

1 Calculators in Divinity: Henry Savile and Thomas Bradwardine

2

3 Scott Mandelbrote

4 *Peterhouse, Cambridge*

5

6 But what y^t God afore wote, must nedes bee

7 After the opinion of certaine clerkes

8 Witnesse of him, that any clerke is

9 That in schole is great alteracion

10 In this mater, and great disputacion

11 And hath ben, of an hundred thousand men

12 But I ne can nat boulte it to the bren

13 As can the holy doctour saint Austin

14 Or Boece, or the bishop Bradwardin

15 Whether that goddess worthy foreweting

16 Straineth me nedely to do a thing

17 (Nedely clepe I simple necessitie)

18 Or if the free choice be graunted me

19 To do the same thing, or do it nought

20 Though God forewote it, er it was wrought¹

21

22 In the Nun's Priest's Tale, Chaucer introduced the figure of Thomas Bradwardine (c. 1300-

23 1349) alongside that of St Augustine as someone who had understood the otherwise

¹ Geoffrey Chaucer, *Workes* (London, 1598), fol. 87r; cf. Thomas Bradwardine, *De causa Dei, contra Pelagium et de virtute causarum ad suos Mertonenses, libri tres*, ed. Henry Savile (London, 1618), sig. a3v.

1 incomprehensible problem posed by divine foreknowledge for human free will. Bradwardine,
 2 whom Henry Savile believed to have been born in 1290, had been consecrated as Archbishop
 3 of Canterbury in 1348.² His earlier clerical career had included service from 1337 as Chancellor
 4 of St Paul's Cathedral. At first apparently a client of Richard de Bury, the powerful and
 5 bibliophilic Bishop of Durham, Bradwardine later entered the service of Edward III and
 6 witnessed the king's success in the war in France. He remained in touch, however, with the
 7 scholarly environment of Merton College, Oxford, of which he had become a Fellow in 1323.³
 8 There he was involved in debates between the followers of Duns Scotus and those of Thomas
 9 Aquinas, and in the furore over William of Ockham's annotations on the *Sentences* of Peter
 10 Lombard, which were condemned at both Oxford and Avignon in 1326. Whereas Bradwardine
 11 would eventually stress the necessity of divine will in the transforming power of grace,
 12 Ockham drew out its contingency. In particular, he suggested that the gift of grace implied
 13 divine acceptance of an act whose merit arose from the free will of its human actor.⁴ This
 14 theological debate was the initial context for the lectures that Bradwardine reworked in 1344
 15 as *De causa Dei*, and that he addressed from London to his fellow Mertonians in order to
 16 combat the rise of what he considered to be neo-Pelagianism.

17

18 Although *De causa Dei* circulated reasonably widely in the later Middle Ages (more
 19 than fifty manuscripts reproducing at least part of it survive), it was not one of his writings that
 20 found its way into print in the late fifteenth or early sixteenth centuries.⁵ Instead it was first

² Bradwardine, *De causa Dei*, ed. Savile, sig. a2v; for a modern outline of Bradwardine's life, see the entry by Gordon Leff in *ODNB*.

³ G. H. Martin and J. R. L. Highfield, *A History of Merton College* (Oxford, 1997), pp. 56-59.

⁴ For discussion of these topics, see Gordon Leff, *Bradwardine and the Pelagians* (Cambridge, 1957); H. A. Oberman, *Archbishop Thomas Bradwardine. A Fourteenth Century Augustinian* (Utrecht, 1958); James A. Weisheipl, 'Ockham and some Mertonians', *Mediaeval Studies* 30 (1968), 163-213. I have not been able to consult Brian Fleming's 1964 Louvain dissertation, *Thomas de Bradwardine*.

⁵ See James A. Weisheipl, 'Repertorium Mertonense', *Mediaeval Studies* 31 (1969), 174-224, at p. 181; Richard Sharpe, *A Handlist of the Latin Writers of Great Britain and Ireland before 1540* (Turnhout, 1997), pp. 642-644; Edit Anna Lukács, 'Die Handschriften von Thomas Bradwardines Traktat *De causa Dei* in Österreich', *Codices Manuscripti et Impressi* 99/100 (2015), 3-10. See also Thomas Bradwardine, *De causa Dei contra*

1 edited by another Mertonian, Henry Savile (1549-1622), at the time both Warden of the College
 2 and Provost of Eton College. The peculiarities of Savile's edition deserve more attention than
 3 they have hitherto received, even though the immediate context for its reception in the
 4 Arminian controversy that was eventually played out at the Synod of Dort (1618-19) has been
 5 obvious to a number of scholars.⁶

6
 7 Savile's edition of Bradwardine's *De causa Dei* was entered in the Stationers' Register
 8 on 21 July 1617 to John Bill (1576-1630), one of the partners in the office of the King's
 9 Printer.⁷ Savile was still at work on the historical details of the preface, in which he sketched
 10 out Bradwardine's career and determined that he had died in 1349, in February and March
 11 1618. At the same time, he was also contemplating how to word the dedication to James VI &
 12 I, using the antiquary and herald William Camden (1551-1623), whose advice he had taken on
 13 sources for Bradwardine's life, as an intermediary with the printer.⁸

14
 15 Bill and his partner Bonham Norton had just bought out Robert Barker and his son,
 16 Christopher, from their interest in the King's Printing House, in a settlement of debt that would

Pelagium et de virtute causarum, ed. Edit Anna Lukács (Göttingen, 2013), pp. 11-13. Both Weisheipl and Sharpe give the impression that earlier editions than Savile's exist, but these are confusions with the publication of Bradwardine's writings on geometry, arithmetic, and the art of memory.

⁶ Nicholas Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists. The Rise of English Arminianism c. 1590-1640* (Oxford, 1987), p. 56; Luca Baschera, 'Witnessing to the Calvinism of the English Church: The 1618 Edition of Thomas Bradwardine's "De Causa Dei Adversus Pelagium"', in *Bewegung und Beharrung, Aspekte des reformierten Protestantismus, 1520-1650*, eds. Christian Moser and Peter Opitz (Leiden, 2009), pp. 433-446.

⁷ Edward Arber (ed.), *A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London, 1554-1660*, 5 vols (London, 1875), 3: 612.

⁸ Thomas Smith (ed.), *V. Cl. Gulielmi Camdeni, et illustrium virorum ad G. Camdenum epistolae* (London, 1691), pp. 219-220, 224-225. The dedication leaf (which is found between the title-page and sig. a2) is signed 'a' but is in fact a cancel, inserted after the rest of the first quire of the book had been printed. Although present, it was not bound into Savile's own copy of the book, see S. Leigh Sotheby and John Wilkinson, *Catalogue of a Selection of Singularly Curious & Rare Books from the Libraries of those Eminent Scholars, Sir Henry Savile and Sir John Savile* (London, 1860), p. 24, number 228. Royal involvement and approval were not, however, an afterthought for Savile's edition, as other evidence shows. Another inserted leaf follows p. 876 in some but by no means all copies and bears two columns of errata: see, for example, Oxford, Merton College, shelfmark 46. a. 12.

1 soon be taken up in Chancery and referred by the court to Savile for arbitration.⁹ As Maria
 2 Wakely and the late Graham Rees have shown, the edition of Bradwardine formed part of a
 3 group of nine impressive, folio works written or edited by leading figures in the government
 4 of James VI & I, which were produced by the King's Printers between 1616 and 1620, and
 5 which testified to royal faith in the power of the printed word to determine political and
 6 religious debate.¹⁰ The books concerned (other than *De causa Dei*) were the works (in English
 7 and later in Latin) of James VI & I, edited by James Montagu, then Bishop of Bath and Wells
 8 and later Bishop of Winchester; two volumes of the anti-papal *De Republica Ecclesiastica* of
 9 the renegade Archbishop of Split, Marc' Antonio de Dominis; the similarly critical history of
 10 the Council of Trent written by the Venetian, Paolo Sarpi (also a friend of De Dominis), which
 11 appeared in Italian, English, and Latin versions; and Francis Bacon's *Instauratio magna*.
 12 Several of these publications, including *De causa Dei*, were later named by Bill as having been
 13 loss-making undertakings that he had been required to print 'for y^e advancement of o^r religion
 14 & honor of y^e Nation'.¹¹ The demands that the almost simultaneous production of such
 15 substantial books made on the King's printing house were considerable. Certainly, Bonham
 16 Norton, Bill's partner and the holder of the patent for the printing of Latin books on behalf of
 17 the Crown, judged initially that *De causa Dei* was too expensive to take on.¹² The work only
 18 went ahead after the King had expressed his displeasure and, through the Secretary of State,
 19 Sir Ralph Winwood, compelled Norton to acquire the necessary materials for the edition. In a

⁹ See Henry R. Plomer, 'The King's Printing House under the Stuarts', *The Library* 2nd series 2 (1901), 353-375, especially pp. 356-360.

