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Abstract:

Since his death in 1607, Abraham Fleming has never been completely forgotten about. This thesis covers all aspects of Fleming’s life. It begins with his time at Cambridge and the relationships he forged there. It studies his varied and sometimes groundbreaking contributions to the books associated with him (with a focus on his English texts and translations). It also covers his ordination into the Church of England and subsequent career as a chaplain to Charles Howard, earl of Nottingham. It also elucidates his previously unknown life as a curate in the parish of St Nicholas, Deptford and as a deacon and priest St Pancras, Soper Lane, and finally his sermons at Paul’s Cross in the grounds of St Paul’s Cathedral.

Fleming’s legacy of at least 52 printed books, which includes original godly protestant treatises, English translations of Latin and Greek classical works, and books commemorating unusual occasions, have ensured that his name lived on in bibliographic catalogues. Since the 1950s a few scholars have considered Fleming’s work on Holinshed’s Chronicles as significant contributions to the text. However, the subsequent articles that have been written about him have been narrow in scope and at times unreliable.

Recent studies of Fleming have considered him only as a minor writer, yet this thesis demonstrates that he was a literary figure of considerable significance. Fleming made an important contribution to the emerging public sphere, as foregrounded by Jurgen Habermas, that was lauded by his contemporaries but he has largely slipped from view. Before this doctoral research little was known about Fleming’s career as a preacher in the Church of England, a career in which he proved just as diligent as when he was a “learned corrector” of books. The aim of this thesis has been to throw fresh light on the multi-faceted career of Abraham Fleming and establish him as a leading figure in late-Sixteenth century political and print culture.
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Acknowledgements

There are a number of people without whom this thesis would not have been possible. Foremost among these is my supervisor Professor Pauline Croft. When it seemed unlikely that there would be material enough for a Ph.D. on Fleming, Pauline looked at my initial research and gave me a chance. She has been patient and generous, she is always supportive and knowledgeable, and she is a consummate historian and academic.

I would not have met Pauline without John A. W. Lock, fellow researcher and mine of information on just about everything. His suggestion that I “have a chat with Pauline” and subsequent introduction to her led to my enrolment at Royal Holloway, University of London and the completion of this thesis. At Royal Holloway, Professor Blair Worden agreed to act as my advisor, as required by the university regulations.

I want to thank my friend Steve Moore, without whom I would not have heard of the Black Dog, which led to me the Wunder pamphlet that introduced me to Fleming some 15 years ago. I also valued the contributions to discussion made by many members of the Tudor and Stuart seminars at the Institute of Historical Research, London, particularly those of: Professor Michael Questier of the Department of History, Queen Mary, University of London; Dr Rivkah Zim of the English Department, Kings College, London; Simon Healey of the History of Parliament Trust; Helen Good of the University of Hull and regular contributor to the Tudor and Stuart seminars; and Professor Richard Hoyle of the Department of History, University of Reading.

I thank Dr Michael Honeybone, lecturer at the Open University, and his wife Diana who have been studying Fleming’s brother, Samuel, and who have been very enthusiastic in their support of me and my research. Michael Saunders, former churchwarden of St Mary the Virgin, Bottesford, has not only shown great interest in my work but opened the church for me on a number of occasions so that I could explore Fleming’s last resting place.

Many thanks go to Mr and Mrs Nicholas Fothergill of Stanford Hall in Lutterworth who allowed me into their library to look for Fleming’s manuscripts, and to their librarian Sarah Maughan for her help during my visits. I thank Revd Steven Doel, former vicar of St Nicholas, Deptford, for his time, the guided tour of his church and for telling me about his parish. I also thank Gary Haines, archivist and records keeper to the Worshipful Company of Mercers for sending me two books about the Company. I also thank the staff of the Huntington Library, California, for welcoming and assisting me during my research trip; I thank in particular archivist Steve Tabor for his help regarding the Huntington’s unique Melton Holinshed. Thank you to Professor Peter W. M. Blayney of University of Toronto, author of The Bookshops in Paul’s Cross Churchyard, for an inspirational meeting in which I realised how much could be achieved when one has very little known material to work with. Thank you to Dr Roger Lovatt, Librarian of Peterhouse, Cambridge, for allowing me to see the Buttery books and Dr Andrew Perne’s library inventory. I also thank Professor Ronald Cooley of the English Department, University of Saskatchewan, for sending me a copy of a rare early study of Fleming. Lastly, my thanks also go to my friend Chris Yates who has accompanied me on a number of research trips including the one to the Huntington Library, California.
Conventions and Abbreviations

All dates are given in the New Style with the given year beginning on 1 January.

All dates are *anno domini* unless suffixed with “B. C.”
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The full titles of Fleming’s works are given at their first mention of the book in the chapter that deals with that book. Elsewhere in the thesis the titles have been abbreviated. For reference, a catalogue of all Fleming’s known printed material is provided in Appendix B and each entry gives the full title and the abbreviated title of the book.

Printed books and journals: where London is the place of publication, London has been omitted from the references.

**DNB** refers to *Dictionary of National Biography* (1885-1900).


**BL** is the British Library.

**LG** is the London Guildhall archive.

**LRO** is the Lowestoft Records Office.
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**TNA** refers to The National Archives.
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**AthC** is Charles Cooper’s *Athenae Cantabrigienses* (1858).


**Lowndes** is William Lowndes’ *The Bibliographer’s Manual of English Literature* (1834).

**PBR** is Thomas Walker’s *A Biographical Register of Peterhouse Men and Some of their Neighbours* (1927).

**Tanner** is Thomas Tanner’s *Bibliotheca Britannico-Hibernica* (1748).
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Chapter One:

Re-introducing Abraham Fleming (c. 1552 – 1607)

It is surprising that so few historians today are familiar with the author and cleric Abraham Fleming. In the later sixteenth century his pamphlets, short treatises and a broadside on popular topical events, as well as his sermons at London’s Paul’s Cross probably made him a household name, at least in London. Ben Jonson is known to have read Fleming’s English translation of Virgil’s Bucoliks; he provided materials for the writers Reginald Scot, Raphael Holinshed, Barnabe Googe and George Whetstone, amongst other notable authors. London’s leading printers, for example Henry Denham, relied on his experience as an editor to rework their older titles. In later life Fleming corresponded with Archbishop Whitgift, who was already familiar with his work. He moved on the periphery of Elizabeth I’s court and he became chaplain to Admiral Lord Howard of Effingham shortly after the Armada was defeated. Fleming was a licensed preacher, a curate in Deptford and later rector of St Pancras, Soper Lane, a small parish with links to the wealthy Worshipful Company of Mercers.

Fleming was well known in his own day as a prolific writer, translator, poet, editor and indexer. Within two years of his first book being printed, Fleming was listed as a known author in the 1577 edition of Holinshed’s Chronicles. The antiquary Francis Thynne later included both Abraham and his brother Samuel in his list of eminent writers. Many of Fleming’s books ran to second, sometimes third and even fourth editions during his lifetime. Later editions of his devotional writing were still selling well into the 1620s. Two accounts of explorer Martin Frobisher’s epic voyages, to which Fleming contributed celebratory verses, were translated into several languages and sold across Europe. At least one antiquary, Francis Peck, is known to have collected his works in the eighteenth century.

---

1 Fleming’s name was included in Francis Thynne’s ‘List of Writers of our Nation’, which was included in Holinshed’s Chronicles (1577), pp. 1874-6 and on p. 1589 of the ‘Continuation’ in the 1587 edition.
2 The first True Report of Frobisher’s expedition was written by crewmember Dionysia Settle in 1577 and the second by Thomas Ellis, a sailor, in 1578. These are discussed further on pp. 164-7.
Fleming’s writings were listed in antiquarian and bibliographic catalogues throughout the eighteenth century. During the nineteenth century, reprints of his two most popular books were made: a facsimile of Straunge and Terrible Wunder (1577) was published in 1820 (and most recently in 2010). Fleming’s translation of John Caius’ De Canibus Britannicus entitled Of Englishe Dogges (1576) has been regularly reprinted, most recently in 1969, 2005 and 2010. Fleming was a prominent figure and some of his books have been published through four centuries, yet Fleming himself has been little studied. His life and works are important to anyone with an interest in the history of the printed book, the Renaissance in England, indexing, dictionaries, godly protestantism, preaching, early ‘scientific’ works and popular culture.

Fleming warrants a close study for three main reasons. Firstly, as a skilled translator, editor and poet he was involved with 52 known first editions between 1575 and 1589. Almost everything Fleming published was either written in or translated into English. This made his books, which ranged from godly treatises to classical texts, accessible to anyone who could read or listen to a reading. Fleming was keen to educate others and produced a number of ‘pedagogical’ texts, for example Latin-English dictionaries for young children and engaging introductions to the classics, such as his translation of Synesius’ Bushie Haire (1576).

Fleming’s texts were sold in a variety of sizes and qualities to suit all purses (as discussed throughout Chapters Five and Six, see also Appendix B, pp. 241-59). Subsequent chapters within this thesis will describe book production and explain Fleming’s contribution to the growing market for printed books during the mid- to late-sixteenth century. He enhanced the trade for printed books and was regularly commissioned by prominent members of the book trade, which had sprung up around St Paul’s churchyard and other areas of London such as Fleet Street. Fleming helped promote literacy, education and book ownership within an

---

3 Abraham Fleming, A Strange and Terrible Wunder wrought very late in the Parish Church of Bongay (1820 edn); the most recent edition was published on 10 September 2010 by Kessinger Publishing.
4 The Latin title of Caius’ original text is grammatically incorrect and should have been written De Canibus Britannicus.
5 See p. 145-7. Abraham Fleming, A paradoxe proving by reason and example, that baldnesse is much better than bushie haire, &c. (1579).
increasingly cultured population. Today his titles reflect what the people of London wanted to read and what he thought people should learn in order to promote his moral and religious views; he promoted the dissemination of new ideas while also supporting the views of the Elizabethan regime.

