including the 1616 *A clowd of witnesses* as well as a 1617 manuscript tract presented to Bishop of Winchester James Montague entitled *JESUS of Nazareth, king of ye Jewes*.³⁰ These works are clearly not composed by Speed: not only do they

²⁷ Lightfoot, 'Preface', sig. A2r.

²⁸ Martha Driver, 'Mapping Chaucer: John Speed and the Later Portraits', *The Chaucer Review*, 36 (2002), 228-249 (p. 241); The first license was issued in 1610 for ten years; the second in 1617 for seven years; *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the Reign of James I*, ed. by M. A. Everett Green, 5 vols (London: 1857-1872), I: 1603-1610 (1857), p. 639; II: 1611-1618 (1858), p.431.

²⁹ Raleigh Skelton, 'Bibliographical Note', in *A Prospect of the Most Famous Parts of the World. London, 1627*, ed. by Raleigh Skelton (Amsterdam: Theatrum Orbis Terrarum, 1966), pp. viii. Speed's ODNB entry gives the sum as '£700', but given that Bendall cites this from Skelton, who states the sum as '£600', I assume the ODNB sum is in error.

³⁰ John Speed, *A clowd of witnesses: and they the holy genealogies of the sacred Scriptures* (London: 1616); London, British Library, MS Egerton 2255.

reference languages that Speed could not read, they even contain direct quotations, sometimes pages long, from Broughton's published works and manuscript drafts.³¹ More interestingly, they also contain material that appears nowhere in Broughton's published or unpublished writings but which Speed still could not have produced himself, and which often expand Broughton's own arguments. It seems likely that these works were composed from the papers that Broughton left with Speed when he fled England during the *Concent* controversy, which Speed then polished in style, moderated in tone and published under his own name. While it is doubtful that Speed would burn the manuscripts purely to conceal evidence of his intellectual debts (certainly after the *Concent* controversy association with Broughton was generally undesirable), it seems that he did

³¹ Large parts of the 1616 *A cloud of witnesses*, for example, are taken from known works by Broughton, linked together with filler passages/transitions by Speed. For example, sig. Br-B3v of *A Cloud of Witnesses* derives from Broughton's *Observations vpon the first ten fathers* (London: 1612); sig. B4r-C2v is an outline of the (idiosyncratic) structure of Broughton's *Concent*; sig. C3r-Fr contains many of the major characteristics and phrasing of Broughton's *A letter to a friende, touching Mardochai his age* (London: 1590) and the section of the work most crucial for the analysis which follows below, sig. G6v-K4v, is in patches identical to Broughton's *A defence of the holy genealogies* (London: 1595). Broughton's peculiar turns of phrase are taken verbatim (e.g. 'our countrey man *Lyra*, corrupted by study of malicious *Rabbines*' vs. '*Nicholas Lyra*, our Countrey-man, corrupted by study of malicious *Rabbins*' (Broughton, sig. C1r; Speed, sig. H2r) and '*Iohn Lucidus*, extremely deceyued by a forged *Philo*' vs. '*Iohn Lucidus*, deceiued by a forged *Philo*' (Broughton, sig. C4r; Speed, sig. H2r), as is his criticism of previous genealogical solutions like Lucidus's, which is identical in content to the passages of the *Concent* discussed earlier.

at least make use of them before their destruction. These later works, therefore, contain valuable evidence relating to the early collaboration of the two men as they examined the messianic genealogies from 1588-1592. Most importantly, they contain the only surviving evidence of their response to a crucial historic solution to the genealogical conflict. This was the solution that, before Annianus promulgated the Marian-Lucan solution across the continent, had received near-unanimous acceptance for well over a millennium.

This solution came from Julius Africanus' (c.160 – c.240) letter to Aristides, preserved in Eusebius' c.323/324 *Historia Ecclesiastica*.³² It was so influential that even where it erred slightly, naming Melchi as Joseph's grandfather according to Luke instead of Matthat, later scholars would not correct it but rather quote Julius (unacknowledged, error withstanding) verbatim.³³ The solution harmonised the genealogies using the law of Levirate marriage from Deuteronomy 25:5-6, which stated that if one of two brothers should die childless, his living brother would be legally compelled to impregnate his widow to produce a child that, though physically of the living brother, would be legally and spiritually of the dead. Accordingly Joseph's grandfathers, whom Julius listed as Matthan and Melchi (the error mentioned above), married in succession the same woman, Estha. Thus their two children, Eli by Melchi and Jacob by Matthan, were

³² Hanmer (ed.), *The ancient ecclesiastical histories*, pp. 10-12.

³³ There is no space for a full survey here, but most Church Fathers supported the Levirate solution, including Ambrose, Jerome, Eusebius, Chrysostom, John of Damascus, Pacatus (writing against Porphyry), Andrew of Crete, Epiphanius Monachus, and even those who felt uneasy with the solution, such as Augustine, followed it in essence. Major medieval figures who supported it include Raymund Martini and Nicholas of Lyra, though Nicholas did correct the Melchi error. See Nicholas of Lyra, *Postilla in totam Bibliam, Postilla litteralis* (Strasbourg: 1492), p. 10.

uterine brothers. So, when Eli married but died childless, Jacob was compelled by Levirate law to marry Eli's widow and produce a child that was physically his but legally and spiritually his brother's. Thus Luke gave Joseph's legal descent and Matthew his physical descent: both true and both necessary to illustrate fully the pedigree of Christ.³⁴