¹⁰ Maria Wakely and Graham Rees, 'Folios fit for a King: James I, John Bill, and the King's Printers, 1616-1620', *Huntington Library Quarterly* 68 (2005), 467-495; Graham Rees and Maria Wakely, *Publishing, Politics, and Culture. The King's Printers in the Reign of James I and VI* (Oxford, 2009), pp. 93-120.

¹¹ W. W. Greg (ed.), *A Companion to Arber* (Oxford, 1967), pp. 257-258; cf. W. A. Jackson (ed.), *Records of the Court of the Stationers' Company 1602 to 1640* (London, 1957), pp. 101, 362-364.

¹² Rees and Wakely, *Publishing, Politics, and Culture*, pp. 36, 152-153.

1 later suit in Chancery between Bill and Norton, Bill asserted his own willingness to comply
 2 with such demands even at his own loss.¹³

3

4 As publishers of Latin books, Bill and Norton had established contacts at the bi-annual,
 5 eight-day Frankfurt book fair, through which learned works were traded across Europe. From
 6 1617, Bill produced a version of the catalogues of the Frankfurt fair, promoting his own books
 7 as well as others that he would be able to obtain from Germany. Bradwardine's *De causa Dei*
 8 was quickly advertised in the catalogue that Bill printed following the September fair in 1617.¹⁴

9 A bill kept by Bill for the natural philosopher, Thomas Harriot, from 31 October 1617 to 29
 10 July 1618, which featured heavily books advertised in the fair catalogues, provides a
 11 contemporary sale price for *De causa Dei* of 15 shillings.¹⁵ The edition of Bradwardine
 12 continued to appear, shifting its location among other publications, in subsequent fair
 13 catalogues issued by Bill until his final catalogue in 1628. Copies were certainly sold into the
 14 Continental market in this way, even during the period of time, between 1622 and 1627, when
 15 Bill ceded his interest in the Latin stock to the Stationers' Company. The Antwerp bookseller,
 16 Jan II Moretus at the Officina Plantiniana, took two copies at the autumn fair in 1626. His
 17 purchases from Bill and Norton more broadly draw attention to the relationship that Savile had
 18 had for some time with the King's Printers. John Norton, then the King's Printer, was
 19 effectively the publisher for the Greek patristic editions that Melchisedec Bradwood printed on

¹³ Kew, The National Archives, C5/592/24 (Bill v. Norton).

¹⁴ *Catalogvs vniversalis pro nvndinis Francofvrtensibvs avtvmnalibus, de anno M. D. C. XVII.* (London, 1617), sig. A1v. On Bill's role in the international trade in Latin books, see Rees and Wakely, *Publishing, Politics, and Culture*, pp. 190-241. For the Frankfurt fair, see Ian Maclean, *Scholarship, Commerce, Religion. The Learned Book in the Age of Confessions, 1560-1630* (Cambridge MA, 2012).

¹⁵ Chichester, West Sussex Record Office, Petworth House Archive, HMC 241/4, fol. 9r-v; printed in Scott Mandelbrote, 'The Religion of Thomas Harriot', in *Thomas Harriot. An Elizabethan Man of Science*, ed. Robert Fox (Aldershot, 2000), pp. 246-279, at pp. 272-279. The earliest evidence for institutional purchase of which I am aware is that of Peterhouse, Cambridge, which acquired a copy by 24 March 1619: see Ward Library, Peterhouse, Ms. 405, fol. 33v. It is unlikely that this is the copy which survives in the library, since that derives from the donation in 1635 of some of the books of the Mertonian physician, Theodore Gulston. Gulston's copy (Peterhouse, Perne Library, shelfmark H. 4. 24) lacks the errata and has printer's waste from the edition used in its gilt-tooled binding, suggesting in turn that it was acquired close to the time of publication.

1 behalf of Savile at his Eton press in the early 1610s. Bill and Bonham Norton, as partners in
 2 the Latin stock, were later the conduit for the sale to Moretus, for example, of Richard
 3 Montagu's edition of the invectives against Julian the Apostate by Gregory of Nazianzus (Eton,
 4 1610), as well as for the enormous and remarkable Eton edition of the works of John
 5 Chrysostom (Eton, 1610-1613).¹⁶

6
 7 Savile also intervened personally, notably through the network provided by the
 8 embassies of his son-in-law, Sir Dudley Carleton (1573-1632), to Venice from 1610 to 1615
 9 and at the Hague from 1616, to promote the distribution of copies of his edition of Chrysostom
 10 in Italy and the northern Netherlands.¹⁷ It is worth dwelling for a while on the nature of Savile's
 11 web of contacts and its links with the folio publications of John Bill. Dudley Carleton, who by
 12 1617 hoped to succeed Savile as Provost, had been involved with the printing of Greek texts at
 13 the Eton press. While in Venice, he encouraged Sarpi in the writing of the history of the Council
 14 of Trent, which may in part have been meant as a response to the *Consensus Ecclesiae catholicae*
 15 *contra Tridentinos* (1613) of his cousin, George Carleton, later Bishop of Llandaff.¹⁸

16
 17 Carleton also approached Sarpi to write against the ideas of Conrad Vorstius (1569-
 18 1622), the successor to the chair of Jacobus Arminius at the University of Leiden, and a
 19 theologian whom James VI & I suspected of denying the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity.¹⁹

¹⁶ Rees and Wakely, *Publishing, Politics, and Culture*, pp. 204-207, 213-214, 222, 230-231. For Bradwood, see R. B. McKerrow (ed.), *A Dictionary of Printers and Booksellers, 1557-1640* (London, 1910), pp. 47-48.

¹⁷ Kew, The National Archives, SP 14/72 fols 112r, 212r; SP 14/80, fol. 69r; S. van der Woude, 'Sir Henry Savile's Chrysostomus Edition in the Netherlands', in *Stydia bibliographica in honorem Herman de la Fontaine Verwey*, ed. S. van der Woude (Amsterdam, 1966), pp. 437-447; Willem Nijenhuis (ed.), *Matthew Slade 1569-1628. Letters to the English Ambassador* (Leiden, 1986), pp. 16-20.

¹⁸ Maurice Lee, Jr. (ed.), *Dudley Carleton to John Chamberlain 1603-1624 Jacobean Letters* (New Brunswick, 1972), pp. 107-108; Gaetano Cozzi, 'Fra Paolo Sarpi, l'anglicanesimo e la *Historia del Concilio Tridentino*', *Rivista storica italiana* 68 (1956), 559-619; Kew, The National Archives, SP 14/92, fol. 90r; SP 14/93, fol. 95r.

¹⁹ Lee (ed.), *Dudley Carleton to John Chamberlain*, pp. 121-4; David Wootton, *Paolo Sarpi between Renaissance and Enlightenment* (Cambridge, 1983), pp. 90-93; Frederick Shriver, 'Orthodoxy and Diplomacy: James I and the Vorstius Affair', *English Historical Review* 85 (1970), 449-474.

1 Concerns over the spread of Socinianism meanwhile motivated De Dominis too. He wrote the
 2 dedication for John Bill's Italian edition of Sarpi's history, with whose publication he was
 3 closely involved, and he also translated Bacon's *De sapientia veterum* for Bill to print. In 1617,
 4 De Dominis was canvassed as Dean of the Chapel Royal at Windsor, and when visiting the
 5 King there in October crossed the Thames to Eton in the company of the Archbishop of
 6 Canterbury, where he was welcomed by Savile and his wife.²⁰ The interests of Savile and De
 7 Dominis were also intertwined in efforts to obtain for Carleton the fruits of the living of
 8 Langley, a few miles from Eton, in 1619 and 1620.²¹

9

10 The activity of De Dominis for reunion with the Greek Church chimed strongly with
 11 the hopes of George Abbot (1562-1633), Archbishop of Canterbury, who was in turn named
 12 on the title-page of Savile's edition of Bradwardine as having ordered its publication.
 13 Ecclesiastical reunion was one of the matters under discussion during Dudley Carleton's
 14 embassy at the Hague, which overlapped with the meeting of the Synod of Dort. Carleton
 15 secured the appointment as a delegate of James VI & I to the Synod of his cousin, the newly
 16 appointed Bishop of Llandaff. Savile's sub-Warden at Merton and his subsequent successor
 17 there as Warden, Nathaniel Brent (1573/4-1652), was also a client of Abbot, whose niece he
 18 eventually married. Brent travelled to Italy on Carleton's embassy in the service of Savile's
 19 stepdaughter, and later acted as Carleton's secretary at the Hague. He was responsible in 1618
 20 for sending the Italian manuscript of Sarpi's history of the Council of Trent clandestinely to
 21 England for Bill to publish. At Abbot's instigation, Brent prepared the English translation of

²⁰ See Noel Malcolm, *De Dominis (1560-1624): Venetian, Anglican, Ecumenist and Relapsed Heretic* (London, 1984); W. B. Patterson, *James VI and I and the Reunion of Christendom* (Cambridge, 1997), pp. 220-259; Kew, The National Archives, SP 14/93, fols 2r, 227r; for an earlier meeting of Savile and De Dominis, this time at Lambeth, see SP 14/90, fol. 153r-v.