Secondly, Fleming is worth understanding because he was a well-respected editor and indexer who worked with some of the leading printers and booksellers of the day. Important texts such as the second edition of Raphael Holinshed’s Chronicles (1587) would not have been produced without his very considerable input. Fleming not only produced small popular texts for the public sphere; his activities also illustrate the fluidity of the book trade and the “communication circuit” or local networks between different printers and booksellers. The network that existed between printers, booksellers and editors, contributors and censors was epitomized by Fleming’s work on Holinshed’s Chronicles. Fleming was a pioneer, opening up the world of exciting, topical and sensational printed texts to a new audience and he helped revolutionize the way in which books were thought about and produced.

Thirdly, Fleming is important as an interesting social and religious commentator. His news pamphlets and personal papers can help us to understand some of the religious and political issues that were prominent during his career. Fleming became a chaplain to Lord Howard of Effingham, later earl of Nottingham and his wife Catherine Carey. My research has also revealed that Fleming was a curate in St Nicholas’ Deptford, a parish that was important for its connection to the English navy and home to the queen’s lord high admiral, Lord Howard of Effingham. The playwright Christopher Marlowe was buried in St Nicholas’ and Fleming assisted with, or possibly performed, his funeral. Later Fleming was appointed to the formerly wealthy but decayed parish of St Pancras, Soper Lane, close to St Paul’s. He most likely secured this position with a written dedication to fellow Petrean (Peterhouse alumnus) Archbishop Whitgift, and he was known to Whitgift through the Privy Council’s censoring

---

6 The terms “communication circuit” and “local network” have been discussed by English cultural historian Professor Daniel Woof in his book The Social Circulation of the Past: English Historical Culture 1500-1730. (Oxford, 2003).
of Holinshed’s Chronicles. Fleming’s commitment to the reformed church was firmly established by the time of his ordination. He quickly became a licensed preacher and delivered eight sermons at Paul’s Cross, a pulpit reserved for influential clergymen.

**Historiography:**

Most of Fleming’s literary career has been overlooked, as have the last two decades of his life. It has been said that "sources of information about him are limited". This is not true for there is a range of contemporary sources about Fleming and he left countless clues within his writing from which a great deal can be inferred about the man and the society in which he lived. Despite this, recent academic articles that mention Fleming still repeat the same limited ‘facts’. Most of these stem from Thompson Cooper’s outdated entry in the 1889 Dictionary of National Biography (hereafter DNB) and the entry in John Venn and J. A. Venn's *Alumni Cantabrigienses* (1922), which was based on Thompson Cooper’s DNB entry of 1889 and his earlier contribution to Charles Henry Cooper (ed.) *Athenae Cantabrigienses* (1858). Both sources greatly simplified Fleming’s life and this thesis demonstrates that there are numerous omissions in these two brief studies. The recent *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (hereafter ODNB) entry for Fleming is objective but not fully comprehensive. Further to this, the majority of studies featuring Fleming focus on his contributions to Holinshed’s Chronicles. This can be attributed to the fact that Holinshed’s Chronicles is well known and already well-studied (primarily because of its connection to Shakespeare who used the book when researching history plays). Today the 51 other texts associated with Fleming remain largely unstudied and many of his books are now very rare.

During the eighteenth century Fleming’s books were catalogued by antiquaries who made no attempt to provide any information or understanding about the man behind the titles. A

---

8 The Victorian fascination with Shakespeare lead to a version of Holinshed’s Chronicles being produced that comprised solely the sections that Shakespeare had apparently used – this was called Shakespeare’s Holinshed. This abridged text has caused confusion as those unfamiliar with the various copies, editions, books and collections of excised material that represent Holinshed’s Chronicles believe ‘Shakespeare’s Holinshed’ to be another name for Holinshed’s Chronicles, which it is not.
facsimile of *Strange and Terrible Wunder* from 1820 included this early, brief biography of Fleming:

> Of the narrator Abraham Fleming, nothing more is known than that he was Rector of St Pancras, Soper Lane from October 1593 till 1607, in which year he died. He was probably a school-master... he appears to have been an industrious author, and most probably subsisted on the labours of his pen.9

Cooper’s description of Fleming in *DNB* provided the first detailed biography of Fleming but Cooper did lasting damage to his subject’s reputation. Labelling Fleming a “poor poet” but an “excellent and diligent antiquary”, Cooper’s denigration has resulted in fundamental mistakes that have clouded almost all subsequent studies of Fleming. Cooper’s comments and opinions reveal more about the Victorian view of what constituted good literature than they do about Fleming.

It is clear from this research that Fleming was not an antiquary, but because he worked so extensively on the 1587 edition of *Holinshed’s Chronicles* it has always been assumed that he was an antiquary. It is true that he did work alongside antiquaries such as Francis Thynne, John Hooker, William Harrison and John Stow, but Fleming himself was never a member of the College of Antiquaries.10 The difference between Fleming and his colleagues is that they were known to be collectors of manuscripts, very early books, maps and antiquities. Fleming by contrast is not known to have collected any such items or even to have been particularly interested in the past. Among his large manuscript collection were just two papers relating to the defeat of a late Roman Emperor and Roman Triumphal Arches. His other papers (listed in Appendix C) described contemporary events, while those manuscripts written by Fleming himself related recent occurrences, his own sermons or personal correspondence. Fleming did produce scholarly translations of popular classical writers such as Virgil or Pliny, but he also translated the books of his protestant contemporaries such as John Calvin (d. 1564) or

---

9 *Fleming Wunder* (1820), preface. This information about Fleming was taken from Newcourt’s *Repertorium*, Richard Newcourt’s *Repertorium ecclesiasticum parochiale Londinense* (1708) vol. i, 519.

10 The College of Antiquaries was founded in 1586 following proposals to form an “English Academy” and library. The College became the Society of Antiquaries in 1707.
John Knox (d. 1574). He also contributed to groundbreaking books like Reginald Scot’s *Discoverie of Witchcraft* (1584), which in effect denied the existence of witchcraft. When Fleming did write about current affairs, such as the earthquake of 1580, he was not committing these events to paper in order to preserve them for future generations as an antiquary might; rather Fleming exploited events as vehicles for spiritual or moral lessons.

Antiquaries were concerned with collecting, studying and preserving old or antique objects, often in private collections, and not readily sharing the items in their own collections. This thesis argues that Fleming was not an antiquary and his main concern was wholly different, namely to take Latin material and, rather than preserve it, transform the text into something new that enabled large numbers of people to buy it and access the information therein. He did this time and time again during his career as a writer. It must be remembered that he was involved with over 50 printed books of which *Holinshed’s Chronicles* was just one: one collaborative project (no matter how large or well-known the project may have become) does not an antiquary make. It must also be remembered that Fleming became involved in producing *Holinshed’s Chronicles* primarily because he was an excellent and diligent corrector, editor and indexer, not because the Holinshed syndicate was in need of another contributing antiquary.

The first modern study of Fleming was made by Dodson in 1955.\(^\text{11}\) While Dodson gave an overview of Fleming’s career, she drew the conclusion like Cooper that Fleming’s written work was somewhat lacking, particularly in humour. Dodson did not, however, consider two aspects of his writing. Firstly, whether, given his earnest beliefs and the nature of his subject matter, was humour an appropriate device? Secondly, as this thesis argues, Fleming did in fact produce humorous and satirical books when appropriate. His *Bushie Haire* (1576), the proverbs in his dictionaries and his willingness to work on *Beehiue of the Romish Church* (1579) clearly demonstrate that Fleming used humour as a device. The value of Dodson’s synopsis is that it was the first to place Fleming in some context and although the majority of

\(^{11}\) See fn 7, p. 11.
her article was focused on *Holinshed’s Chronicles* she did advocate Fleming as the book’s editor-in-chief.

Seven of the subsequent ten academic articles and books that included Fleming were also based on *Holinshed’s Chronicles*. William E. Miller wrote an article that focused entirely on *Holinshed’s Chronicles* entitled ‘Abraham Fleming: editor of Shakespeare’s Holinshed’. Stephen Booth’s *A Book called Holinshed’s Chronicles* barely mentioned Fleming at all except to support the notion that Fleming was *Holinshed’s Chronicles*’ editor-in-chief. Elizabeth Story Donno’s 1989 article ‘Abraham Fleming: a learned corrector in 1586-87’ described Fleming’s activities and role during the year 1586-7 immediately prior to the publication of *Holinshed’s Chronicles*. Cyndia Susan Clegg’s ‘Which Holinshed’s Chronicles?’ focused on identifying the differences between surviving copies of *Holinshed’s Chronicles*, but did not explore the roles of the men who produced this edition.

Annabel Patterson’s *Reading Holinshed* acknowledged that Fleming was “chief editor on the second edition”. However, while Patterson’s book is peppered with short references to Fleming and his editorial decisions, the total amount of page-space devoted to him was small. Patterson’s conclusions do not make sense; her comments on Fleming’s character and contributions are belittling and label Fleming as moralising and dull, yet this thesis argues

---

12 There are actually 15 modern studies that include Fleming and/or *Holinshed’s Chronicles* known at the time of writing but I do not include Christopher Reeve’s popular title *A Strange and Terrible Wunder: the story of the Black Dog of Bungay*, (Bungay, 1988); neither do I include my unpublished Masters thesis ‘Religion, Familiars and Abraham Fleming: an attempt to explain the Strange and Terrible Wonder of 1577’ (2001), nor my published article that followed this in *Fortean Times* issue 195 (April 2005). Amie Shirkie, a student of English at the University of Saskatchewan has also written an undergraduate dissertation on early humanist texts, which includes a brief description of Fleming’s *Diamond of Devotion*.