This kind of application of Jewish law to a New Testament problem was Broughton's speciality, and the response to it in Speed's *A Clowd* is a good example of an argument not found in Broughton's writings, but which Speed lacked the languages and knowledge to construct himself. This response used the Talmud to gather information about Levirate Marriage which could not be found in the Hebrew Bible; namely, that the law in Deuteronomy 25 only applied to germane brothers ('for brethren by the mothers side onely, no such *lawe* was either ordained, or practised'), as its *raison d'être* was to preserve lines of inheritance and only 'the son by the *man*, and not by the *woman*, euer succeeded in the inheritance.'³⁵ Since the Levirate solution rested on the fact that '*Jacob and Eli are made brethren and twines of one venter by Estha*', this meant that Eli and Jacob in fact lacked the requisite kin relation for Levirate marriage.³⁶ The patristic solution, in other words, could not withstand the pressure from the greater sixteenth-century knowledge of post-biblical Judaism and Jewish practices, and to a Hebraist like Broughton it quickly revealed itself to be untenable.

Moreover, the response to the patristic harmonisation in *A Clowd* helps us to identify the trigger which turned Broughton's abstract, chronologically-motivated harmonisation into a document specially designed for lay readership and the English Bible. The key to this trigger lies in the fact that the Levirate solution was so well-

³⁴ Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica*, 1.vii, PG.20.90B-95B.

³⁵ Speed, *Clowd*, fol. 66r. See BT Baba Batra, fol. 8a.

³⁶ Speed, *Clowd*, fol. 64v.

established that by the twelfth century it had found a stable visual form in the French theologian Peter of Poitiers' (Petrus Pictaviensis) *Compendium historiae in genealogia Christi*, which usually took the form of a large manuscript scroll tracing the genealogy from Adam until Christ. Using the medieval 'roundel and radiating lines' format of the *arbor consanguinitatis*, the *Compendium* was probably originally an educational aid.³⁷ It was also, however, an immensely successful piece of scholarship, remaining popular well into the fifteenth century: over two hundred copies survive and it was translated into several vernaculars.³⁸ Furthermore, it provided an innovative diagrammatic visualisation of

³⁷ For the best overview, see Philip Moore, *The Works of Peter of Poitiers, Master in Theology and Chancellor of Paris (1193-1205)* (Notre Dame: 1936). Useful for the educational context is William Monroe, 'A Roll-Manuscript of Peter of Poitiers' *Compendium*', *The Bulletin of the Cleveland Museum of Art*, 65.3 (1978), 92-107.

³⁸ The Bodleian library, for instance, contains at least ten copies and the British Library at least 23. For more on the *Compendium*, see Andrea Worm, "Ista est Jerusalem".

Intertextuality and Visual Exegesis in Peter of Poitiers' *Compendium historiae in genealogia Christi* and Werner Rolevinck's *Fasciculus temporum*', in *Imagining Jerusalem in the Medieval West*, ed. by Lucy Donkin and Hanna Vorholt (Oxford: University Press, 2012), pp. 123-161; idem, 'Visualising the Order of History: Hugh of Saint Victor's *Chronicon* and Peter of Poitiers' *Compendium Historiae*', in *Romanesque and the Past: Retrospection in the Art and Architecture of Romanesque Europe*, ed. by John McNeill and Richard Plant (Leeds: British Archaeological Association, 2013), pp. 243-64; Melanie Holcomb, *Pen and Parchment: drawing in the Middle Ages* (New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 2009), pp. 113-116; Anthony Grafton and Daniel Rosenberg, *Cartographies of time* (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 2010), p. 31; Mary Carruthers, *The book of memory* (Cambridge:

Julius' Levirate solution, which knotted Luke and Matthew's genealogies together using an adaptation of Aristotle's Square of Opposition. This took the form of a saltire cross inside a rectangle which had as its corners four roundels containing Joseph's two fathers and grandfathers, and at its centre had Esta, the widow who joined them all together.³⁹

Given the popularity of the *Compendium* it is not surprising to find Petrus' diagram of the Levirate solution repeated by major medieval biblical scholars: it was, for instance, reproduced in some copies of Nicholas of Lyra's *Postilla*.⁴⁰ More surprising, however, and more relevant to this essay is the fact that Petrus' diagram, along with the patristic Levirate solution it represented, can also be found printed at the start of the Bishops' Bible. For, from its first edition in 1568, this Bible came with a prefix of eleven leaves of genealogical diagrams copied straight from Petrus' *Compendium* (not even the corrected version), thus representing every aspect of the patristic solution from the Melchi error to the Aristotelian visualisation of Levirate marriage (Figs 1 and 2).⁴¹ Matthew Parker, who supervised the production of the Bishops' Bible, probably printed these diagrams straight from one of the medieval manuscripts in his collection, of which there are two viable candidates.⁴²

University Press, 2008), pp. 328-9; p. 452; F. Saxl, 'A Spiritual Encyclopaedia of the Later Middle Ages', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 5 (1942), 82-142 (pp. 107-8).

³⁹ See e.g. Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Auctarium D.4.10, fol. 592r (Fig. 1).

⁴⁰ For instance, the diagram is present in the copy of the *Postilla* in Princeton, Princeton University Art Museum, MS y1937-266 fol. 122r.