²¹ Kew, The National Archives, SP 14/110, fol. 84r; SP 14/111, fol. 24r; SP 14/113, fol. 58r.

1 Sarpi's text, published in 1620, and wrote the letters of dedication to the King and the
2 Archbishop.²²

3

4 The eighteenth-century edition of correspondence found in the papers of the Brent
5 family contains hints of closer involvement by Savile in this broader story of publication. It
6 concludes with a letter from Thomas James 'Philo-Brentius' to the Warden of Merton, asking
7 him to arrange the presentation of Sarpi's history of the Council of Trent to Archbishop Abbot.
8 The letter is dated simply 'Augusti septimo [7 August]' and mentions the expectation of a
9 meeting of Parliament. It is likely that the author of the letter was Thomas James (1572/3-
10 1629), who served as Bodley's librarian until his resignation in 1620. It is possible that the
11 letter is to Nathaniel Brent, in which case it would have to have been written after 1622 and to
12 relate to the second edition in English of Sarpi's history, published in 1629. Parliament had
13 been prorogued in June 1628 and met again in January 1629. But there are various reasons for
14 thinking that the letter might in fact be addressed to Savile and have been written in 1619 or
15 possibly 1620. One of these is that it makes no mention of the additions made to the 1629
16 edition. Another is that Brent was engaged in translating Sarpi's work in the late spring and
17 early summer of 1619. People were also expecting that Parliament would be called later that
18 year, even though it was not in fact summoned until November 1620.²³ Moreover, the printing
19 of the Italian edition of Sarpi's history (for which the dedicatory letter was dated January 1619
20 (i.e. 1620)) had been delayed by the need to revise the text, under Abbot's supervision, to

²² See Andrew Hegarty's life of Brent in *ODNB*; Lewis Atterbury (ed.), *Some Letters Relating to the History of the Council of Trent* (London, 1705), pp. 6-26; Paolo Sarpi, *The Historie of the Council of Trent* (London, 1620), sig. ¶3r-4r, ¶6r-v; Rees and Wakely, *Publishing, Politics, and Culture*, pp. 108-109; Kew, The National Archives, SP 14/108, fol. 103r; SP 14/109, fol. 77r.

²³ Atterbury (ed.), *Some Letters*, pp. 23-24 (the translation offered on pp. 25-26 is problematic); Kew, The National Archives, SP 14/108, fol. 103r-v; SP 14/109, fols 77r-v and 203. Abbot's copy of the 1620 edition of Brent's translation survives (Lambeth Palace Library, shelfmark *H830 1545).

1 remove unauthorised changes made by De Dominis.²⁴ Also suggestive is the information, given
 2 in letters from Abbot to Brent at Venice in the summer of 1618 printed in the collection, that
 3 ‘The Old Man, which was my Guest when you departed, doth tell me that there be some other
 4 things in the hands of our two good Friends [Sarpi and his biographer, Fulgenzio Micanzio],
 5 that are worth transcribing’.²⁵ Although this is most likely to be a reference to De Dominis
 6 himself, it might also indicate Savile. There is evidence both that Savile was already an admirer
 7 of Sarpi’s writings and that friends referred to Savile affectionately as ‘the Old Man’ by 1618.²⁶

8
 9 These comments should indicate that Savile’s engagement with the King’s Printers to
 10 publish a book dealing with free will and predestination by order of Archbishop Abbot and
 11 with a dedication to James VI & I was not a surprising act. Bradwardine’s work spoke directly
 12 to issues raised in debate at Trent that Sarpi would address, notably in his treatment of the
 13 discussion of free will and predestination at the Council in 1546.²⁷ At the same time, it echoed
 14 the debates in the Netherlands, in which James VI & I had already intervened. These were
 15 watched closely by several members of Savile’s circle. For example, Brent discussed the
 16 politics and doctrine of the Arminians with Abbot privately in November 1616. As Brent wrote
 17 to Carleton: ‘He conde[m]neth Grotius for a busie bodie, for his ambition, for his indiscretion,
 18 and for a liar. He thinketh y^t he slandereth his Ma[jesty]: and y^e B[ishops] of England when he
 19 maketh them favourers of his partie, for if any do, it is only y^e B. of Leechfeild. for w^{ch} opinion
 20 his Grace alleaged many inducements.’²⁸ A worried Savile asked Carleton ‘how scapes my

²⁴ Lambert B. Larking, ‘Notes of Sir Roger Twysden on the History of the Council of Trent’, *Notes and Queries* 2nd series 85 (1857), 121-124. Twysden’s copy of the 1619 Italian edition of Sarpi’s history is now at Washington, D. C., Folger Shakespeare Library, shelfmark STC 21760 copy 2.

²⁵ Atterbury (ed.), *Some Letters*, pp. 7-8, 10-11 (quotation at p. 10).

²⁶ Kew, The National Archives, SP 14/74, fol. 67r (Savile to Carleton, 14 July 1613); SP 14/92, fol. 143r (Richard Harrison to Dudley Carleton, 28 May 1617). For evidence that Abbot referred to De Dominis as ‘the old man’, see Anthony Milton (ed.), *The British Delegation at the Synod of Dort (1618-1619)* (Woodbridge, 2005), pp. 24, 26 (letters from Abbot to Carleton, 28 December 1617 and 8 January 1618).

²⁷ Sarpi, *Historie*, pp. 192-215.

²⁸ Kew, The National Archives, SP 14/89, fols 72v-73r. The Bishop of Lichfield was John Overall.

1 acquaintance Grotius in this te[m]pest' as the controversy reached its political climax in
 2 February 1619. The debates at the Synod of Dort drew in further people that Savile knew
 3 directly. John Hales, whose career as a scholar of Greek Savile had sponsored at both Merton
 4 and Eton, observed and reported on the Synod as Carleton's chaplain. Savile bemoaned the
 5 silence of Hales towards 'his poore frends at Eato[n]', which he attributed to the demands
 6 placed on him at Dordrecht.²⁹ Samuel Ward (1572-1643), Master of Sidney Sussex College,
 7 Cambridge, and, like Savile a member of one of the companies that had prepared the
 8 Authorised Version of the Bible (1611), was a delegate at the Synod. There he shared with
 9 Matthias Martinius, the delegate from Bremen who was close to members of the British
 10 delegation, ideas that derived directly from his reading of Bradwardine.³⁰

11

12 The most important figure in the revival of the work of Archbishop Bradwardine,
 13 however, remained Archbishop Abbot. Abbot and his brother, Robert (1559/60-1618), who
 14 was Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford from 1612 until his elevation to the see of Salisbury
 15 in December 1615, were both consistent proponents of orthodox, predestinarian divinity. This
 16 was reflected not only in their own writings and their attitudes to the developing controversy
 17 over divine foreknowledge, grace and necessity and human free will in the contemporary
 18 Netherlands, but also in their efforts to control the form and content of preaching in the
 19 University of Oxford. Both men were involved in the controversy that came to a head in
 20 interviews conducted before the King with John Howson, canon of Christ Church, and William
 21 Laud, then President of St John's College, Oxford, in June 1615. Howson and Laud were both
 22 accused of handling disputed points in divinity in a manner that favoured Catholic authors in

²⁹ Kew, The National Archives, SP 14/105, fol. 194r.

³⁰ See Milton (ed.), *British Delegation*, p. liv. For the presence of Bradwardine in Ward's commonplace books, see Cambridge, Sidney Sussex College, Ms. Ward I, fol. 8r-v; for Ward's praise of Savile, see Ms. Ward I, fol. 53r. On later debate in the Netherlands over Bradwardine, see James Tanis, 'Abraham van der Heyden. A Seventeenth-Century Bradwardinian', in *Augustine, the Harvest, and Theology (1300-1650)*, ed. Kenneth Hagen (Leiden, 1990), pp. 333-348.