13 William E. Miller, ‘Abraham Fleming: Editor of Shakespeare’s Holinshed’, *Texas Studies in Literature and Language* 1 (1959-60), pp. 89-100. The title of this article is slightly misleading since *Shakespeare’s Holinshed* compiled by W. G. Boswell-Stone was published in 1907, and obviously Fleming did not edit this Edwardian book.


17 Annabel Patterson, *Reading Holinshed’s “Chronicles”*, (Chicago, 1994).
that the Holinshed syndicate needed Fleming because he was a spirited, motivated and
dynamic worker (as is demonstrated throughout Chapter Four). Patterson’s book highlighted
the need to re-evaluate Fleming, but even in recent published articles this has not happened.
In 2000 David Wootton, quoting from Patterson’s Reading Holinshed, described Fleming’s
“drab career” as that of a “minor litterateur” whose “varied and insignificant productions
make him an easy target for gentle ridicule”.\(^1\) Wootton was inaccurate and his article
arguably fanciful in other ways too. Wootton placed Fleming firmly within a religious sect
called the Family of Love, but it is apparent from contemporary evidence that Fleming was a
mainstream protestant and not a Familist.

This thesis will reveal a very different Fleming from the monotonous character portrayed in
earlier studies. It is apparent that Fleming’s colleagues and contemporaries valued him and
the dynamic expertise that he could bring to book production. Fleming was actually a
spirited writer and often wrote with considerable emotion, as his many prefaces and glosses
demonstrate. Irritated outbursts against his own printers and readers imply that he was a
respected or feared editor actively watching the print shop floor, making sure his texts were
accurate. Fleming was not afraid to condemn shoddy workmanship publicly. In a prefix letter
entitled ‘Ad Philomusos’, Fleming openly castigated one printer, Thomas Purfoote, for being
careless and allowing errors into his Shorte dictionarie in Latine and English (1584).
Purfoote did not remove Fleming’s slur from this edition, which suggests that he was as
careless as Fleming said. However, subsequent editions of this book (on which Fleming did
not work) lack these bitter castigations. Until the Privy Council’s censoring of Holinshed’s
Chronicles there is no evidence that anyone dared to criticize or counter Fleming. He clearly
was not insignificant, drab or ridiculous, as recent scholars have asserted.

\(^1\) David Wootton, ‘Reginald Scot/Abraham Fleming/The Family of Love’, in Stuart Clarke (ed.),
The most recent published study of Fleming is Clegg’s ODNB entry published in 2004.19 Clegg condensed the busy and varied life of Fleming into seven paragraphs that focused on the best known and most cited of his works: Holinshed’s Chronicles. This article is similar to Cooper’s DNB entry before it although Clegg left out the subjective Victoriana and concentrated on reviewing the man and his literary achievements. Fleming’s fastidious, committed and dedicated nature is evident in Clegg’s useful article. However, Clegg failed to shed any new light on Fleming and did not correct the errors perpetrated by her predecessors.

Clegg mentioned Fleming’s involvement with better-known Elizabethan writers such as Scot and Googe but overlooked Fleming’s other relationships, even though these relationships resulted in important texts. This gave the impression that Fleming owed his limited success to these other writers. However, this thesis will demonstrate that Fleming was in fact very successful in his own right; without Fleming these writers’ books would never have been finished, ‘polished’ and published in the form in which we know them today. Clegg does not put Fleming or his texts into a developed context. As a result any sense of Fleming’s works arising from an involvement with, or reaction to, politico-religious events has been lost. The emphasis on Holinshed’s Chronicles implies that this was the pinnacle of Fleming’s career, which it may have been in terms of its sheer size, but this thesis argues that Fleming’s literary career spanned 14 years of which only three were spent compiling Holinshed’s Chronicles. It is therefore the dozens of other texts that he wrote or helped produce that reveal the most about Fleming and Elizabethan literary society; Clegg’s ODNB article and its predecessors have overlooked these texts.

One academic study of Fleming that must be mentioned is William E. Miller’s unpublished doctoral dissertation ‘Abraham Fleming, Elizabethan Man of Letters’. 20 Miller was enrolled in the English department of the University of Pennsylvania and, supervised by Allan G. Chester, submitted his thesis on Fleming in partial fulfilment of his doctorate. Until this thesis, Miller’s study of Fleming was the most thorough study produced and he attempted to consider all aspects of Fleming’s life and varied careers. Nonetheless, Miller’s dissertation contained many gaps and omissions. Furthermore, he provided scant information on areas of Fleming’s minor publications, dictionaries or events in Fleming’s life that he (Miller) knew little about. On other subjects, namely Virgil and Holinshed’s Chronicles, Miller overcompensated. Likewise Miller had plenty to say about Cambridge students in the sixteenth century but only scratched the surface of important issues such as Elizabethan printing and allied trades. Perhaps Miller’s biggest limitation was that he was based in the United States of America with restricted primary sources to hand. This explains his emphasis on copies of early books housed in American libraries and his limited discussions of texts kept in English institutions. Miller’s footnotes and acknowledgements suggest that he relied heavily on contacts in British libraries and archives thus gaining his information at second hand. Furthermore, Miller wrote at a time before important studies such as those by Patrick Collinson, which would have added greater depth to his understanding of Fleming’s godly treatises. Miller’s dissertation is therefore out-dated.

All the studies of Fleming produced over the last century have one thing in common: there has been confusion over cataloguing Fleming’s “complete” works and to date there is no definitive answer to the question “on exactly how many books did he work?” Tanner, for example, listed 24 titles (including one unpublished manuscript). Cooper claimed that Fleming was associated with 59 works but only named 22 titles. Clegg’s ODNB entry stated that Fleming was associated with 57 titles, but named just 12 and mentioned three more.

20 William E. Miller, ‘Abraham Fleming, Elizabethan Man of letters: a biographical and critical study’ (unpublished: University of Pennsylvania, 1957). I am indebted to Professor Ron Cooley, English Department, University of Saskatchewan. Without his kind assistance it would have been impossible to see Miller’s dissertation.
Clegg at least attempted to vary some of the titles she listed from those usually documented. Her predecessors typically copied each other’s lists of Fleming’s works without querying or adding to them. For example, Holinshed’s Chronicles and Fleming’s translations of Virgil are always listed, whereas his Alphabet of Praiers (1591) is rarely mentioned. This simply reflects the titles that modern academics think important enough to warrant listing and says nothing of Fleming’s or his peers’ priorities. From 1575 until 1588 when Fleming worked within the book trade, he surely came into contact with innumerable texts. Without a complete and accurate list of the titles he wrote or worked on, the complexity of the Elizabethan book trade is underestimated; it is also an underestimation of Fleming’s own range of interests, skill and contacts. Yet creating an accurate and definitive list of complete works for Fleming has proved problematic.

Rather than try to pin Fleming down to a precise number of titles, it would be more accurate to say that Fleming is known to have been associated with a certain number of books. He was employed by the Fleet Street printer Richard Tottell, probably towards the end of the 1570s, and could have anonymously helped edit any number of books printed by Tottell.21 There are likely to be other published books, rare or lost, to which he contributed and which have yet to be connected to him, but Fleming almost always identified himself. Of the printed books that bear Fleming’s initials, name or signature tags (in other words titles that he is known to have either written or made a contribution to) this thesis puts the figure at 52 (see Appendix B, pp. 241-59). He left a substantial collection of personal papers as well, which included the transcripts of his eight Paul’s Cross sermons. All of these sermons (which are discussed on pp. 205-13) were catalogued by Peck prior to 1732 but later lost. Peck catalogued a further 65 manuscripts which were “in Fleming’s hand”, that is to say owned by him and given the suffix MS manu Abraham Fleming by Peck. However, not all of the 65 manuscripts in Peck’s catalogue were necessarily in Fleming’s handwriting, those that were had been given a different suffix by Peck. Fleming certainly wrote 15 manuscripts

21 Another of Tottell’s employees, Ralph Blower, wrote that he and Fleming were Tottell’s “servants”, (see pp. 65-6).
himself because Peck took care to note that these were in Mr Fleming’s writing and not just in his possession. Fleming may have written more but without finding and comparing the manuscripts it is impossible to say. These 15 unpublished papers range from personal letters to the manuscripts for Fleming’s autobiography and plans for his own funeral. The grand total of Fleming’s known works, published, unpublished and preached, comes to 73 items.²²

Whilst some shorter studies have already been made of Fleming’s life and works there are quite clearly gaps and mistakes within them that need to be addressed. Miller’s dissertation also needs reviewing, since half a century of ground-breaking research in related fields has taken place since he wrote his thesis. Contrary to previous thinking, there is a great deal that can be said about Fleming and his life. He was not the drab and dreary minor character described by Cooper, Patterson and Wootton. He led a busy life and played diverse roles within both the literary world and, later, the church. He was often demanding and difficult to work with, yet greatly respected and at times he showed a sense of humour. Fleming was a key figure among his colleagues and contemporaries and as such he deserves a full scholarly study. While his very early years are harder to summarize it is still possible to correct and amplify previous understanding of his youth, starting with his birth.