⁴¹ *The holie Bible conteynyng the olde Testament and the newe* [The Bishops' Bible] (London: 1568), sig. C7v.

⁴² Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 29, fols. vir-xir; MS 437, fols. 1r-6v.

For someone like Broughton, fresh from studying cutting-edge chronological and genealogical scholarship, it must have seemed painfully antiquated to have these centuries-old diagrams displayed in England's official Bible, especially when continental scholars had over sixty years ago left behind the patristic solution they represented. Indeed, this pain is recorded in *A Clowd*, which disapprovingly noted that Petrus' diagrams were 'in a Table once printed with the great Bible.'⁴³ In other words, at the same time as Broughton's interest in biblical genealogy was growing, he was also realising that this was a topic in which English vernacular scholarship lagged far behind her continental, Latinate equivalents. Moreover, both he and Speed had seen that this ignorance was enshrined in the official English Bible in a diagram that was (literally) medieval, representing a solution that could not even withstand a reading of the Talmud.

Broughton believed that it was the duty of a good translator to intervene in problems such as this.⁴⁴ But unlike the problems of translation in the English Bible (of which Broughton was also aware), the improvement of the genealogies would require more than an incisive philological intervention. Rather, because the problem manifested as nothing less than eleven pages of annotated diagrams, a compelling alternative would need to confront the issue on both sides: the intellectual (which Broughton had already established in his *Concent*) and the visual - a realm in which Broughton had no experience of working.

II. The Visual Component: Drafting the AV diagrams.

⁴³ Speed, *Clowd*, fol. 64v.

⁴⁴ See the general comments in Hugh Broughton, *An epistle to the learned nobilitie of England* (Middelburg: 1597), pp. 17-23.

It has already been mentioned that Broughton was not working alone but rather with John Speed, at that time an obscure merchant tailor. Speed's ignorance of continental scholarship and lack of languages mean he could not have contributed to the harmonisation itself, but he did have other talents. Indeed, as Broughton became more dissatisfied with the Bishops' Bible's genealogical diagrams, he had in Speed a man unusually qualified to fashion a new visual form to replace them.

Speed is best known today for his county maps, his atlases, and his (derivative) historical works such as the *History of Great Britain* (1611).⁴⁵ However, not much is known of Speed's life before 1598, when the patronage of Sir Fulke Greville granted him the financial security necessary to pursue his own projects. This security is usually viewed as the beginning of Speed's historical and antiquarian interests, after which he was introduced to men such as William Camden and Robert Cotton and eventually became a member of the Society of Antiquaries.⁴⁶

However, Speed must have been working on historical matters and reaching out to antiquarian circles long before he succeeded in entering them. By 1598 he had already collected enough important historical material to present to the Queen, and he dedicated his 1595 wall map of Canaan to William Cotton, a prebendary at St Paul's who happened

⁴⁵ For Speed's reliance on Robert Cotton, see his letters he sent during the writing of the *History*, in *Original Letters of Eminent Literary Men*, ed. by Henry Ellis (London: 1843), pp. 108-112. The original letters are in London, British Library, MS. Cotton Julius C. III, fols. 65-68.

⁴⁶ The best overview of Speed's life is in Skelton, 'Bibliographical Note', pp. v-xiii on which most of Speed's ODNB entry is based, and A. Baynton-Williams, *John Speed*, website, Map Forum, 1999, nos. 1-2, www.mapforum.com [accessed 10 January 2015].

to be a cousin and friend of Sir Robert Cotton.⁴⁷ Moreover, there is a suggestive letter from William Camden to the Flemish engraver Jodocus Hondius dated 27th April 1607, after the death of William Rogers left Speed's *Theatre* without an engraver. In it Camden recommended Speed to Hondius and asked the latter if he would take Rogers' place as engraver. The letter is usually quoted as if it were a letter of introduction, but this is not the case:

‘In letters which you sent to me long ago, you mentioned that John Speed, a man who is among us the most industrious in Chorography, was toiling away at some new maps of British Counties, and that he was going to use you as the engraver. The man himself has now made this same thing known to me and shown me the aforementioned maps (which he will send to you) which are reasonably well drawn, and he pressed upon me at the same time that I might commend him to you.’⁴⁸

This makes it clear that not only did Hondius know Speed before 1607, but also that Hondius had ‘long ago’ contacted Camden about Speed and his work. Hondius was only

⁴⁷ John Speed, *Canaan as it was possessed both in Abraham and Israels dayes w[i]th with the stations and bordering nations* (London: 1595).

⁴⁸ ‘Literis, quas jam pridem ad me dedisti, innuisti Joannem Speed, virum in Chronographicis [*sic* for Chorographicis?], apud nos summè industrium, novas tabulas Comitatum Angliae moliri: & te Sculptore usurum. Hoc idem jam ipse mihi significavit, & tabellas, quas tibi missurus est, sanè graphicè descriptas ostendit, simul ut ipsum tibi commendarem, obnixè rogavit.’ *Camdeni et illustrium virorum epistolae*, ed. by Thomas Smith (London: 1691), Letter LXII, pp. 87-88.

in England from 1583-1593 when he sought religious asylum after the capture of Ghent; he likely met Speed while etching the plates for Broughton's *Concent* in 1587, which Speed was helping prepare for press.⁴⁹ This letter suggests that Speed was already attempting to contact famous antiquarians such as Camden and Cotton through his existing connections much earlier than 1598.