1 questions of doctrine and authority.³¹ Howson, in particular, had a long history of debate with
 2 Oxford Calvinists. In 1612, he had suggested that the annotations to the Geneva Bible
 3 concerning the doctrine of the Trinity supported Arianism. This incensed some of Savile's
 4 friends: Thomas Bodley wrote to Thomas James that 'I repute it a mater muche importing the
 5 honour & credit of the Vniuersitie, and to say the very truth, the whole church of this realme,
 6 that [Howson] should be censured seuerely.'³² The echo of Bradwardine's own experience is
 7 not difficult to hear and it seems very likely that Abbot's sponsorship of a work against
 8 Pelagian divinity, which had originally been addressed directly to members of the University
 9 of Oxford, was far from coincidental. Savile's position in this debate is also clear from other
 10 evidence apart from his work on Bradwardine. In August 1618, he proposed to Carleton that
 11 John Prideaux, Robert Abbot's orthodox successor as Regius Professor in Oxford, should assist
 12 him by attending the Synod of Dort.³³

13

14 Bradwardine had been specifically worried about the spiritual health of the Mertonians
 15 among whose number he continued to count himself. Savile presumably felt similar concern
 16 about the local sphere of controversy, which was however a manifestation of worrying
 17 developments within learned Christendom much more broadly. Debate in Oxford mirrored
 18 earlier developments in Cambridge (in particular the teaching of John Overall, by this time

³¹ Nicholas Cranfield and Kenneth Fincham (eds.), 'John Howson's Answers to Archbishop Abbot's Accusations at his "Trial" before James I at Greenwich, 10 June 1615', *Camden Miscellany* 29 (1987), 319-341; Kenneth Fincham, 'Prelacy and Politics: Archbishop Abbot's Defence of Protestant Orthodoxy', *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research* 61 (1988), 36-64; Michael Questier, *Dynastic Politics and the British Reformations, 1558-1630* (Oxford, 2019), p. 361.

³² G. W. Wheeler (ed.), *Letters of Sir Thomas Bodley to Thomas James* (Oxford, 1926), pp. 227-228; see also Paul C. H. Lim, *Mystery Unveiled. The Crisis of the Trinity in Early Modern England* (New York, 2012), pp. 277-280.

³³ Kew, The National Archives, SP 14/98, fol. 117r. Archbishop Abbot later refused Carleton's suggestion that Prideaux be appointed on the basis that he 'cannot be provided so sudden': see Milton (ed.), *British Delegation*, pp. 157-158.

1 Bishop of Lichfield).³⁴ It echoed controversies that had developed over the teaching of
 2 Arminius at Leiden and more broadly in the Dutch Republic. Above all, it took place in the
 3 context of renewed discussion over the extent of divine foreknowledge and human freedom
 4 which divided Catholic theology (notably for members of the Jesuit order and at the University
 5 of Louvain, where it drew in English Catholic exiles), as well as sustaining debate between
 6 Catholics and Protestants.³⁵ In response, the work of Bradwardine held out the promise of
 7 reconciling the truth of Christian doctrine, as it had been known in pre-Tridentine tradition,
 8 with orthodox Protestant teaching, without compromising such theology with contemporary
 9 errors sponsored by supposed Catholic semi-Pelagians and their presumed followers (notably
 10 Arminius and his allies) in the Reformed Churches.³⁶

11

12 Bradwardine's writings provided Savile with a local means of scholarly intervention in
 13 theology by reference to someone with a broad doctrinal reach who had also shown particular
 14 respect for royal authority and who provided a model for the teaching of philosophy in the
 15 Platonic tradition from a grounding in Euclidean geometry.³⁷ The parallel, in this respect, with
 16 Savile himself is clear.³⁸ Savile drew it out in his preface to *De causa Dei*, where he dwelt on
 17 Bradwardine's achievements as a patron of astronomers, as a mathematician, and as a student

³⁴ See H.C. Porter, *Reformation and Reaction in Tudor Cambridge* (Cambridge, 1958), pp. 376-413; Anthony Milton, "'Anglicanism by Stealth": The Career and Influence of John Overall', in *Religious Politics in Post-Reformation England*, eds. Peter Lake and Kenneth Fincham (Woodbridge, 2006), pp. 159-176.

³⁵ For this debate, whose origins lay partly in the ideas of Luis de Molina, see Antonio Gerace, *Biblical Scholarship in Louvain in the 'Golden' Sixteenth Century* (Göttingen, 2019), pp. 149-200.

³⁶ This was certainly the eventual position of John Davenant, a delegate at Dort and Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity at Cambridge: see David S. Sytsma, 'Aquinas in Service of Dort: John Davenant on Predestination, Grace, and Free Choice' in *Beyond Dort and De Auxiliis. The Dynamics of Protestant and Catholic Soteriology in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, eds. Jordan J. Ballor, Matthew T. Gaetano, and David S. Sytsma (Leiden, 2019), pp. 169-199.

³⁷ Bradwardine, *De causa Dei*, ed. Savile, sig. a3v-4v, c4r-v, p. 876.

³⁸ For Savile's recovery of the history of mathematics, see Robert Goulding, *Defending Hypatia* (Dordrecht, 2010).

1 of the science of motion. Savile believed that Bradwardine and his contemporaries wrote
 2 theology in a Euclidean style of hypothesis and demonstration.³⁹

3
 4 Both Bradwardine's philosophy and his theology were in more general discussion in
 5 any event at Oxford in the early seventeenth century. Thomas James, Bodley's librarian,
 6 attributed to Bradwardine the belief of John Wyclif (whom he regarded as a proto-Protestant)
 7 'in the nature of a true sole-iustifying faith, against merit-mongers and Pardoners, *Pelagians*,
 8 and *Papists*.'⁴⁰ Richard Field, the Oxford-educated prebend of Windsor who was being
 9 considered for succession to the bishopric of Oxford at his death in 1616, discussed a number
 10 of medieval Augustinians in his polemic in favour of the antiquity of Protestant belief and
 11 against Robert Bellarmine and the Tridentine doctrine of grace. Field claimed that Bradwardine
 12 advanced what was 'euer the doctrine of the Church of *England*' when he 'confirmeth and
 13 proueth' what Robert Grosseteste (c. 1170-1253), Bishop of Lincoln, had argued. Field fleshed
 14 this out from Gregory of Rimini (1300-1358) in the following way: 'noe act morally good,
 15 canne bee done without the speciall grace of GOD, for if there bee noe vertue without such
 16 grace, then canne there bee noe act morallie good: which is yet more fully cleared: for euey
 17 vertuous and morall good act, either is orderly loue, or presupposeth it: soe that if there can bee
 18 noe orderly loue without GODS grace, there can bee noe act of vertue, or act morally good.'⁴¹
 19 Bradwardine, for Field, held 'that God willeth those euils that are sinnes, & that in respect of
 20 euey thing, he hath an act of will, either that it shalbe, or not be, and not a meere negation of
 21 such act.'⁴²

22

³⁹ Bradwardine, *De causa Dei*, ed. Savile, sig. a2v, a3v.

⁴⁰ Thomas James, *An Apologie for Iohn Wickliffe* (Oxford, 1608), sig. k3v.

⁴¹ Richard Field, *Of the Church, Five Bookes*, 2nd edn, ed. Nathaniel Field (Oxford, 1628), p. 261; for Field's life, see the entry by Vernon G. Wilkins in *ODNB*. These passages of the third book were added to the text of the first edition of 1606, based on notes left incomplete by Field at his death.

⁴² Field, *Of the Church*, p. 128.

1 For Field, Bradwardine was notable for the way in which he provided a method of
 2 engagement with the theology and philosophy of contemporary Catholic scholasticism.⁴³ His
 3 ideas on free will, grace, and necessity, could be assimilated to those of other orthodox
 4 medieval doctors, notably Grosseteste. This was a position that was shared by Thomas James.⁴⁴
 5 Savile too may have been sympathetic to it. Certainly, he was at work on a Merton manuscript
 6 of Grosseteste with a view to publishing his letters at much the same time as his edition of
 7 Bradwardine was going through the press.⁴⁵ For all of these writers, the example of
 8 Bradwardine provided evidence that the medieval Church had properly embraced positions
 9 closer to those of Protestantism than to those enunciated at the Council of Trent and defended
 10 by contemporary Catholicism.⁴⁶

11

12 Savile's interest in Bradwardine, however, seems to have begun much earlier than
 13 1617. Indeed, it can be dated fairly exactly to the time that work on the Eton edition of
 14 Chrysostom was coming to an end and that Howson's preaching was causing a furore in
 15 Oxford. Evidence for this derives from two sources. The first of these is Samuel Clarke's
 16 posthumous life of William Twisse (1577/8-1646). Twisse was an undergraduate at New
 17 College, Oxford, where he was later a Fellow. At some point, he may have been a pupil of
 18 Robert Abbot and he became a prominent controversialist, in particular opposing the ideas of
 19 the Oxford Platonist, Thomas Jackson. In this context, he returned consistently to

⁴³ For the relevance of Bradwardine's ideas of space and extension to scholastic philosophy, including that of the Jesuit, Francisco Suárez, and the Coimbra commentators, see Edward Grant, *Much Ado about Nothing* (Cambridge, 1981), pp. 153-174. For Bradwardine's relevance to Catholic debates over free will and necessity, as they played out in contemporary Protestant theology, see Ballor, Gaetano, Sytsma (eds.), *Beyond Dordt and De Auxiliis*; J. Martin Bac, *Perfect Will Theology. Divine Agency in Reformed Scholasticism as against Suárez, Episcopius, Descartes, and Spinoza* (Leiden, 2010).