**Early biography:**

Fleming’s birth year has always been assumed to be 1552 because the memorial plaque in the church where he is buried states that he was about 56 when he died in 1607. His brother Samuel was the rector of that church and responsible for placing the memorial over the crypt. The relationship between the two brothers was always a close one. Francis Thynne, the antiquary and herald, noted in *Holinshed’s Chronicles* that Fleming and his brother Samuel were “brethren by one bellie”, a quasi-legal term referring to *fratres uterinum* meaning that they were maternal half-brothers.²³ In 1732 Francis Peck described the brothers

---

²² A complete list of all the manuscripts belonging to Fleming can be found in Appendix C, pp. 260-6.
as just that: “fratrem suum uterinum”. Later in the eighteenth century Bishop Thomas Tanner, a bibliographer, took “brethren by one bellie” to mean that the brothers were “fratres gemini” or twins.

According to his brother Samuel (who was born in 1548), Fleming was born in 1552. However, early in 1592 Fleming made the following statement in a deposition in the Court of Chancery concerning a dispute between Thomas Gryffen, John Mable and William Chapman.

Abraham Fleming Clerk and preacher Chapleyn to the right honourable Lorde howard of Effyngham lord Admyrall of Englande. of the age of xlvi years or theraboutes sworn and ex[amine]d the first daye of Februarye in the xxxiii year [of Elizabeth’s reign].

If Fleming’s statement is correct and he was aged 47 in 1592, then he would have been born in 1543 or 1544. Presumably he read through this deposition and checked his statement before signing it, so it seems doubtful that he would have missed any major errors, particularly as by that time he was an experienced learned corrector. It is true that the majority of people born at this time did not know exactly when their birthday was and discrepancies of four or even five years are not unheard of. If Fleming was a twin born in 1548, it is possible that he could have mistaken how old he was when he signed the deposition. It is also possible but very unlikely that for some reason Fleming was not baptized when he was born but later in 1552 and this became Samuel Fleming’s point of reference when he dictated his brother’s memorial plaque.

In the preface to Fleming’s dictionary-index of 1585 he referred to himself as Londonigenam and Thynne’s brief description in Holinshed’s Chronicles of the Fleming brothers confirms that

---

24 Francis Peck, Desiderata Curiosa vol. I (1732), 54
26 The National Archives (hereafter TNA) PRO C24/221 ‘Gryffen v. Mable et al, 34 Eliz. Regnus’.
27 Ibid.
28 Fleming’s colleague Arthur Golding was born in about 1536 but a precise year is not known. Another of Fleming’s contemporaries, George Gascoigne was born sometime between 1530 and 1535 (one website even suggests 1525 as his birth year).
they were “Londoners born”. Fleming, in his manuscript autobiography, said he was living in London from 1582 onwards and implied that he came back to London in 1576 or 1577. The likelihood is that Fleming was born in Holborn. Miller suggested that his father might have been a prosperous grocer from Holborn called Henry Fleming who died in 1561. The evidence linking Henry Fleming to Abraham is circumstantial but suggestive that the two men had much in common, including protestantism. Certainly Fleming was familiar with Holborn; he produced a biography of the area’s greatest public benefactor, William Lambe, and was associated with a number of students from the Inns of Chancery and Gray’s Inn. Fleming never moved far from that parish. In the early 1570s Fleming attended Cambridge but he withdrew after Michaelmas term late in 1575. Thynne’s biography stated that Fleming came (surely meaning returned) to London in 1576 or 1577, which would coincide with him leaving Cambridge.

Fleming’s family must have been at one time middle-class and prosperous. Both boys were well educated, although by the time Samuel and Abraham enrolled at Cambridge the family was no longer wealthy. Judging from the brothers’ sound knowledge of Latin and understanding of Greek, they both went to grammar school. Abraham’s name cannot be found in any existing school registers although Samuel (who seems to have been the more gifted of the two) is known to have attended Eton. Both brothers had a talent for poetry and although Samuel never pursued writing as a career, his early verses were deemed very good.

---

29 The autobiography is “Abrahami Flemingi de Vita sua succincta & lucida Historia, Anno 1605. a seipso conscripta. MS. Manu Flemingi”. Boyd’s Inhabitants of London contains no Flemings in London during the required time period, although Boyd is by no means a comprehensive source.

30 Miller, quoting from John Gough Nichols The Diary of Henry Machyn. Citizen and Merchant Taylor of London from A.D. 1550 to A.D. 1563, (London, 1848), wrote that Henry Fleming made his will on 17 May 1559 and added a codicil on 10 January 1561 that he should be buried “after a decent order without any vayne pompe”. Machyn recorded that Henry Fleming was buried on 17 January 1561 “in sant Peters in Cornehylle… cared to the chyrche with-owt syngyng or clarkes, and at the chyrche a sphalme songe after Genevay, and a sermon and bered contenent”. The reference to Geneva is almost certainly to the Psalms in the Geneva Bible (not the re-enacted Elizabethan Prayer Book with its Coverdale Psalms) and suggests that Henry Fleming was a Calvinist.

31 See pp. 162-3.

32 Miller, W. E. ‘Samuel Fleming, Elizabethan Clergyman’, The Library Chronicle, Vol. XXV, No.2 (Spring 1959). Samuel was at Eton in 1563 when Queen Elizabeth escaped plague-ridden London and stayed near the school; he was one of the schoolboys chosen to contribute to a manuscript book for the queen and he presented two acrostic poems.
One of his poems was printed as part of Edward Grant’s *Graecae Linguae Spicilegium*. Grammar school boys learned Latin and some Greek by rote and the brothers were certainly confident in both languages. Abraham’s later dictionaries suggest that he was competent in French too. There was also a strong emphasis on discipline within the grammar school. Perhaps he was drawing on his own experience when Fleming wrote in 1581 “ Foolishnesse is bound in the heart of a child but the rod of correction shall drive it away”.  

On 28 August 1565 Samuel went up to Kings College, Cambridge where he completed a Bachelor’s and then a Master’s degree. He was one of the poorer boys awarded a scholarship and Abraham similarly had to work in Peterhouse Buttery when he was a student in order to earn his place at university. In 1576 Samuel Fleming became tutor to Sir John Harington, another Etonian matriculated at Kings and godson of the queen. Harington was respectful, even fond of Samuel and wrote many accounts of his tutor “to whom [he] never came, but grew more religious; from whom [he] never went, but parted better instructed”. As his academic record suggests, Samuel Fleming was serious-minded and according to Harington he was “a grave and learned man and one of verie austere life”. It is likely that Abraham shared his brother’s dedicated attitude to learning and work but was less naturally gifted than Samuel, who ranked highly at Cambridge.

Fleming followed Samuel to Cambridge in November 1570. Fleming was an old student by Elizabethan standards as most boys went to university when they were as young as 14 years old. Miller has suggested Fleming was at Cambridge unofficially for some time but did not enrol until Michaelmas 1570 but lack of funds might have been the reason that went up to

---

33 Edward Grant, *Graecae Linguae Spicilegium ex praestantissimis Grammaticis in quatuor Horrea collectum* (1575). The British Library’s copy (shelfmark C.80.a.20), which was dedicated to and presented to Elizabeth I is a beautiful book, still bound in its original tooled white leather depicting the queen’s coat of arms and embossed with gold. It is not clear if this is the same text as Grant’s *Graeca Spicilegium in Scholae Westmonasteriensis Progymnasmata* (1575), which was dedicated to Lord Burghley, although Samuel Fleming was not a pupil at Westminster school. See also p. 145.
37 See William E. Miller, ‘Samuel Fleming, Elizabethan clergyman’, *University of Pennsylvania Library Chronicle* Vol. XXV (1959), 61-79; p. 63. This is not unusual as Kings was founded especially to take skilled but poor students from Eton who otherwise would not get a University education.
Peterhouse as a more mature student. He was matriculated at Peterhouse as a sizar, a less well-off scholar whose fees were paid by his college and in return he served in Peterhouse Buttery. Fleming did not graduate until 1582, twelve years after joining Peterhouse. His time at university seems to have been a troubled one. One of his earliest translations, *Of Englishe Dogges* (1576), was dedicated to his college master Dr Andrew Perne, and Fleming used the dedication to acknowledge the “relief” he had received from Perne during a “serious affliction” or illness. It is likely that Perne supported Fleming by lending him books from the college library and his own private collection, enabling Fleming to translate them into English and sell them. Fleming was clearly indebted to Perne and determinedly completed his degree. After 9 April 1575 he was no longer mentioned in the Buttery Books, which suggests that he was not in regular residence at Peterhouse. This date coincides with the publication of Fleming’s first translation, Virgil’s *Bucoliks* in English, and is about the time of his “coming to London” as described in his lost autobiography. He might also have stayed with his brother who was the rector of nearby Cottenham when college life became too expensive for him, or when plague disrupted the university (as it did during Michaelmas term 1574-5, although Fleming remained in residence at that time). These interruptions, commitments in London and his ‘affliction’ go some way to explaining why Fleming took twelve years to graduate and it is likely that by 1576 Fleming had moved back to London, since he was no longer in residence at Peterhouse.

---

38 Venn & Venn *Alumni Cantabrigienses*, p. 587. Some unconfirmed evidence from Peterhouse suggests that Fleming was dismissed from or had misbehaved while working in the Buttery. I do not think this was so; there is no evidence to suggest that Fleming ever misbehaved and he seems to have followed his college’s strict rules when in residence. However, he may have “dropped out” in 1575 (see fn 40, pp. 23-4).

39 At that time only the college masters were allowed to access the books in the college libraries. Fleming would not have been allowed to take out the books himself. Dr Roger Lovatt, Peterhouse librarian, pers. comm.