Moreover, Speed must have started exploiting these contacts for access to historical documents early on, not just for his wall-map but also for his portrait of Chaucer for Thomas Speght's 1598 edition of the poet's works. This portrait, full of heraldic arms and descent lines, attests to Speed's early research into secular genealogy and ability to access the relevant archives.⁵⁰ It is these interests and contacts in not just religious history but also heraldry and antiquarianism that could explain the most striking visual difference between Bishops' Bible's stemmata and the final AV diagrams: the layout of the genealogies themselves.

It is immediately noticeable that the AV genealogies employ the modern line-drop rectilinear format rather than the medieval 'pied de gru' roundel-and-radiating-lines format of the Bishops' Bible's twelfth-century schematics (compare Figs 3 and 4). It is important to recognise how innovative this revamped format was: not only did it allow for a more copious genealogy to be represented on a single page, it also facilitated the representation of more intricate kin relations, reducing the need for the extensive

⁴⁹ There is additional evidence for connection between Hondius and Speed before 1592 in the fact that Broughton's *Moses on mount Synai (right honorable) had a reulation of God* (London: 1592), 'grauen in brasse' by Hondius, appears to have been engraved from the manuscript draft in Speed's hand in Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 950 fol. 6v-7r.

⁵⁰ *Workes of our ancient and learned English poet, Geffrey Chaucer*, ed. by Thomas Speght (London: 1598), sig. Ar. On this portrait, see Driver, 'Mapping Chaucer', 228-249.

commentary visible in the Bishops' Bible/Petrus' diagrams. Furthermore, this format was integral to Broughton and Speed's revision of the Bishops' Bible genealogies from the start. There are at least five extant manuscript drafts of the AV genealogies, in a mixture of Broughton and Speed's hands.⁵¹ Each represents the genealogies at a different stage of completion, and in each the distinctive rectilinear line-drop format is used. At least four of the manuscripts seem to represent successive drafts rather than unrelated attempts as they share key structural innovations and steadily smooth out the knottiest Old Testament genealogies. Indeed, by examining minor changes in the depictions of problematic genealogies across these four manuscripts it is possible to order them and see the diagrams brought closer to the final form of the AV genealogies, from the mostly incomplete structures in Harley 1525 to the fuller but disjointed structures in O.5.53 and Add. 86; to the beautifully drawn, integrated genealogies of Bodley 950, similar in content and layout to the AV diagrams.⁵² MS 766, also close but not identical in format

⁵¹ London, British Library MS Harley 1525; Cambridge, Trinity College Library, MS O.5.53; Cambridge, University Library, MS Add. 86 and London, Lambeth Palace, MS 766 all appear to be predominantly in Broughton's hand, and Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Bodl. 950 is predominantly in Speed's hand (i.e. the same hand as in MS Egerton 2255). I say 'predominantly' because there is some overlap; for example, Broughton likely wrote the Greek in MS Bodl. 950.

⁵² For example, the descent from Terah in Harley 1525, fol. 55r is roughly sketched, with many roundels unfilled: these genealogical structures are further completed and neatened in O.5.53, fols. 6v-7r and Add. 86 fols. 5v-6r; they are joined together as branching trees in Bodley 950, fols. 14v-15r to give a multifaceted descent from Terah, which is essentially identical in content to the descent from Terah in the AV genealogies, though these are polished and neatened to fit the print requirements. See *The Holy Bible*,

and contents to the AV genealogies, appears to be a separate presentation copy of the genealogies, probably for one of Broughton's patrons such as Henry Hastings, 3rd Earl of Huntingdon.

It seems then that when Broughton and Speed began work on revamping the diagrams they decided not to update Petrus' model but rather to begin afresh, disregarding their only precedent. But where did Broughton and Speed find a new model for their diagrams? The answer lies in Speed's studies, for his early interests in heraldry and secular genealogy connected him to the world of antiquarian scholarship which was developing the exact tools the two men needed to create diagrams to replace the ones they had disregarded.

Particularly relevant was the world of professional heraldry, with which we saw Speed engaged for the composition of his Chaucer portrait. The early sixteenth century saw a dramatic growth in heraldry, customarily attributed to social shifts that made families anxious to prove (or forge) their claim to a noble lineage.⁵³ The increased pressure these changes placed on visitations (the tours undertaken by representatives from the College of Arms to inspect/authorise the coats of arms), caused genealogies to assume an unprecedented importance: the first sign of this was the 1512 writ of aid requiring all visitations to record descent.⁵⁴

Conteyning the Old Testament, and the New. Newly Translated out of the Originall tongue, by his Maiesties Speciall Comandement [The King James Bible] (London: 1611), p. 6.

⁵³ Felicity Heal and Clive Holmes, *The Gentry in England and Wales, 1500-1700* (Stanford: University Press, 1994), 20-37; Richard Cust, 'Catholicism, antiquarianism and gentry honour: the writings of Sir Thomas Shirley', *Midland History*, 5 (1998), 40-70.