⁴⁴ James, *Apologie*, sig. k3v: 'that true great Clearke Rob. Grosthead'.

⁴⁵ See a letter of Thomas Gataker to James Ussher, 24 June 1617, printed by Elizabethanne Boran (ed.), *The Correspondence of James Ussher*, 3 vols (Dublin, 2015), 1: 129.

⁴⁶ On the debate over the visibility of doctrines associated with Protestantism in medieval Christianity, see Anthony Milton, 'The Church of England, Rome, and the True Church: The Demise of a Jacobean Consensus', in *The Early Stuart Church, 1603-1642*, ed. Kenneth Fincham (Basingstoke, 1993), pp. 187-210, 282-285.

1 Bradwardine's teaching. He cited Bradwardine on divine perfection, on the limitlessness of
 2 God's power ('who can do all things that imply not contradiction'), the necessity of divine
 3 being, and the degrees of divine rewards and punishments according to human merit.⁴⁷
 4 According to Clarke, Twisse 'took his Degree of Doctor, with a general applause. For he had
 5 before given a great manifestation... of his Learning... in transcribing, and judiciously
 6 correcting the Writings of that profound Doctor, *Thomas de Bradwardine*, which were to be
 7 Published by Sir *Henry Savil*.'⁴⁸ As Luca Baschera points out, if Clarke is to be believed,
 8 Twisse's work on Bradwardine must have occurred before 5 July 1614, when he became a
 9 doctor of divinity.⁴⁹ A second piece of evidence is more revealing. On 26 January 1612 (i.e.
 10 1613), Samuel Ward wrote to Thomas James, asking him 'as soone and as safely as you can to
 11 send my Manuscript Bradwardin to Abraham Segard, Stationer within Blackfriars. He will see
 12 it safelie conveyed vnto me to Cambridge.'⁵⁰

13

14 Ward's letter to James is interesting in a number of ways. As has already been noted,
 15 both James and Ward were themselves readers of Bradwardine. As early as 1600, James had
 16 drawn attention to the presence of manuscripts in English libraries of *De causa Dei*, which he
 17 considered one of the most important unpublished works of old religious controversy,
 18 favourable to Protestantism.⁵¹ Moreover, the bookseller Abraham Segard, who was probably a

⁴⁷ William Twisse, *A Discovery of D. Iacksons Vanitie* ([Amsterdam], 1631), pp. 15-16, 94-97, 356-7, 456, 686. See also William Twisse, *The Doctrine of the Synod of Dort and Arles* ([Amsterdam, 1631]), p. 68; William Twisse, *Opera* (Amsterdam, 1652); Cambridge, Sidney Sussex College, uncatalogued correspondence of John Davenant, William Twisse, and Samuel Ward (1630-1632). The interpretation of this debate given by Sarah Hutton, 'Thomas Jackson, Oxford Platonist, and William Twisse, Aristotelian', *Journal of the History of Ideas* 39 (1978), 635-652, needs to be modified to take account of Twisse's broader interest in the divinity of Scotus and Aquinas, which helped to define his interpretation of human free will (see Richard Muller, *Divine Will and Human Choice: Freedom, Contingency, and Necessity in Early Modern Reformed Thought* (Grand Rapids, 2017), pp. 225-235).

⁴⁸ Samuel Clarke, *The Lives of Sundry Eminent Persons in this Later Age* (London, 1683), p. 14.

⁴⁹ Baschera. 'Witnessing to the Calvinism of the English Church', p. 441.

⁵⁰ G. W. Wheeler (ed.), *Letters Addressed to Thomas James* (Oxford, 1933), p. 64, printing Oxford, Bodleian Library, Ms. Ballard 44, fol. 153.

⁵¹ Thomas James, *Ecloga Oxonio-Cantabrigiensis* (London, 1600), p. 143.

1 Huguenot exile, later acted as an agent for John Bill.⁵² The manuscript mentioned in the letter
 2 is almost certainly the fourteenth-century copy of *De causa Dei* bequeathed by Ward to Sidney
 3 Sussex College, Cambridge, in 1643.⁵³ Like Field and Savile, Ward also associated
 4 Bradwardine's theology with that of Grosseteste.⁵⁴ The transmission of Ward's manuscript to
 5 Oxford indicates that James was already involved in preparation of a copy of the text (of which
 6 the Bodleian had no version), but the rest of the letter suggests that this plan had been
 7 abandoned. Ward wrote: 'Sorry I am that you doe not proceed to the setting forth of it, I dowbt
 8 not but M^r Rimey would give you in Copies of the book so many as would make vp that which
 9 he is behind with you.'⁵⁵ Presumably, therefore, Twisse took up the work that James had begun.
 10 It seems likely that it was carried on under Savile's direct supervision from the summer of 1615
 11 (and just after Abbot's interview with Howson) until the autumn of 1616, since Savile told
 12 Carleton on 3 September 1616 that he was returning to Eton having spent almost fourteen
 13 months in Oxford.⁵⁶

14
 15 When Savile worked on the edition of Chrysostom, he built up an extensive network of
 16 international contacts, whose members provided him with copies of Greek manuscripts from
 17 places as far away as Mount Athos. He borrowed manuscripts from libraries in Oxford and

⁵² See William John Charles Moens (ed.), *The Registers of the French Church, Threadneedle Street, London: Volume I* (Lymington, 1896), p. 88; Ian Michael, 'John Bill, agente librero de sir Thomas Bodley, impresor real de Jacobo I y librero Londinense del primer conde de Gondomar (I)', *Avisos. Noticias de la Real Biblioteca*, 12 (2006), 6-8.

⁵³ Cambridge, Sidney Sussex College, Ms. 90; Montague Rhodes James, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge* (Cambridge, 1895), p. 73; Nicholas Rogers, 'The Early History of Sidney Sussex College Library', in *Sidney Sussex College Cambridge. Historical Essays*, eds. D. E. D. Beales and H. B. Nisbet (Woodbridge, 1996), pp. 75-88.

⁵⁴ Cambridge, Sidney Sussex College, Ms. Ward I, fol. 8v; see also Ms. 92, a copy of a Durham manuscript of Grosseteste's letters.

⁵⁵ Wheeler (ed.), *Letters Addressed to Thomas James*, p. 64. 'M^r Rimey' may be the bookseller James Rime or Ryme or Rymer (stepson of Ascanius de Renailme), see McKerrow (ed.), *Dictionary of Printers and Booksellers*, p. 228. See also [Thomas James], *The First Printed Catalogue of the Bodleian Library 1605* (Oxford, 1986). No copy of *De causa Dei* is listed among the manuscripts of Bradwardine held at the Bodleian in [Edward Bernard (ed.)], *Catalogi librorum manuscriptorum Angliae et Hiberniae* (Oxford, 1697); see also R. W. Hunt (ed.), *A Summary Catalogue of the Western Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library. Volume I* (Oxford, 1953), pp. 76-122.

⁵⁶ Kew, The National Archives, SP 14/88, fol. 116r.

1 benefitted from the professional work of Greek scribes at the Vatican Library.⁵⁷ After the book
 2 was published, Savile was careful to reward those who had helped him, in order that they might
 3 provide him with further copies of manuscripts in future.⁵⁸ Eventually, in 1620, he deposited
 4 the working papers of the edition, including both manuscripts and adversaria recorded on the
 5 pages of earlier printed versions, in the Bodleian Library.⁵⁹ Savile's behaviour in editing
 6 Bradwardine was different, although he seems to have drawn on at least one source located
 7 overseas. For the most part, however, the edition rested on manuscripts found closer to home.
 8 In the preface, Savile made three claims about his sources.⁶⁰ The first of these was contextual:
 9 the book had been arranged by Bradwardine largely from his Oxford lectures and had been
 10 completed as part of an appeal to his fellow Mertonians, when he was Chancellor of St Paul's.
 11 The second claim was that Savile had edited the text from six manuscripts. The third was that
 12 the 'epigraph' in each of these manuscripts was the same as the one that Savile himself printed
 13 ('*Explicit istud opus, De causa Dei contra Pelagium, & de virtute causarum, & virtute Dei*
 14 *causæ causarum; perscriptum London, anno millessimo trecentesimo quadragesimo quarto*
 15 *Dom. Iesu Christi*'), except in two cases.⁶¹ The two exceptions were the copy found at New
 16 College, Oxford, whose title was '*Summa Doctoris profundi de causa Dei contra Pelagianos,*
 17 *& de virtute causarum, virtute Dei causæ causarum*', and that in the Vatican Library: '*Summa*
 18 *Doctoris Profundi Thomæ Bradwardini de causa Dei contra Pelagianos, & de virtute Dei*
 19 *causæ causarum.*'⁶²
 20

⁵⁷ For an outline, see S. L. Greenslade, 'The Printer's Copy for the Eton Chrysostom, 1610-13', *Studia Patristica* 7 (1966), 60-64; Jean-Louis Quantin, 'Du Chrysostome latin au Chrysostome grec. Une histoire européenne (1588-1613)', in *Chrysostomosbilder in 1600 Jahren*, eds. Martin Wallraff and Rudolf Brändle (Berlin, 2008), pp. 267-346; N.G. Wilson, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Greek Manuscripts of Corpus Christi College, Oxford* (Cambridge, 2011), p. 33.