40 The Peterhouse Buttery Book recorded that between 1572 and 1575 Fleming only attended five out of eight terms, which might explain why he stayed in residence to complete Michaelmas term in 1575 despite there being an outbreak of plague and the other students leaving. Had he also attended all three terms during 1570–1 and again in 1571–2, then he would still only have completed eleven out of the twelve terms needed to graduate. This suggests that in April 1575 Fleming “dropped out” and worked full time in London, since his degree had been so punctuated with absences he would not have been allowed to graduate at that time. A change in the university’s regulations in 1579 allowed students to graduate with eleven terms instead of twelve. The timing of this new ruling surely explains why Fleming resumed his interest in Peterhouse the following year and was finally allowed to graduate in 1581. The Peterhouse Buttery book contains some “cloverleaf” marks or symbols that were only made next to the entries of Fleming’s name. They are contemporary with these registers. It is not known what these marks (cont.)
Once his career as a published writer and corrector was underway, Fleming used his books to appeal to potential patrons in the hope of receiving donations from them. In 1580 Fleming dedicated *Bright Burning Beacon* to Sir William Cordell. Cordell had been Master of the Rolls and Solicitor-General to Mary I. When he died in 1581, Cordell bequeathed £20 to be distributed among the poorer students of Oxford and Cambridge Universities. Perhaps Cordell’s interest in the education of poorer students was the reason Fleming targeted Cordell with this description of his own modest library:

Staid nevertheless at last, it was my lucke, looking among such bookes as I have, not manie in number nor great in value, to light upon a discourse so fit for the time, that I thought I should highly honour God, and doe great good to this lande if I undertooke the translation of the same.\(^{41}\)

The contents of Fleming’s own library are not known; perhaps it was better stocked than he led Cordell to believe. This dedication is valuable and unique in describing his small collection of books. It also reveals the name of one of the books owned by Fleming: Frederic Nausea’s original Latin version of *Bright Burning Beacon*.\(^{42}\) From this it could be supposed that his other early translations were also made from “looking among such books” as he had, which in turn suggests the sorts of texts in which he was personally interested and could afford. All but two of Fleming’s translated publications were produced when he was still a student, which implies that many of the originals were borrowed from Perne. Certainly many of the texts that Fleming translated were present in Peterhouse library or in Perne’s

\(^{41}\) Abraham Fleming’s dedication in *Bright Burning Beacon* (1580; the full title is given in Appendix B, p. 248). Whether Cordell donated some books or money to Fleming following this dedication is not known. This was the third dedication Fleming had made to Cordell; the first two dedications were in *Panoplie of Epistles* (1576) and *Blasing Starrs* (1577). In Blasing Starrs Fleming thanked Cordell for “a favour”. These dedications most likely the reason why in April 1580 Cordell and the other executors of William Lambe’s will asked Fleming to write a 40-page Memorialis to Lambe, which Fleming was presumably paid for or might have received a black gown (see p. 154).

\(^{42}\) Frederic Nausea (c. 1480-1552) had been Bishop of Vienna. *Bright Burning Beacon* was not, strictly speaking a translation of a book by Nausea. However, it did include the text from *Blasing Starrs* that Fleming had translated in 1577, and *Blasing Starrs* was originally written by Nausea. Surely this is what Fleming meant.
collection. The original library catalogue manuscript to 1589 listed various copies of Virgil, also Tully/Cicero and Epistles of the apostle Paul, which were all texts translated by Fleming.

The inventoried contents of Perne’s own library also recorded books that were translated or transcribed and published by Fleming. These included copies of Roger Ascham’s letters, Isocrates, a great number of titles by Tully/Cicero, Pliny, Peter Martyr, John Calvin, Stephen Gardiner (Bishop of Winchester) and several books by Aelian. This evidence makes it more likely that Perne personally helped Fleming by lending him texts from his extensive private collection as well as the college’s library. As some of these books commanded high price tags (one book by Aelian was nearly 14 shillings) it seems very unlikely that Fleming would have been able to buy his own copies at that time. Fleming most likely translated classical texts as part of his Greek and Latin studies and these translations would have made convenient drafts for printed texts.

The books that Fleming translated or transcribed that were not in either Perne’s or the college’s libraries were likely to be from his own library. If this premise is correct, then Fleming owned Virgil’s Eclogues; he also owned Aelian’s Varia Historia (which he translated from Greek into A Registre of Hystories in 1576); he had copies of letters by Tully (Cicero), Pliny and others (these he collected in Panoplie of Epistles, 1576). Fleming most likely had a version of Museus’ sixth-century poem ‘Leander and Hero’ and he surely owned Caius’ De Canibus Britannicus (1570) since he translated this book in 1576. It is possible he acquired a copy of Nausea’s older book Quolio alio cometes exploratio (1531) since this was the progenitor of Fleming’s Blasing Sturrs. Synesius’ fifth-century riposte Encomium calvitii was likely one of the books in Fleming’s library since it was the source for Fleming’s A Paradoxe prouing by reason that baldnesse is better than bushie haire (1579). It is likely that

43 Another book by Aelian from Perne’s library was valued at a more affordable four shillings, but even this might have been more that Fleming could have afforded whilst a student.
Fleming also owned or at least accessed a Geneva Bible (1560) as he was familiar with and quoted extensively from this bible in *Diamond of Devotion* (1581).

The Grace Book shows that on 13 May 1581 Fleming had attended Peterhouse for twelve terms, the total number required for *quadrennium completum*, meaning he had finished his degree. He must also have debated in the necessary disputations in order to progress to the last stage of his degree. The gaps in Fleming’s academic career (some probably due to his serious illness or “affliction”, others due to work) must have been legitimately accounted for according to the college’s regulations on prolonged absence otherwise he would not have been entered for the final hurdle: the Reply to Question. Fleming paid a deposit for but never attended this exam, and consequently the Grace Book recorded that he lost his deposit. Despite this Fleming was awarded his degree, most likely on 5 April 1582; he came 116th in an *ordo* or rank of 216 students. He was at that time extremely busy in London since seventeen books written and augmented by Fleming were published in the months prior to his graduation.

Possibly his interest in godly reform was the reason Fleming elected to go to Peterhouse. It was a small college with less than a hundred students and a number of Fleming’s peers were known puritans: Dudley Fenner for example became a controversialist writer; William Brewster became a puritan Pilgrim Father; William Charke, with whom Fleming was well acquainted, was expelled from the college for preaching. Archbishop Whitgift had also been educated at Peterhouse and, according to Miller’s research, Perne had helped to shelter Whitgift during Mary’s catholic revival. This link to Whitgift was likely to have served Fleming later in his career.

There are no known images of Fleming but occasionally glimpses of the physical man can be spotted in his writing. One such glimpse from about this time can be found in a preliminary

---

poem that he wrote in *Of Englishe Dogges* (1576). It was written when Fleming was in his mid- to late-twenties. “My forhed is but baulde and bare: but,” he added, “yet my body ys beautiful”. This suggests that Fleming went prematurely bald or had a receding hairline (possibly because of the “affliction” and illness he suffered at Cambridge). A receding hairline was no bad thing since portraits thought to be of Shakespeare depict him with a high, bald forehead and this signified intelligence and wit. Fleming himself said “the badge of wisdom is baldness” in his *A Paradox prouing by reason that baldnesse is better than bushie haire* (1579), and in drawing attention to his own “baulde and bare” forehead, Fleming simultaneously highlighted his cleverness and described himself. Never one to suffer insults and abuses, Fleming often responded thoroughly to his critics and several of his manuscripts demonstrate this defensive side of his character. In the preface of *Of English Dogges* Fleming said his body was beautiful because:

Pleasant flowers in me there are…
And though my garden plot so greene,
Of dogges receave the trampling feete,
Yet it is swept and kept full cleene,
So that it yields a savou sweete.

This garden theme was a popular one that Fleming would return to later in his career when composing books and letters.

Religion was to play a major role in the lives of Samuel, Abraham and their sister Hester. Samuel Fleming, ordained at Lincoln in October 1576, was a pluralist rector of Ely, Cottenham and Bottesford; he was awarded the degree of Doctor of Divinity in the 1590s and was chaplain to four successive earls of Rutland. Abraham too was ordained in 1588 and collated in Deptford then to St Pancras, Soper Lane. He was a chaplain and licensed preacher. Hester married a clergyman from Harston in Leicestershire called Thomas Davenport or Damport on 23 January 1587. When Davenport died in 1618, Hester lived with Samuel as his housekeeper. Samuel died in September 1620 making Hester his executrix and

---

46 From the early 1590s Samuel Fleming was referred to as ‘Doctor Fleming’ although there is no surviving record of him obtaining a doctoral degree (see Miller, ‘Samuel Fleming’, p. 67).
she ensured that, in accordance with Samuel’s wishes, his money was used to build Fleming’s Hospital for poor women in Bottesford. Two months later she married John Knowles, her brother’s curate. Their marriage lasted until Hester’s death in May 1622.

Evidence suggests that despite their busy lives and the distances that sometimes separated them, Hester, Samuel and Abraham were close. The brothers’ degrees at Cambridge overlapped, Samuel starting his M. A. at Kings as Abraham enrolled a few minutes’ walk away at neighbouring Peterhouse. After leaving Cambridge, Samuel remained nearby at Cottenham while Abraham moved to London, but they corresponded and exchanged information about key events in Elizabeth’s reign. For example, as chaplain to the Earl of Rutland, Samuel accompanied the earl to the Berwick-upon-Tweed negotiations in 1586. Manuscripts in Abraham’s collection about the negotiations and about the relationship between Scotland and England surely came from Samuel Fleming and were most likely given to Abraham with a view to making the ‘Continuation’ of Holinshed’s Chronicles accurate and detailed.