⁵⁴ *Munimenta heraldica 1484-1984*, ed. by G. Squibb (London: 1984), pp. 20-7. For an overview of developments, see Adrian Ailes, 'Development of heralds' visitations', *Coat*

At first these descents were taken in narrative form or the medieval curvilinear format. But as the interest in ancestry grew under Elizabeth, the Somerset herald Robert Glover initiated a new approach. Glover's approach to visitations marked a sea change in heraldic method: determined to found his pedigrees upon evidence, he copied out family charters, public records and monastic cartularies to test claims to nobility.⁵⁵ It was also Glover who, throughout his 1580s visitations, pioneered the rectilinear line-drop format for genealogies still used today.⁵⁶

Moreover, Glover's innovations disseminated rapidly as changes in the organisation of the library of the College of Arms facilitated easier exchange of techniques among the heralds. The College of Arms only found a permanent building for itself in 1564, meaning that the separate libraries of the various provinces could be collected and catalogued in the same place. This made visitation records accessible to all members and thereby allowed a great wealth of genealogical material to be shared as a common resource. The same library was governed by the rules which Thomas Howard,

of Arms, 3rd ser., 5 (2009), 7-23; A. Wagner, *English Genealogy* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1960); Richard Cust, *Charles I and the Aristocracy, 1625–1642* (Cambridge: University Press, 2013), pp. 7-22.

⁵⁵ Nigel Ramsay, 'Glover, Robert', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, ed. by H. C. G. Matthew and B. Harrison <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/10833>> [accessed 10 February 2015]; Janet Verasanso, 'The Staffordshire Heraldic Visitations: Their Nature and Function', *Midland History*, 26:1 (2001), 128-143; Anthony Wagner, *The Records and Collections of the College of Arms* (London: Burkes Peerage, 1952).

⁵⁶ See, for example, Glover's notes from 1556-1581 in London, British Library, Add. MS 74253, which show him moving from the medieval curvilinear to modern rectilinear format.

Earl Marshal, had set down in August 1554. These stipulated that visitation records, including rough notes, descents and drafts must be deposited in the library and remain there unless needed for visitations (after which they must be returned). This meant that Glover's advances in diagrammatic representation could be accessed, examined and copied by other members of the College quickly and conveniently. Hence why his innovation spread so fast: indeed, by 1618 it had become the method of representing lineage unanimously used by the entire heraldic body.⁵⁷

Moreover Speed and Broughton were working on the biblical genealogies just as heraldic scholarship reached its peak, which coincided roughly with Glover's death in 1588. It seems likely, then, that Speed, gathering information on descent and heraldry for his historical projects (such as the Chaucer portrait) and reaching out to antiquarian circles, became aware of recent heraldic advances in drawing descents and so adopted them as a model for the biblical genealogies he was working on with Broughton.⁵⁸ Thus

⁵⁷ Wagner, *English Genealogy*, p. 323.

⁵⁸ These connections may not have been Speed's uniquely: Broughton's student Robert Devereux, 2nd Earl of Essex, also had connections to the Society of Antiquaries and many of its publications were dedicated to him, like Broughton's *To the right honorable, Robert Earle of Essex*. However, given his investigations into the subject, Speed would have been better acquainted with heraldic scholarship than Broughton. Modern scholarship has rumoured that Broughton himself might have been a member of the Society of Antiquaries (see Claire Kennedy, 'Those Who Stayed: English Chorography and the Elizabethan Society of Antiquaries' in *Motion and Knowledge in the Changing Early Modern World*, ed. by Ofer Gal and Yi Zheng (Dordrecht: Springer Verlag, 2014) pp. 47-70, (p. 66); Christina DeCoursey, 'Society of Antiquaries (act. 1586–1607)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, ed. by H. C. G. Matthew and B. Harrison

the harmonisation Broughton had advanced using a mixture of chronological scholarship and Hebrew learning found an equally avant-garde mode of presentation.

It should be emphasised just how striking Broughton and Speed's genealogical project was within the context of sixteenth-century scholarship. Broughton's solution to Christ's conflicting genealogies, as we have seen, emerged from an engagement with some central issues of contemporary chronology, drawing on the Talmud to refute the longstanding patristic harmonisation and replace it with a more modern one. Yet this erudition would be ruthlessly stripped from the final genealogies. Instead it would be distilled into vernacular diagrams with minimal extraneous commentary, and in a strikingly secular form – all, presumably, to make these findings comprehensible to the English layperson. The AV genealogies not only emerged from an entirely Latinate scholarly culture but also eliminated any reference to this culture so as to accommodate their intended English audience. Indeed, the most creative element of the genealogies

<<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/72906>> [accessed 10 February 2015]).

However, this is unsupported by primary evidence, and originates from a single mention of Broughton identified by Thomas Hearne in the 18th century as a transcription error: 'In a spare leaf in Mr. Tate's manuscript collection, containing the names of some few of the members of the then society of antiquaries, [Richard Broughton] is called *Hugh* Broughton; but this list is the hand-writing of John Anstis, Esquire; late garter king at arms, who it may be supposed either wrote the Christian name *Hugh* instead of *Richard* by mistake, or transcribed it from some other list not so authentick as that given by Mr. Tate.' (Thomas Hearne, *A Collection of Curious Discourses written by eminent Antiquaries*, 2 vols (London: 1771-5), II (1775), p. 424.) Anstis (1669-1744) lived long after Francis Tate (1560–1616) who, as secretary to the Society, knew Richard Broughton personally. It is therefore more likely that Anstis erred than Tate.

was not the actual solution reached itself, which had profound debts to continental scholars, but rather the appropriation of advances in secular heraldic scholarship to package that solution in a form easily accessible and indeed deeply familiar to the literate populace.