⁵⁸ See, for example, Kew, The National Archives, SP 14/77 fol. 53r-v (Savile to Carleton, 1 June 1614).

⁵⁹ Oxford, Bodleian Library, Mss Auct. E. 3. 1.-4. 6.

⁶⁰ Bradwardine, *De causa Dei*, ed. Savile, sig. a3r.

⁶¹ The epigraph (or, as one would now say, explicit) is found at Bradwardine, *De causa Dei*, ed. Savile, p. 876.

⁶² Bradwardine, *De causa Dei*, sig. a3r.

1 These comments would seem to make it straightforward to identify how Savile went
 2 about preparing the text of *De causa Dei*. It is not strictly correct to claim with Luca Baschera
 3 that Savile ‘mentions that the printed text relies on six manuscripts, but specifies the
 4 provenience [sic] only of two of them’.⁶³ Nevertheless, the difficulty that Oberman and others
 5 have had in identifying precisely which manuscripts Savile used is not without explanation.⁶⁴

6
 7 There can be no doubt that the New College manuscript that Savile described is the
 8 copy of *De causa Dei* that can now be found in that College’s library as Ms. 134. Thomas
 9 James, then a Fellow of New College, opened the union catalogue of the manuscripts to be
 10 found in Oxford and Cambridge libraries that he published in 1600 with a list of the
 11 manuscripts of his own College. This manuscript is number 22 in that list and is the only copy
 12 of *De causa Dei* to be found there.⁶⁵ It had been given to New College by William Rede (c.
 13 1315-1385), a mathematician and astronomer who was consecrated as Bishop of Chichester by
 14 the Pope in Avignon in 1369. Rede had become a Fellow of Merton no later than 1344 and at
 15 his death had a library of some 370 books. He was a remarkable donor of one hundred books
 16 to that College and also of one hundred books to New College, as well as a lesser donor to the
 17 libraries of Exeter, Queen’s, Balliol and Oriel Colleges.⁶⁶ His copy of *De causa Dei* was one
 18 of several books that he bought with money given to him by his patron, Nicholas of Sandwich.⁶⁷
 19 Rede’s manuscript was on hand for both James and later Twisse to use, assuming that one or
 20 both of them acted as amanuenses in the preparation of Savile’s edition at one time or another.
 21 Its ownership and associations were redolent of the Merton of Bradwardine which so attracted

⁶³ Baschera, ‘Witnessing to the Calvinism of the English Church’, p. 440.

⁶⁴ Oberman, *Archbishop Thomas Bradwardine*, pp. 18-20.

⁶⁵ Thomas James, *Ecloga*, p. 2. See also H. O. Coxe, *Catalogus codicum mss. qui in Collegiis Aulisque Oxoniensibus hodie adservantur*, 2 parts (Oxford, 1852), 1/7: 49; William Poole and Christopher Skelton-Foord (eds.), *Geometry and Astronomy in New College, Oxford* (Oxford, 2019), p. 67.

⁶⁶ A.B. Emden, *A Biographical Register of the University of Oxford to A.D. 1500*, 3 vols (Oxford, 1957), 3:1556-1560; F.M. Powicke, *The Medieval Books of Merton College* (Oxford, 1931), pp. 28-32, 87-92.

⁶⁷ Oxford, New College, Ms. 134, verso of flyleaf.

1 Savile. It was also bound with the *questiones* on predestination of Thomas of Buckingham, a
 2 contemporary of Bradwardine in Merton's fellowship.

3
 4 The only difficulty concerning this manuscript is that its explicit reads: 'Explicit istud
 5 opus de causa dei contr^a pelagium, et de virtute causarum, v[ir]tute dei cause causarum,
 6 p[er]scriptum London[iis], anno millesimo trecentesimo q[ua]dragesimo quarto d[omi]ni
 7 ihesu cristi.'⁶⁸ Allowing for slight variations in spelling and in the expansion of abbreviations,
 8 this is exactly the colophon that Savile printed. Yet, in the preface to *De causa Dei*, he told the
 9 reader that the New College manuscript had a different epigraph. Some of the text that he gave
 10 there as part of the title of the New College manuscript is to be found on the flyleaf that records
 11 Rede's purchase and subsequent donation of the book. There one may read: 'S[um]m[a]
 12 doctoris p[ro]fundi de causa dei cont[ra] Pelagiu[m] [e]t de virtute cau[sarum]. 3. Libros
 13 continens.' Finally, the opening of the book has the rubric: 'de causae dei [con]tra pelagiu[m],
 14 et de v[ir]tute causa[rum]...'⁶⁹ Nevertheless, even a combination of these three titles, written
 15 at different times in different hands, does not produce exactly the text that Savile claimed the
 16 New College manuscript bore. The correct conclusion to draw from this is not that Savile did
 17 not use the New College manuscript as one of his copy texts, indeed as one of the most
 18 significant of them. Instead, it is that one must use the clues Savile gave us with care.

19
 20 Before turning to the Vatican manuscript that Savile also named, it is worth trying to
 21 track down the other four sources that he used. Savile reproduced a colophon dated 1344 as
 22 part of his standard epigraph for the text. He clearly thought that this was significant and that
 23 it indicated a copy made at or very close to the time when Bradwardine completed his book. A

⁶⁸ Oxford, New College, Ms. 134, fol. 322r.

⁶⁹ Oxford, New College, Ms. 134, fol. 1r. Savile pointed out that the title 'Doctor profundus' had been bestowed on Bradwardine by the Pope: Bradwardine, *De causa Dei*, ed. Savile, sig. a3v. He suggested that this implied that the Mertonian had the same standing as Scotus and Aquinas.

1 copy of *De causa Dei*, bequeathed by Bradwardine's contemporary, John Staveley, had been
 2 recorded in a mid-fourteenth-century list of the theological books owned by Merton College.⁷⁰
 3 This volume was lost, however, by the time of Savile. Merton nevertheless owned another
 4 fourteenth-century copy of *De causa Dei* which was fundamental to Savile's edition (and
 5 whose general appearance was remarkably similar to the manuscript at New College). Its
 6 epigraph read: 'Explicit istud opus de c[aus]a d[e]i c[on]tra pelagiu[m] & de virtute causar[um]
 7 virtute d[e]i cause causar[um] p[er]scriptu[m] London[iis] anno millesimo trecentesimo
 8 quadragesimo quarto d[omi]ni Ih[esu] Chr[isti].'⁷¹ Two features of this book were
 9 particularly striking to Savile, since they were incorporated into his edition but did not feature
 10 elsewhere in the manuscript tradition of *De causa Dei*. One of these was the opening letter of
 11 Bradwardine, introducing the book to his Mertonians, which Savile printed between
 12 Bradwardine's preface and the opening of book 1 of *De causa Dei*. This was found added at
 13 that location in the otherwise blank second column of folio 4v in the manuscript. The other was
 14 also added in the same hand, this time after the explicit of the work, again where Savile chose
 15 to print it. It was a letter from Bradwardine to his Mertonians accompanying the completion of
 16 his text. These two letters were critical for Savile's location of Bradwardine's book as a pastoral
 17 as well as a doctrinal text, addressed to contemporary Oxford readers. Both letters were in fact
 18 copied in the hand of Simon Lambourne, Fellow of Merton from 1347 to 1361, who also
 19 recorded on the flyleaf of the manuscript that he paid seven marks for having the text of the
 20 book written out (probably in Oxford) in 1369.⁷² Lambourne had died by 1387. His manuscript
 21 was given to Merton and appears in a list of books that can be dated to before 1385.⁷³ A
 22 seventeenth-century hand recorded on the flyleaf of the manuscript that it was a gift from

⁷⁰ Powicke, *Medieval Books of Merton College*, pp. 23, 120.

⁷¹ Oxford, Merton College, Ms. 71, fol. 266v.

⁷² Oxford, Merton College, Ms. 71, fols 4v, 266v, iv. On Lambourne, see Emden, *Biographical Register*, 2: 1087. See also R. M. Thomson, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Medieval Manuscripts of Merton College, Oxford* (Cambridge, 2009), pp. 73-74.