It is not known whether either brother married. Samuel kept his sister as his housekeeper before and after her first marriage; it seems likely that he devoted his entire adult life to learning and the Church. He even died in the pulpit in the midst of delivering a sermon. Fleming by contrast came to the church later. He was a companion of George Whetston who, according to his biographer, was known to be a “wild oat sower” around Holborn, although there is no evidence that Fleming shared his friend’s interest in meeting women and Whetston later renounced his carefree lifestyle.47 In the late 1580s or early 1590s when he was a preacher Fleming probably lived with a male housemate in Wood Street but that did not preclude him from having a wife and certainly the Fleming brothers did discuss, hypothetically at least, questions about marriage.48 Fleming was also close to older, more

47 Miller, ‘Abraham Fleming, Elizabethan Man of Letters’, p. 47. This provides more evidence that Fleming was from Holborn.
48 See also p. 209. Shakespeare, for example, is known to have lodged with a married couple in Silver Street, London.
sedate role models, for example Dr Richard Caldwell whose death in 1584 was recorded by Fleming in *Holinshed’s Chronicles* with genuine sadness and affection.\(^{49}\) In *Diamond of Devotion* (1581) Fleming offered advice to husbands regarding the treatment of their wives and avoidance of women of lesser repute. This may have been based on experience and matrimony was certainly a topic for discussion between the Fleming and his brother: in 1595 they corresponded on the question of whether a man could take a second wife while his first wife was still alive.\(^{50}\) Other evidence implies that Fleming remained a bachelor; once ordained he baptized and buried dozens of his parishioners between 1593 and 1607 but his registers do not contain any reference to members of his own family.

This thesis argues that Fleming was a focused and determined man and not, as the original DNB and subsequent portrayals suggest, an average student or second-rate character. Despite illness, financial hardship and the demands of working in London he was determined to be awarded his degree.\(^{51}\) In 1576 when Fleming only had four known translations to his name, he was listed in the first edition of *Holinshed’s Chronicles* as one of the ‘Writers of our Nation’.\(^{52}\) To make it onto the list Fleming must have made a noteworthy contribution to the book trade. Admittedly he was placed fourteenth from last on this long list of writers who were ranked “according to their degrees, callings and worthiness even as they came to memory,” but he was listed none-the-less; his name appeared one higher than the noted demonologist Reginald Scot.

\(^{49}\) See Miller, ‘Abraham Fleming: Editor’, pp. 52-3. Fleming described Caldwell as “so aged that his number of yeeres with his white head adding double reverence to his person” and went on to describe Caldwell’s passing thus: “the good old doctor fell sicke, and as a candle goeth out of it selfe, or a ripe apple falling from the tree, so departed he out of this world at the doctors commons, where his usuall lodging was; & was verie worshipfullie buried.” *Holinshed’s Chronicles* (1587), p. 1349. The tone and detail of this passage suggests that Fleming was indeed fond of Dr Caldwell.

\(^{50}\) This is one of numerous manuscripts belonging to Fleming listed by Peck: “Samuelis Flemingi. S.T.P. Rectoris de Cottenham in Com. Cantab. ad Abrahamum Flemingum. Fratrem suum uterinum, Epistolam privata, in qua (an Uxor secunda superstite prima, ducenda sit?) Quaestio solvitur xxvi Junii, MDXCV. MS. *Manu* Samuelis Flemingi.” Peck, *Desiderata Curiosa*, p. 54.


\(^{52}\) Thynne, ‘List of Writers of our Nation’, *Holinshed’s Chronicles* (1577), pp. 1874-6. Fleming is towards the bottom of this list of names, which were “arranged… as they came to memory”. His name was also included in Thynne’s alphabetical catalogue of writers included in volume III of the 1587 edition on pp. 1589-90.
Identifying Fleming’s contributions to books is occasionally puzzling but rarely insoluble because he initialled and put his name to almost everything that he worked on, be that an entire book, a poem, a prefix letter or an index. In Scot’s Discoverie (1584) he wrote under the pseudonym “Gnimelf Maharba” (Abraham Fleming written backwards). Although he did not always sign off with his name, Fleming did use Latin mottos and signature tags to close his writing, for example “FINIS propositi laus Christo, Nescia FINIS”, “Quinquid donatur ingratis dilapidatur” and “Quod Abraham Fleming” (sometimes abbreviated to “Qd Abraham Fleming”).

Fleming delighted in word play and frequently toyed with letters, using his name or the alphabet acrostically within texts. Nowhere is this personalising of texts more evident than in Diamond and Holinshed’s Chronicles. Other signatures took the forms of a godly Latin tag or an angry comment for the reader. He did this at the end of his ‘tables’ (indexes) in volume three of Holinshed’s Chronicles: “If the reader be not satisfied with this table, let him not blame the order, but his own conceipt”. At times his observations were directed at specific people, like the unfortunate and allegedly incompetent printer Thomas Purfoote, uncomfortable reading for the individual concerned but useful in confirming Fleming’s presence on a text. While the extent of his role as editor-in-chief of the second edition of Holinshed’s Chronicles is sometimes disputed, it is certain that Fleming provided the indexes, oversaw much of volume one’s production and contributed numerous passages to the entire 1587 text. The unique Melton copy of Holinshed’s Chronicles is peppered with editor’s marks in Fleming’s hand demonstrating his fastidious attention to detail. The printed text was also initialled, tagged and signed by Fleming. He was a fanatical perfectionist expecting the same hard work from others as he did from himself, as his

---

53 This signing of indexes was, and is, very unusual according to Christine Shuttleworth, former editor of the journal The Indexer, pers. comm.

54 This copy of Chronicles, which takes its name from a previous owner and Holinshed scholar Jerry D. Melton, is now at the Huntington Library in California, shelfmark HL 478000. I visited the Huntington to see the handwritten marks for myself. The volumes are from a first print run. There are often dozens of corrections per page pointing out obvious pagination, spelling and syntax errors as well as minute blots and other marks that sullied the pages. The vast majority of these marks are by the same hand. They indicate an exacting, even obsessive personality with extremely high standards.
derisive comments about Purfoote’s carelessness at the press demonstrated. When
Holinshed’s Chronicles was censored and the Privy Council removed sections of his hard
work, Fleming flared up in writing and wrote angrily to the Privy Council.55

Fleming also adopted two Latin tags, which can be used to identify him. The first was
handwritten in the Huntington Library’s Melton copy of Holinshed’s Chronicles: “Quinquid
donatur ingratis dilapidatur”, meaning “whatever is given to the ungrateful is wasted”.

It is this handwritten signature tag found among the editor’s corrections that lead some
scholars to believe that Fleming was the main editor behind the 1587 Holinshed’s
Chronicles. The tag appears handwritten over a printed version of his name. Between the
handwritten tag and the printed name is written “quod” meaning ‘says’, the whole phrase
reading “whatever is given to the ungrateful is wasted says Abraham Fleming”.56 It is
unclear what Fleming was referring to, perhaps he alluded to the hundreds of hours’ worth of
work that he had given to the Holinshed’s Chronicles project between 1584 and 1587, only
to see large amounts of the text removed by the Privy Council. Certainly in three
unpublished manuscripts Fleming wrote with angry frustration about the “spiteful”
individuals who ordered certain sections to be cut out.57 The tag may have had a godly
message too: whatever had been given was a gift from God and humankind in general was
the ungrateful party.

From 1580 onwards Fleming started using the printed word “FINIS” to close his sections
within books, for example at the end of his “Table of Common places” or index to Certain
sermons in defence of the gospel preached of late by Thomas Cooper (1580). From 1582 this
developed into Fleming’s full signature tag: “FINIS propositi, laus Christo nescia FINIS”,
which means “the end of the discourse but, praise Christ, we do not know the final end”.

55 The letters were catalogued by Peck, Desiderata Curiosa II, 49-56. See also pp. 117-8 of this thesis.
The copy referred to is the Melton Holinshed in the Huntington Library, shelfmark HL 478000.
57 Peck, Desiderata Curiosa II, 49-56. See also pp. 117-8 of this thesis.
These Latin mottos reveal a lot about the man who devised and used them. Firstly
“Renaissance Latin tags were a lively, thoughtful and quite entertaining way to sign off
having written a long discourse”.58 As discussed above, Fleming has been described as drab,
a poor poet, humourless and some have subsequently labelled him unimaginative. Yet he
could be and was often creative; he frequently displayed irritation and anger. He also showed
an ironic sense of humour in his tags. Secondly, according to Honeybone, “Latin tags are a
sign of being clever and so the aim is to get the reader to puzzle over the meaning or
suddenly to quickly see the meaning. What matters is to show off your learning and spread
knowledge”.59 Fleming was learned and seems to have made it his mission to spread
knowledge to ordinary people. He took books on numerous subjects, translated them from
Latin into more accessible English and published them in different formats so that prices
were tiered to suit all pockets, and he proudly put his name to everything he wrote.

These tags also reveal less worldly aspects of Fleming’s personality. His opinion that
whatever was given, surely meaning divine gifts from God, was received ungratefully and
wasted is entirely in keeping with his religious writing. This sentiment is echoed in his
lengthy Diamond of Devotion, an elaborate series of six allegorical treatises within one
book, each extolling God’s goodness and man’s wastefulness. Likewise the lighter, wittier
tag which Fleming used between 1582 and 1588 epitomised his much repeated view that
mankind would live forever (once in heaven) and therefore would not know a final end. It
also recalled his reformed, protestant belief in predestination: man did not know his final
end, but God knew the fate of all.