In order to achieve this, Broughton and Speed needed to foreground the scholarly solutions that the diagrams presented, without drowning them in the dense polyglot quotations or cross-references with which continental elites usually advertised their learning. Instead, the novel (in an English context) intellectual features of the diagram, those features most profoundly indebted to continental scholarship, were highlighted to the reader with visual signals so as to make them lucid to those with none of the learning usually required to understand them. The break from patristic tradition which attributed Luke's genealogy to Mary and Matthew's to Joseph, for example, was emphasized throughout the diagrams through the inclusion within each roundel of biblical references, making it easy to trace the path of Lucan references leading upwards from Mary (reiterated by the filled, patterned line signalling that this Christ's physical descent), and the path of Matthean references leading upwards from Joseph. Just in case the reader overlooked this, however, the symmetrical boxes at the top of p. 33 (Fig. 4) and p. 34 (Fig. 5) of the genealogies reiterated the point: 'According to Matt.' was the description attached to Joseph's genealogy, and 'According to Luke' to Mary's. The method of harmonisation, then, was doubly emphasised, so that the reader could not miss it. Furthermore, another of Broughton's particular concerns, namely the application of Jeremiah 22:24 to Jechoniah, was highlighted with a box at the bottom of p. 33 next to the roundel of Jechoniah, which stated: 'Solomons house ending in Coniah, and hee a signet plucke off from Gods right hand', and cited Jeremiah 22:24. Again these diagrams disseminated innovative genealogical scholarship and underscored their innovations with prose annotations and pictorial signals.

Moreover, the aspect of the genealogies most crucial for the chronological work underpinning them – the interpretation of Matthew’s descent as dynastic succession without sanguinity – was made equally obvious. It was openly stated in the book-shaped box at the bottom of p. 34: ‘Ioseph and Mary both of Zorobabel, Daudid, and Iudah, are parents of Christ. Ioseph legally, in whose right he is king of the Iewes, which succession St. Matthew followeth’ and again underscored by further annotations. The labels at the bottom of p. 33 stressed that the line thus traced ‘according to Matthew’ (as stated at the top of the page) was ‘by succession’ until Salathiel, and the banner at the bottom of p.34 emphasised that from Salathiel the line was traced ‘by law’ following the legal inheritance of the right to be ‘king of the Iewes’. Luke’s genealogy, however, was traced ‘by nature’ throughout. Just in case the reader missed these prose signals, once more a visual safety-signal was in place: the line of succession on p. 33 was highlighted by a series of crowns placed above the relevant roundels.⁵⁹ In other words, the AV genealogies flaunted their innovations with a series of visual and verbal markers designed to make its novelties impossible for the lay reader to miss. The intellectual solution the genealogies had adopted and adapted was a cutting-edge piece of scholarship within an English context, and the reader was meant to know it.

This was scholarship not for scholars but for the layperson, and its novelty was bound up with its reformulation. After all, while the biblical genealogies did have a long history of diagrammatic representation, Broughton and Speed drastically changed the function and layout of these diagrams. Their separate skill sets allowed them to fuse two

⁵⁹ *The Holy Bible, Conteyning the Old Testament, and the New. Newly Translated out of the Originall tongues: by his Maiesties Speciall Comandement* [The King James Bible] (London: 1611), see pp. 33-34 (Figs 4 and 5).

unconnected forms of scholarship, sacred philology with secular heraldry, to fashion a new form that could better deliver the products of learned disciplines into lay understanding. This kind of work should give us a fresh perspective on the connections between learned, critical culture (which over the sixteenth century had used philological scholarship and technical disciplines such as chronology to establish a new harmonisation of Christ's conflicting genealogies) and the vernacular lay culture here given easy access to the results of this scholarship in neatly-packaged, easily digestible form. Furthermore, this was not a case of such scholarship having limited circulation outside a tiny elite, divorced from the mass population and lacking any commercial success. Rather, the immense popularity of the AV genealogies and their great financial success suggests that there was a demand for work of this nature.⁶⁰

These conclusions are reinforced by an analysis of the genealogies' printing in different formats. From 1612 up until 1640, the genealogies (like the AV) were printed not just in large folio, but also in small folio, quarto, octavo and duodecimo. The publication of the genealogies in these smaller formats is precisely what we would expect of a work intended for a lay audience to study at home and, unsurprisingly, these smaller formats were frequently bound and even sold together with similarly sized Bibles – not just smaller AVs, but also Geneva versions.⁶¹

⁶⁰ See p. 14, fn 29 above.

⁶¹ For examples of the quarto Geneva bound with Speed's genealogies see the copies in Cambridge, Trinity College Library, C.12.73, C.12.34, and C.12.45. For evidence that the smaller-format genealogies were bound and sold together, see the bookbinders' price lists in Mirjam M. Foot, 'Some bookbinders' price lists of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries' in *De libris compactis miscellanea*, ed. by G. Collin (Aubel and Brussels: Bibliotheca Wittockiana, 1984) pp. 273-319 (pp. 287-292).

More importantly, the intellectual content of the genealogies was remarkably well maintained across these different formats. From small folio to octavo all the key visual features of the genealogies described above remained unchanged, retained despite the drastic decrease in size. Alterations consisted chiefly of superficial cuts: quotations were abbreviated; decorated roundels had their decoration scaled down (although decoration was never removed entirely, so preserving the overall balance of visual impact); biblical references inside the roundels were removed; and, in the most complex descents (such as that from Levi on p. 13), roundels were brought closer together and occasionally, at the edges of the page, rearranged to maximise spatial efficiency.⁶² In general, however, the overall structure of the genealogies, their basic layout, and the emphatic visual signals such as banners, shields, borders and boxes were carefully preserved even in octavo format.