⁷³ Powicke, *Medieval Books of Merton College*, pp. 159-160.

1 Lambourne. Savile, however, paid no attention either to the donor or to the real date of writing
 2 of the manuscript in his edition. Other features of the Merton manuscript also betray its
 3 importance for the editing of Savile's text. For example, the layout of the table on page 13 of
 4 Savile's edition is closer to that found in the Merton manuscript than the more elaborate form
 5 of presentation in the New College manuscript.⁷⁴ In the main body of the text itself, Savile
 6 normally followed the Merton manuscript, printing its text while recording variants from the
 7 New College manuscript (and others) in the margin. This included printing some but not all of
 8 the apparatus of biblical and other textual references given in the margins of the New College
 9 manuscript, but found less extensively in the Merton manuscript.

10

11 Thomas James had recorded the existence of a manuscript of *De causa Dei* at Merton
 12 in 1600.⁷⁵ As noted above, he knew of Samuel Ward's copy of the book before 1613. This
 13 manuscript, which is more elaborately decorated than either the copy at Merton or that at New
 14 College, also bears the epigraph that Savile identified as being found in copies that he used for
 15 his edition. Here, indeed, it takes almost exactly the form that Savile printed: 'Explicit istud
 16 opus de causa dei cont[ra] pelagiu[m] et de virtute causarum, virtute dei cause causarum.
 17 Perscriptum London[iis]. Anno millesimo trecentesimo quadagesimo quarto domini nostri
 18 Jhesu Cristi.'⁷⁶ Textually, Ward's manuscript was closer to that at New College than it was to
 19 the one at Merton. In addition to the manuscripts at New College and Merton, James knew of
 20 four other copies of *De causa Dei* in 1600. These were located at Oriel College, Oxford; Corpus
 21 Christi College, Cambridge; Peterhouse, Cambridge; and in the private library of Lord
 22 Lumley.⁷⁷

⁷⁴ Oxford, Merton College, Ms. 71, fol. 8r; Oxford, New College, Ms. 134, fol. 10r.

⁷⁵ James, *Ecloga*, p. 16.

⁷⁶ Cambridge, Sidney Sussex College, Ms. 90, fol. u⁴r.

⁷⁷ James, *Ecloga*, book two, p. 22.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

Details of the manuscript at Oriel are hard to obtain. It was volume 55 in James's list of 71 manuscripts at the College in 1600. By no later than 1697, it was no longer there.⁷⁸ It is possible that it was one of the manuscripts used by Savile. It is more likely, however, that Savile made use of Ms. 24 in the library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge.⁷⁹ This had entered the collections of Matthew Parker (1504-1575), Archbishop of Canterbury, on 20 December 1567, possibly as a gift from Andrew Perne, Master of Peterhouse. Bequeathed by Parker to his Cambridge College, this manuscript originally came from the Benedictine cathedral priory at Worcester, to which it had been given by the monk, John de Preston, in 1348. It is textually similar to New College Ms. 134, but in terms of layout and decoration is more reminiscent of Merton Ms. 71. Its epigraph reads: 'Explicat istud opus de causa dei c[ontra] pelagiu[m] & de virtute causar[um] virtute dei cause causar[um] p[er]scriptu[m] London[iis] anno milesimo trecentesimo quadragesimo q[ua]rto d[omi]ni Jh[esu] [Christ]i.' It is in fact probably the oldest datable manuscript of *De causa Dei* that was available to Savile and was a fourth copy of the text whose epigraph might have led him to believe that it was written (or copied) in 1344.⁸⁰ It seems plausible that, like New College Ms. 134 and Merton Ms. 71, it was written in Oxford, where de Preston had been a scholar.⁸¹ Corpus Christi Ms. 24 was also the source of one of the earliest discussions in print in England of Bradwardine's ideas of the dependence of free will on divine grace and divine necessity. The Cambridge divine William Perkins (1558-1602) cited Bradwardine, to demonstrate the historical context for what

⁷⁸ James, *Ecloga*, p. 45; [Bernard (ed.)], *Catalogi*, part two, pp. 27-28, listing 72 manuscripts.

⁷⁹ See James, *Ecloga*, p. 81, also noticing contemporary biographical information about Bradwardine found on the flyleaf of the manuscript. Cf. Bradwardine, *De causa Dei*, ed. Savile, sig. a4v.

⁸⁰ Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, Ms. 24, fols iiiiv and 271v. See also Montague Rhodes James, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of Corpus Christi College Cambridge*, 7 parts (Cambridge, 1909-1913), 1: 47.

⁸¹ Emden, *Biographical Register*, 3: 1518; R.M. Thomson, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Medieval Manuscripts in Worcester Cathedral Library* (Cambridge, 2001), pp. xxvi-xxvii.

1 were now Protestant ideas, in his work about the false claims to catholicity of the Roman
 2 Church. The book was published posthumously by Perkins's former pupil, Samuel Ward.⁸²

3

4 In 1600, Thomas James had identified two more manuscripts of *De causa Dei*. One of
 5 these was in the library at Peterhouse, Cambridge, where it had been catalogued in 1418 and
 6 was seen by John Bale about 130 years later. Another was in the private library of John, 1st
 7 Baron Lumley at Nonsuch.⁸³ By the time that Savile was at work on his edition, both of these
 8 manuscripts had entered the library of Richard Bancroft, Archbishop of Canterbury, and were
 9 therefore now under the care of his successor, George Abbot.⁸⁴ The first, which has cautions
 10 entered by fifteenth-century Cambridge masters, including one by William Dyngley (who can
 11 be associated with several books at Peterhouse), is written in several hands and has some of
 12 the textual features of New College Ms. 134. Its epigraph reads: 'Explicit istud opus de ca[usa]
 13 d[e]i [con]t^{ra} pelagiu[m] & de v[ir]tute cau[s]a[r]um d[e]i Thome de Bradwardyna Cancellarii
 14 London[i]i p[er]scriptu[m] Cantebriggie Anno d[omi]ni millesimo CCC^o octogesimo quinto
 15 Editum ab eode[m] Thoma London[i]i anno d[omi]ni mill[es]i[m]o CCC q[ua]dragesimo

⁸² William Perkins, *Problema de Romanæ fidei ementito Catholicismo*, ed. Samuel Ward (Cambridge, 1604), p. 72. Savile referred directly to Perkins's use of Bradwardine, along with that of the Catholic jurist and editor of the Tridentine canons and decrees, Orazio Luzzi: Bradwardine, *De causa Dei*, ed. Savile, sig. a3r. See also W. B. Patterson, *William Perkins and the Making of a Protestant England* (Oxford, 2014), pp. 197-198.

⁸³ James, *Ecloga*, part two, p. 22; Peter D. Clarke (ed.), *The University and College Libraries of Cambridge*, Corpus of British Medieval Library Catalogues 10 (London, 2002), p. 472; John Bale, *Index Britanniae scriptorum*, ed. Reginald Lane Poole, with an introduction by Caroline Brett and James Carley (Woodbridge, 1990), p. 432; Sears Jayne and Francis R. Johnson (eds.), *The Lumley Library. The Catalogue of 1609* (London, 1956).

⁸⁴ They are now Lambeth Palace Library, Mss. 32 and 169 respectively. See R. M. Thomson, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Medieval Manuscripts in the Library of Peterhouse, Cambridge* (Cambridge, 2016), p. 205; Montague Rhodes James, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of Lambeth Palace: The Medieval Manuscripts* (Cambridge, 1932), pp. 46-47, 265-266; James Carley (ed.), "'Accurately and exquisitely made": George Abbot's Preface to the 1612 Catalogue of Lambeth Palace Library', in *From the Reformation to the Permissive Society*, eds. Melanie Barber, Stephen Taylor and Gabriel Sewell (Woodbridge, 2010), pp. 43-62; Jayne and Johnson (eds.), *The Lumley Library*, p. 302. I am grateful to James Carley for advice about the entry for 'de Bradwardina de causa Dei contra Palagium. f^o. bis' in the post-mortem list of Bancroft's library (Lambeth Palace Library, Ms. LF/F/1). Both books were among those moved to Cambridge University Library in 1647 and rearranged on their return to Lambeth by Archbishop Sancroft: see N. R. Ker, 'Archbishop Sancroft's Rearrangement of the Manuscripts of Lambeth Palace', in E. G. W. Bill, *A Catalogue of Manuscripts in Lambeth Palace Library, Mss. 1222-1860* (Oxford, 1972), pp. 1-53, at pp. 5-6, 29.