In addition to his two Latin mottos, two examples of Fleming’s handwritten signature have
survived. These both appear in a Chancery dispute relating to the case between Gryffen and

58 Dr Michael Honeybone, pers. comm. Dr Honeybone is an historian and lecturer with an extensive
knowledge of Elizabethan/Stuart Leicestershire. He has been researching and writing about Samuel
Fleming, Bottesford and Belvoir.
59 Idem.
Mabel et al in which Fleming dictated his witness statements and then signed them. His hand is fluid yet neat and confirms that he was confident with and used to handling a quill; this is most apparent when compared to some of the other less competent signatures on the deposition. Like most clerics or writers, Fleming probably had his own quill and penknife to hand. Bearing in mind that the same person’s handwriting might vary according to how worn down the quill was or the quality of the paper used, the letters of these two signatures are consistent. Fleming spelled his surname with two ms but only wrote one, using an abbreviation stroke over the middle of the name to indicate that the second m was missing.

This also confirms that he was fluid and competent with written conventions, as one would expect from an editor. No other known examples of his actual signature survive although there are thousands of examples of his editor’s marks and handwritten comments in the Melton copy of Holinshed’s Chronicles. The church registers from St Pancras, Soper Lane for the years 1593 until 1607 (now kept in the London Guildhall archive) were most likely to have been handwritten by Fleming as well.

That Fleming wrote or contributed to at least 52 printed texts, some of which were very large, is not in question and that 47 of these texts were produced over a period of just thirteen years is equally certain. Fleming was a driven man who had a genuine interest in three ‘genres’ of book: scholarly texts, religious handbooks and ‘occasional’ books that described specific events or occasions (the latter two were often linked as strange events were viewed by pre-enlightened society as portents from God).

Fleming’s first years as a writer reveal a predominance of scholarly texts that he translated from Latin into English. This is likely to reflect the fact that he was still at Cambridge and immersed in studying such books. His understanding of these texts would have made him a good translator and punctilious editor of them. The known texts are as follows: Virgil’s

60 PRO C24/221, ‘Gryffen v. Mable et al, 34 Eliz. Regnum’.
61 His name has been written variously as Flemming, Flemmyng and occasionally Flemyng but more usually as Fleming, the spelling used in this thesis.
62 This is the copy in the Huntington Library in California, shelfmark HL 478000.
Eclogues into English verse Rythmical (1575); The Bucoliks of P. Virgilius Maro drawne into plaine English verse by A Fleming student (1575); Aelian’s A Registre of Hystories (1576); Panoplie of Epistles. Or a looking glass for the vnlearned. From Tully, Isocrates, Pliny etc. (1576); Certaine Select Epistles of Cicero &c into English (1576); and, Historie of Leander & Hero by Museus (1577). After 1577 Fleming ceased translating classical authors’ works for over a decade until he returned to Virgil’s Bucoliks together with Georgiks in 1589.

His early work translating scholarly writings was equalled only by Fleming’s penchant for popular ‘proto-journalism’ that commemorated major events and occasions. He contributed to Dionysis Settle’s True report of Martin Frobisher’s Voyage (1577) that celebrated Frobisher’s unsuccessful expedition to find the Northwest Passage; he produced Of all blasing starrs in Generall (1577) to commemorate the passing of a comet. His original pamphlet A Straunge and Terrible Wunder (1577) reported a savage dog attack in Suffolk. The pamphlet showcased Fleming’s fast-paced and sensationalist style coupled with his ardent godly beliefs, and it denotes a turning point in his literary career. While popular texts were still being produced, from 1578 until 1583 there was a marked predominance of purely godly titles with which Fleming was associated. It is worth noting that his popular publications at this time, for example his only broadside An epitaph […] vpon the godlie life and death of the right worshipfull Maister William Lambe (1580) also included a strong godly element.

Perhaps the most interesting year of Fleming’s publishing career was 1580, during which eleven Fleming-related titles were printed: one dictionary, five popular texts and five godly books. Fleming’s religious fervour reached its peak in 1581 when he had a hand in seven published texts, all of them godly. They are as follows: the second edition of Footepath of Faith leading to the Highway of Heaven with the Bridge of Blessednesse and Diamond of Devotion; he collated Manuall of Christian Praiers made by divers devout & Godlie men such as Calvin, Luther, Melanchton into English; he also translated Jerome of Ferrera
(Savoranola) Meditations on the 31st and 51st Psalms; he edited and corrected Hutchin’s David’s Sling against great Goliath; Fleming contributed the ‘Godly and Fruitful Prayer’ and marginal notes in Latin to Jacobus Wittevronghelus’ De vera Christiani hominis and he also contributed a letter to Golding’s English translation of the same book entitled True beleefe of a Christian man. This letter, which was addressed to John Aylmer, Bishop of London, has been allocated a separate STC number to the rest of the book, which has complicated understanding Fleming’s involvement on the text (particularly as in the past there has been confusion between the Latin and English versions of De vera Christiani hominis).

After 1581 Fleming’s literary productivity waned. He helped to produce only one book in 1582, an English reworking of St Augustine’s Monochamie of motives in the Mind of Man or a battell betweene virtues & vices. In 1583 Fleming indexed two books, although one was very large: Golding’s The sermons of M. John Calvin upon Deuteronomie; and, The Common Places of Peter Martyr by Anthony Marten. The latter comprised six lengthy parts which must have tested Fleming’s indexing skills while preparing him for an even greater test to come: Holinshed’s Chronicles. The last two years of Fleming’s literary career saw him return to scholarly texts, Latin/English dictionaries, and further translations of Virgil.

The physical forms of the books that Fleming worked on were as varied as the subjects he wrote about. He produced a single-sided broadside, the Epitaph to William Lambe (1580). He wrote short pamphlets such as Straunge and Terrible Wunder (1577). Fleming wrote much longer treatises such as Diamond, which was palm-sized yet had over 300 pages. These titles were entirely Fleming’s own creations. Some of the titles associated with him were collaborations; the most obvious example of this would be Holinshed’s Chronicles. Fleming wrote the English translations of the poems in Scot’s substantial volume Discoverie of Witchcraft (1584) and it is possible that he also edited this book for the printer William Brome. There was another quiet period in Fleming’s publishing career between 1584 and 1587. Again it is very likely that he was almost exclusively involved in compiling and editing Holinshed’s Chronicles (1587), and was simply too busy to produce much else.
Fleming’s titles were produced in a multitude of sizes ranging from folio through to very small sextodecimo for his devotional pocket books. His roles on each book were equally varied and it seems that Fleming could be called on to finish and embellish another author’s book in order to make it print-worthy and marketable. He wrote and contributed dedicatory letters, poetry, indexes and recommendatory verses. He could translate and he could ‘correct’ or edit to a very high standard. No project was too small or too large for Fleming’s capabilities, no task was beyond his experience and he was more than capable of single-handedly producing his own original texts. He was clearly a perfectionist willing to point out his colleagues’ failings publicly. This must have made Fleming difficult to work with and might even have filled some printers with apprehension. Despite this he was a real asset to any printing house and enjoyed long associations with the leading printers of the day. It is the many and varied texts to which Fleming contributed to will be explored in the following chapters, beginning with one of Fleming’s earlier printed books.
Chapter Two:

A Straunge and Terrible Wunder (1577)

The pamphlet entitled *Straunge and Terrible Wunder wrought very late in the parish church of Bongay* was written by Fleming in August 1577 and printed soon afterwards. It was twelve pages long and octavo in size (approx 9cm wide and 14cm long). Within the *Wunder* pamphlet’s pages was an account of two ‘strange and terrible’ incidents that took place in Bungay and Blythburgh in Suffolk. A cross between tabloid front-page news and a zealous sermon, *Wunder* was intended to be popular and cheap. It included a woodcut illustration of the sinister dog that was the pamphlet’s main character, and Fleming closed this account with ‘A Necessary Prayer’. Today Fleming’s 1577 *Wunder* pamphlet survives as a unique copy in the British Library. 63 Yet Fleming’s black dog story is well known and still provides a modest income from tourists visiting Blythburgh and Bungay’s churches. The dog remains Bungay’s town mascot to this day and a modern weathervane featuring the black dog with staring eyes and a lightning flash overlooks the town square.

The *Wunder* pamphlet is one of only two printed items by Fleming that can be dated almost precisely. 64 The severe thunderstorm described in the pamphlet took place on 4 August 1577 between nine and ten o’clock in the morning. It is unlikely that Fleming witnessed the event himself, but news it reached him quickly. The pamphlet was in circulation within four weeks of the storm, although *Wunder* might have been produced more quickly than that and could have been available to buy within days rather than weeks of the event it portrayed. Certainly Fleming was the first person to have described the event and he did so with considerable zeal and imagination, blending fact with fiction to produce something sensational.

---

63 The British Library has the only original copy of the pamphlet that I have been able to find at the time of writing. The Bodleian and Folger Libraries each have a reprinted version from 1820. In 1937 another reprinted version was produced that is more common. There is a microfilm of the BL original 1577 copy in the University of Saskatchewan.

64 The other was his broadside *Epitaph* which was written after Lambe’s death on 21 April 1580 and must have been in circulation before the funeral on 6 May as the date and place of Lambe’s funeral were advertised in the broadside.
The Wunder pamphlet actually relates two events linked by the same storm. The first of the events in the pamphlet took place in St Mary’s church, Bungay, ten miles from Norwich. On Sunday 4 August 1577 during morning service “there fell from heaven an exceeding great and terrible tempest sodein violent […] which fell with a wonderful force […] not simply raine but also of lightning and thunder”. The roaring of the thunder and the “rare and vehement” lightening flashes robbed the congregation of their wits while “things void of life […] shook and trembled”. Bungay had been struck by a severe summer storm during which the “whole church was so darkened Yea with such palpable darknesse, that one persone could not perceive another”.