Naturally, much more had to be cut for the genealogies in duodecimo, but to compensate for this loss of detail in the diagrams themselves, the duodecimo genealogies came printed with an extra page not found in the other formats, entitled ‘A true & easie reconciliation of the Euangelists, S. *Matthew* and S. *Luke*.’ This summarised the harmonised descent from David to Christ and noted all of its key intellectual features: the curse of Jechoniah, Christ’s descent ‘by law’ following Matthew and ‘by nature’

⁶² As a sample, I have compared the 1611, 1613 and 1630 large folio editions, the 1612 and 1616 small folio editions, the 1612, 1616, 1630, 1633 and 1636 quarto editions and the 1615, 1635 and 1638 octavo editions of Speed’s *The genealogies recorded in the Sacred Scriptures* to check that these features remain consistent across the three formats throughout the duration of the genealogies’ printing.

following Luke.⁶³ Thus, even readers of the smallest printed genealogies would still be able to appreciate the scholarly essence of the solution they proposed. All of this evidence suggests a sustained attempt to retain both the intellectual content of the diagrams and its accessibility to lay readers. Indeed, as the traces of reading left in some copies of the genealogies suggest, these smaller formats were frequently consumed by a lay audience: one Cambridge copy, for instance, was annotated jointly by a mother and her son.⁶⁴

One question here arises: how were lay readers expected to use these genealogical tables? In 1595 Broughton published a work that can answer this question: *A direction to finde all those names expressed in that large table of genealogies of Scripture lately gathered by I.S.*, intended to match the diagrams Speed had published in 1592. The purpose of this was ‘to adde[...]some instruction for the vse’ of the genealogies ‘for the Readers benefite.’⁶⁵ It comprised of every name mentioned in ‘that large Table of Genealogies of Scripture’ next to two numbers, ‘whereof the first number serueth for the side margentes, and the later answerable to the highest fygures’, allowing the reader to look up any biblical

⁶³ Duodecimo editions are rare: I have examined the 1620 edition in Cambridge University Library, SSS.26.5, which is bound with a beautifully hand-coloured and embroidered 1620 AV, owned (although it is difficult to tell from the partially-erased note on the inner cover) by two sisters.

⁶⁴ ‘Elizabeth faulknour is my name and with my son i wrot thes’, late seventeenth-century hand, in John Speed, *The genealogies recorded in the Sacred Scriptures, according to euery family and tribe* (London: 1636), p. 10, annotation in Cambridge University Library, Syn.5.63.5.

⁶⁵ Broughton, *A defence of the holy genealogies*, sig. C1r.

personage in the index and discover, using the genealogies, their immediate and remote kinship, as well as distance from Christ.⁶⁶

Even more revealing is Speed's revision and reprinting of this index in 1616 to match the King James Bible genealogies, intended to aid 'the ready finding of any person or name contained in the draughts of those that are printed with the new Bible of the last translation.'⁶⁷ Speed here not only added to the index a scriptural reference (presumably to allow it to be read in both directions) but also marginal letters to denote 'the most noted among them of any Nation, kindred, & Tribe, vpon whom the chiefest storeis in Scriptures depend', such as 'KI' for a King of Judah, 'P' for a Prophet etc.⁶⁸ Moreover, he made Broughton's referencing more efficient, by dividing the page into four quadrants and assigning each quadrant a letter so that names could be located with page number then the quadrant.

It is evident from these indexes how Speed and Broughton wanted readers to use their genealogies. They probably imagined that when readers of the Bible came across a new name, or were confused by an apparent genealogical inconsistency, they would turn to their indexes, check the name in the table, find it in the genealogies with the reference, and thereby gain all the information necessary to situate that figure within the intricate networks of scriptural kinship. The AV genealogies were intended to be anything but 'decoratively printed but useless' additions to the main translation. They were an apparatus to settle confusion and be actively used, not passively admired. They were

⁶⁶ Idem, *A direction to finde all those names expressed in that large table of genealogies of Scripture lately gathered by I.S* (London: 1595) sig. A1r.

⁶⁷ John Speed, *An alphabetical table serving for the readie finding of any name contained in the Genealogies prefixed before the Bibles of the new Translation* (London: 1616), sig. A1r.

⁶⁸ Ibid., sig. A2r.

interventions against the outdated diagrams of the Bishops' Bible. They were meant to correct potential misapprehensions of the scripture at the very same time as scripture was being read.

III. Conclusion

It should be clear that something greater underwrote the production of the AV genealogies than anxiety about inaccurate genealogies. To understand this deeper motivation, we need to have a better sense of what larger vision the genealogies fed into. What did Broughton think was the purpose of vernacular, stripped-down biblical scholarship such as this? This question is too large for a conclusion, but suggestions can be made by examining one additional genealogical problem Broughton found in the very centre of the 1572 revision of Bishops' Bible.⁶⁹

Very little work has been done on Matthew Parker's 1572 revisions to the Bishops' Bible. This is possibly because the main changes did not affect the biblical text itself, which has historically been the priority of most scholars, probably due to the ongoing influence of the text-critical concerns of nineteenth-century scholarship. This is perhaps also why no previous attention has been paid to the twelfth-century diagrams prefixed to the Bishops' text, which I discussed earlier. But for contemporary readers, and even for eighteenth-century readers such as John Strype, the most obviously important addition to this edition was its extended apparatus, namely four tables inserted at controversial points of the scripture.⁷⁰ As well as chronological and historical information these also included, in the last insertion, a table reconciling Christ's

⁶⁹ Broughton, *An epistle*, p. 17.