1 q[ua]rto.⁸⁵ Despite the fact that it was copied at Cambridge in 1385, this manuscript therefore
 2 also bears a colophon that suggests that *De causa Dei* was written in 1344. Although the
 3 wording of the explicit differs very slightly from that favoured by Savile, it seems most unlikely
 4 that he would not have made use of a manuscript of *De causa Dei* in the possession of the
 5 Archbishop who ordered that the book be published. This manuscript, moreover, was the last
 6 complete or near complete copy of the text known to Thomas James. The book that had
 7 belonged to Lord Lumley has features of the appearance, layout, and textual variants of New
 8 College Ms. 134, but it is incomplete and breaks off at the end of book 1 of *De causa Dei*.⁸⁶

9
 10 There were other manuscripts of *De Causa Dei* that were recorded in seventeenth-
 11 century England, for example a second copy from the cathedral priory at Worcester (where it
 12 was catalogued by the royal librarian, Patrick Young, in 1622-1623), or a copy in the library
 13 of Lincoln cathedral.⁸⁷ They seem less likely, however, as copy texts for Savile's edition than
 14 any of the books already discussed. This is also true of manuscripts overseas that bore a
 15 colophon with the date 1344.⁸⁸ Information from a sixth manuscript was, however, used. This
 16 came from the Vatican Library. According to Oberman and others, Ms. Vat. Lat. 1038, a
 17 manuscript whose colophon is dated 1357 and which was copied at Paris by Gerit Baptiste of
 18 Diest, is the most likely candidate to have been consulted by Savile or his agents. This book
 19 was in the collections of Gregory XII in 1411.⁸⁹ Unfortunately, the explicit of this manuscript

⁸⁵ Lambeth Palace Library, Ms. 32, fol. 257r.

⁸⁶ Lambeth Palace Library, Ms. 169.

⁸⁷ Thomson, *Worcester Cathedral Library*, p. 75; Patrick Young, *Catalogus librorum manuscriptorum bibliothecae Wigoniensis Made in 1622-1623*, eds. Ivor Atkins and Neil R. Ker (Cambridge, 1944), p. 51; R. M. Thomson, *Catalogue of the Manuscripts of Lincoln Cathedral Chapter Library* (Cambridge, 1989), p. 11 (incomplete).

⁸⁸ For example, Padua, Basilica di Sant' Antonio, Ms. 170, whose colophon matches that identified by Savile. See Luigi M. D. Minciotti, *Catalogo dei codici manoscritti esistenti nella biblioteca di Sant'Antonio di Padova* (Padua, 1842), p. 59.

⁸⁹ Oberman, *Archbishop Thomas Bradwardine*, p. 18; Auguste Pelzer, *Codices Vaticani Latini. Tomus II, pars prior* (Vatican City, 1931), pp. 546-547; Antonio Manfredi, *I Codici latini di Niccolò V*, Studi e Testi 359 (Vatican City, 1994), pp. 278-279.

1 does not match Savile's own description of his source at the Vatican and, moreover, the text
 2 contains significant variants which are not recorded by Savile. By contrast, the richly illustrated
 3 manuscript written at Rome in 1411 by the Augustinian Boezio da Tolentino, matches both
 4 Savile's description of its epigraph and contains readings which, like those of New College
 5 Ms. 134, can be found in the margin of Savile's text. It entered the library of Nicholas V from
 6 the collections of the Carmelites. Its explicit reads: 'Explicit Sum[m]a doctoris p[ro]fundi
 7 thome brauardini de causis dei [con]t[ra] pelagian[orum] et de virtute dei cause causarum.'⁹⁰ It
 8 was presumably particularly important to Savile to obtain a Roman example of a manuscript
 9 acknowledging Bradwardine's status as 'Doctor profundus', the title that he had been given by
 10 the Pope in Avignon.

11

12 Savile therefore brought to fruition a project that Thomas James and Samuel Ward had
 13 canvassed and carried it out with the help of James, Ward, and Twisse. Others who perhaps
 14 aided him by making copies of materials may have included John Wilton, chaplain of Merton.
 15 In 1619, Wilton wrote to the bookseller, Thomas Thorpe, about copies of the manuscript
 16 biblical commentaries of the Dominican Nicholas de Gorran that he was sending to Savile.⁹¹
 17 When Savile's edition of *De causa Dei* appeared, it was immediately swept up by the debates
 18 about Arminianism then convulsing both the English and the Dutch Churches. Its occasion,
 19 however, seems to have been a much more local dispute about the preaching of Reformed
 20 divinity in Oxford. In both contexts, Archbishop Abbot played a major role, even as his
 21 political power began to wane after 1618. The project of editing *De causa Dei* was conducted
 22 under Abbot's patronage and depended in part on books from the Archbishop's library.

⁹⁰ Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Ms. Vat. Lat. 1040, fol. 305v.

⁹¹ Cambridge University Library, Ms. Add. 4251/1500. Tentatively dated to 8 February 1619 from its discussion of Thomas Cartwright, *A Confytation of the Rhemists Translation* ([Leiden], 1618). On Thorpe, see McKerrow (ed.), *Dictionary of Printers and Booksellers*, pp. 265-266. I am grateful to Thomas Roebuck for sharing his thoughts about this letter.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

The publication of *De causa Dei* represented in many ways the beginning rather than the end of Bradwardine's influence on the debate over free will and predestination in the English- and Dutch-speaking churches of the seventeenth century.⁹² Twisse and Ward, in particular, of those who had been involved in the edition continued to refer to Bradwardine extensively in their own writings of the 1620s and 1630s. Increasingly, however, the position that they represented lost out in a new generation of avant-garde readers, more critical of the positions of Perkins or, indeed, Savile. It is fitting to end a discussion of the way in which public teaching about predestination, whether in Oxford or in Leiden, had created an atmosphere for the revival of fourteenth-century divinity with another controversy about preaching. In January 1625, Samuel Ward preached a sermon in the university church (Great St Mary's) at Cambridge about grace. There, he cited 'our Bradwardine, the most strenuous proponent of the grace of God' ('*Bradwardinus noster, gratiæ Dei strenuissimus assertor*'), from Savile's edition, in the context of an Augustinian attack on the supposed Pelagianism and semi-Pelagianism of the Jesuits and the Remonstrants.⁹³ For one of his readers, Matthew Wren (1585-1667), newly appointed Master of Peterhouse and future Bishop of Hereford, Norwich, and eventually Ely, this was all too much. Bradwardine was 'an enemy of God' ('*hostis dei*'), who lived his life in a manner contrary to faith. In place of Bradwardine, Wren cited the opinion of the heterodox reformer, Francesco Stancarò, which had won praise from Bellarmine: the teaching of Peter Lombard (on which Ockham had commented) was worth more than that of a

⁹² See Tanis, 'Abraham van der Heyden'; Baschera. 'Witnessing to the Calvinism of the English Church', pp. 441-446; Aza Goudriaan, 'Samuel Rutherford on the Divine Origin of Possibility', in *Reformed Orthodoxy in Scotland*, ed. Aaron Clay Denlinger (London, 2015), pp. 141-156; Simon J. G. Burton, 'Disputing Providence in Seventeenth-Century Scottish Universities: The Conflict between Samuel Rutherford and the Aberdeen Doctors and its Repercussions', *History of Universities*, 29/2 (2016), 121-142.

⁹³ Samuel Ward, *Gratia discriminans* (London, 1626), pp. 22-23, 42.

- 1 hundred Luthers, two hundred Melancthons, three hundred Bullingers, four hundred Peter
- 2 Martyrs, or five hundred Calvins.⁹⁴
- 3

⁹⁴ Wren's comments may be found in an interleaved copy of Ward's sermon: Oxford, Bodleian Library, shelfmark 4° Rawl. 150, especially at p. 37 (and facing), facing p. 43, and facing p. 54. See also Anthony Milton, *Catholic and Reformed* (Cambridge, 1995), p. 314; Stephen Hampton, 'Samuel Ward and the Defense of Dordt in England', in *Beyond Dordt and De Auxiliis*, eds. Ballor, Gaetano, and Sytsma, pp. 200-218. For Wren's public quarrel with Ward over teaching in the University in 1627-1628, see Margo Todd, 'Anti-Calvinists and the Republican Threat in Early Stuart Cambridge', in *Puritanism and its Discontents*, ed. Laura Lunger Knoppers (Newark, 2003), pp. 85-105.

1 Summary:

2

3 This essay discusses the immediate context and form of the publication of Henry Savile's
4 edition of Thomas Bradwardine's *De causa Dei* (1618). It sets out the political and theological
5 significance of the work in relation to publications of the King's Printers, the Synod of Dort,
6 and the activities of Archbishop Abbot. It moves on to consider how the edition was made,
7 resituating it in Oxford intellectual life of the early 1610s and in the broader world of
8 theological controversy, and identifying some of those who conceived and assisted with the
9 work. It considers which manuscripts were used in making the edition.

10

11 Key words:

12

13 Savile, Abbot, Bradwardine, predestination, free will, Oxford, Synod of Dort, printing.

14

15

16

17