⁷⁰ John Strype, *The Life and Acts of Matthew Parker*, 2 vols, (Oxford: 1821) II, pp. 220-221.

genealogies.⁷¹ The insertion of these tables into the Bishops' Bible is revealing, particularly if, as Strype thought, their addition was the primary purpose for the revision. Moreover, examination of the final, genealogical table is surprising, for the entire piece gives Anniius's solution, probably (given the similarity of presentation), taken from Lucidus's 1537 *Opusculum*.

It is startling to find Anniius's harmony in the very centre of the Bishops' Bible, and all the more so because it appears alongside other chronological and philological apparatus with continental origins. Not only does this suggest that the English ecclesiastical establishment of the 1570s was feeling some need to keep abreast of scholarship on problems such as Christ's genealogies, it also suggests that they thought the Bishops' Bible of 1568 required the insertion of a significant quantity of chronological and philological data.

Less surprisingly, Broughton criticised this table as he had criticised Anniius and Lucidus's uncritical reliance on him.⁷² But his reasons for criticising the solution in this vernacular table were revealingly different from his reasons for criticising it in Lucidus's Latin *Opusculum*. Whereas the Latin was bad because it was relied on forged sources and weak biblical scholarship, the English was bad because it was 'poisoning all simple that use it', with the wide print circulation 'enough to poison an whole nation'.⁷³ In other words, the English genealogical tables, easily accessible to the unlearned and inserted in the officially approved vernacular bibles, were dangerous precisely because its readers were uncritical, and therefore its damage unlimited. In this respect Broughton did not consider his genealogies to be anomalies in the field of English vernacular biblical

⁷¹ Bishops' Bible, LXIIv; CCXXXVIIIv; LXXVIIv; prefixed to the NT, Iv.

⁷² See Broughton, *An epistle*, pp. 17-23 and Broughton, *Concent* (1590), sig.Dr-v.

⁷³ Idem, *An epistle*, p. 20; p. 17.

scholarship, but merely superior contributions to the ‘furtherance of the simple’ already attempted (and botched) by the Bishops’ Bible.⁷⁴

Indeed, although the reality was more complex, the assorted chronological and genealogical tables of the 1572 Bishops’ Bible were enough to give Broughton the impression that the English ecclesiastical establishment shared his ideal of an erudite vernacular Bible that could make scripture accessible to the layperson in a form that reflected advances in contemporary biblical scholarship. From this perspective the genealogical diagrams, completed in the early 1590s, represent the pinnacle of Broughton’s optimism for the future of English biblical scholarship. As it turned out, Broughton misjudged the direction in which vernacular translation was heading, and his calls throughout the 1590s for a new English Bible with a hefty scholarly apparatus were generally met with silence by the English Bishops. It is perhaps revealing that even when his genealogies were at last issued with a new translation, Broughton himself played little part in the matter: their authorship was entirely attributed to Speed, and it was likely even Speed who wrote the preface ‘To the Christian Reader’ outlining the solution his colleague had advanced.⁷⁵

Recent work on the history of reading and vernacular Bibles has become increasingly preoccupied with the ways in which the paratextual and non-textual features of books were designed to accommodate the average, unlearned lay reader, especially

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 17.

⁷⁵ It is possible that the preface was based on a work initially composed by Broughton, but the prose style differs enough from Broughton’s for it to be likely that Speed was at least in charge of the final draft.

through the use of ‘reading aids’ or ‘reading technologies’.⁷⁶ The genealogies of the King James Bible were an unusually sophisticated and innovative example of such a technology, aiming to transfer scholarly knowledge from learned culture to lay readers in the most accessible, easily-navigated way possible. Moreover, the ‘scholarly knowledge’ they aimed to transmit was very specific: a solution, drawn from Broughton’s study of chronology, to the longstanding problem of Christ’s conflicting genealogies, rendered into visual form in response to the genealogical diagrams and tables in the Bishops’ Bibles of 1568 and 1572. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, the composition of these genealogical diagrams was only made possible by the collaboration between Broughton and Speed which exploited their complementary specialist skills: the former expert in chronology, rabbinics, and the neo-Latin world of sacred scholarship, and the latter in cartography, visualisation and the secular world of heraldic scholarship. One consequence of this is to show vividly how the study of seemingly obscure fields of neo-Latin, continental erudition can give us an unprecedented understanding of the composition, purpose and contemporary significance of vernacular biblical scholarship. More than this, however, it also shows that there were scholars in sixteenth century who envisioned an English Bible that would bring these two worlds far closer together than they had ever been before, or would be after.

⁷⁶ Femke Molekamp, *Women and the Bible in Early Modern England: Religious Reading and Writing* (Oxford: University Press, 2013), pp. 19-50; Peter Stallybrass, ‘Books and Scrolls: Navigating the Bible’, in *Books and Readers in Early Modern England: Material Studies*, ed. by Jennifer Andersen and Elizabeth Sauer (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2002), pp. 42-79 (pp. 51-63).