Fleming continued in the pamphlet, “Immediately hereupon appeared in a most horrible similitude and likenesse [a dog] of a black colour”. This apparition struck such fear into the congregation that “they thought doomes day was already come”. Having manifested itself, Fleming’s dog or “the devil in such a likenesse” ran through the church. Then it “passed between two persons, as they were kneeling in prayer, or so it seemed, wrung the necks of them bothe at one instance” and “where they kneeled they straungely died”. The same dog then “passing by another man […] gave him such a gripe on the back that therewith all he was presently drawen together and shrunk up, as it were a peece of leather scorched in a hot fire: or as the mouth of a purse or bag drawen together with a string”. Happily this man “dyed not” which Fleming thought “amasing” and “mervelous in the eyes of men”.

The clerk of the church, who was up a ladder clearing the gutter, was “smitten down” by a thunderclap but sustained no further injury. Possibly the inclusion of this detail is an oblique reference to an act of divine displeasure because the clerk was clearing the gutter during a Sunday service and not inside the church worshipping God. The storm raged on. “The Rector, or Curate of the church being partaker of the peoples perplexitie, seeing what was seen and done comforted the people, and exhorted them to prayer”. Lightning struck the steeple, “all the wires, the wheeles and other things belonging to the Clock, were wrung in sunder and broken in peces”. Surely this was a terrifying ordeal for those trapped in the
darkness of the church but then the dog vanished as quickly as it had appeared. For those who doubted the dog’s existence Fleming insisted that it had left the stones of the church and the church door “mervelously rented and torne as it were the marks of his clawes or talans”.

The ordeal was over for those in St Mary’s parish Bungay, but the dog’s work was not done. Almost simultaneously a second incident took place in Holy Trinity church, Blythburgh, seven miles from Bungay. Fleming recorded this second attack with vigorous brevity in the Wunder pamphlet:

The like thing entered, in the same shape and similitude where placing himself on a maine balke or beam whereon sometime the rood did stand, sodainly he gave a swing downe though the Church, and there also, as before, slew two men and a lad, and burned the hand of another person that was among the rest of the company, of whom divers were blasted.

This mischief thus wrought he flew with wonderful force to not little feare of the assembly, out of the church in a hideous and hellish likenes.

Fleming attempted to give credibillity to his account, closing the narration with “These things are reported to be true yea by the mouthes of them that were eye witnesses of the same”.

Fleming’s description of the tempest and the hellish dog greatly struck his contemporaries. Certainly the pamphlet circulated among, and captured the imagination of, his well-educated peers. Sir John Harington, poet and godson of the queen (and the pupil of Fleming’s brother) named his pet dog “Bungay”. In 1579 John Louthe reminisced about the story of the storm and the black dog’s appearance. In 1581 the events first described by Fleming were added, along with “a sulphurous stenche”, to Doome warning all men to the judgement, a posthumous reprint of Konrad Lykostene’s Prodigiorum ac ostentorum chronicon printed by Ralph Newberie. This account was taken directly from the Wunder pamphlet and Newberie

---

65 Harington’s Bungay “lacked only the talent to shake golden ducats out of his ears”. A portrait of Harington’s spaniel was depicted on the title page and preface of Orlando Furioso (1592; 1634).
66 See ‘The reminiscences of J. Loude or Louthe, addressed to J. Foxe in 1579’ in J. G. Nichols (ed.) Narratives of the days of the Reformation, chiefly from the manuscripts of John Foxe the Martyrologist; with two contemporary biographies of Archbishop Cranmer (1859).
67 A facsimile of Lykostene’s Doome warning is in the British Library, BL WP.9530/404.
Fleming was the recognized authority on the Suffolk tempest and it is likely that Newberie added Fleming’s name to the 1581 text as it would not only lend that authority to the text but also make it more popular because in 1581 Fleming’s popularity peaked and his writing was sought after.

Fleming was considered a reliable source regarding the tempest of 1577 and this reputation served him well in later years. However, it is unlikely that he witnessed the events first hand since he made a mistake: Fleming claimed that the door of St Mary’s church was clawed by the black dog when, in actual fact, it was a door in Holy Trinity, Blythburgh that bore the talon marks (and still appears to do so). In other publications, even those produced quickly, Fleming was fastidious about correcting details such as these. Had he been present at Bungay or Blythburgh at the time of the storm there is no doubt that his account would have been more accurate. Therefore he must have relied upon someone else who brought oral news of the storm to London.

Despite orally transmitted flaws, Straunge and Terrible Wunder was not wholly incredible at the time it was written, and much of what Fleming described can be substantiated using the churchwardens’ accounts and registers. There are also marks still visible in the door of one church as Fleming described. However, Fleming’s inclusion of the “hellish” hound is obviously a figment of the imagination and contemporary references to Fleming’s phantom dog are rare. In 1580 John Stow wrote of the terrible thunderstorm and damage to the churches of Bungay and Blythburgh, but made no mention of any hounds. Stow was well known for his accurate and objective chronicles and gazetteers, and as such was a trusted

---

68 BL WP.9530/404, p. 403.
69 The claw marks look more like a pair of burns, which might be consistent with a lightning strike. However there is a similar pair of marks on the opposite door as well, strongly suggesting that these grooves were in fact wear-marks made by door furniture, not a giant dog nor lightning.
source. Likewise, *Holinshed’s Chronicles* (1587) documented the storm and resultant damage and human losses but, like Stow, the unidentified author of this excerpt did not mention a dog.

On Sundaie the fourth of August betweene the hours of nine and ten of the clocke in the forenoone, whilst the minister was reading of the second lesson in the parish church of Bliborough [Blythburgh] a towne in Suffolke, a strange and terrible tempest of lightening and thunder strake thorough the wall of the same church into the ground a yard deepe, drave downe all the people on that side above twentie persons, then renting the wall up to the veustre cleft the doore, and returning to the steeple, rent the timber, brake the chimes, and and fled towards Bongie [Bungay] a towne six miles off. The people that were stricken downe were found groveling more than halfe an hour after, whereof one man more than fortie yeares and a boie of fifteen yeares were found starke dead; the other were scorched. The same or like flash of lightening and cracks of thunder rent the parish church of Bongie, nine miles from Norwiche, wroong asunder the wiers and wheeles of the clocks and slue two men which sat in the belfrie, when the other were at the procession of suffrages and scorched an other which hardlie escaped.71

Fleming himself had overseen *Holinshed’s Chronicles*’ production and may even have written this dog-free version (although stylistically the language and somewhat archaic spelling are not consistent with Fleming’s writing). However, it was Fleming’s lurid pamphlet that initially claimed to offer accurate details of event of 1577 in which “an horrible shaped thing” descended on the churches. The phantom black dog was left out of Stow’s *Chronicles* and *Annales* and omitted from *Holinshed’s Chronicles*, since in reality there had never been “an horrible shaped thing” in either church. Unlike some of the more spiritual or speculative books featuring the dog, *Holinshed’s Chronicles* and Stow’s *Annales* were intended to be objective and accurate. Having said that, Stow’s *Survey of London*, which was also intended to be objective and accurate, includes an account very similar to the one described by Fleming in *Wunder*.72

---

72 See pp. 44-5.
The accounts in *Wunder*, *Holinsheed’s Chronicles* and Stow’s *Chronicles* and *Annales* are identical in every respect apart from the phantom dog. The very first account of the incident was written at the time of the event in the church records. In St Mary’s, Bungay the churchwarden’s account book for August 1577 recorded a payment made to “…iiii pore whomen that layed forthe the Bodyes of the ii men that were strycken deade with in the steple of the churche at the great tempest that was the iiiith of August in anno domini meccc Seventy & Seven”. In the margin next to this entry another hand has written “Md. A great terrryble & ferfull tempest at the tyme of procession upon the Sondaye such darkness, Rayne, hayle, Thunder & lightnyng as was never seen the lyke”. The storm that claimed these lives had been an exceptional one.

In 1579, two years after the tempest, a further entry was added to the churchwardens’ accounts:

```
Itm. Pd. to a carpenter for vii Dayes worke with meate and wages for mendyng and Reparing the chynlyng of the steple wyndow at the east syde the was Broken & Jeareyd in pecs at the great tempest of Thunder & lightnyng that was at Bungaye the iii of August byeing Sondaye in An Domini 1577 when ii of the parishners were strkyn dead in the Belhouse & Dyed so other of the Parshners strycken down to the grounde & some hurt in dyverse placys of ther legs & feet to the great feares of all the parishnes.
```

In the margin next to this entry in a contemporaneous hand was written “THE TEMPEST OF THUNDER”. The five deaths, the other two men’s injuries and the damage to the churches had been caused by the extreme storm. The parish burial register for 1577 also records, “John Fuller & Adam Walker slayne in the tempest in the Belfry in the time of prayer upon the Lord’s Day the iii of August”.

---

73 Lowestoft Records Office (hereafter LRO) 1116/E1/1, f. 166 [Churchwardens’ accounts book for 1579].
74 Ibid.
75 Ibid.
76 LRO 116/D1/1.
The addition of the fabled dog makes the pamphlet unique among Fleming’s books. He did not embellish any other texts in this way and it was unusual for Fleming to stray from the facts as he saw them when commenting on any event. The reason for this is that a dog was most likely part of the story by the time news of the storm in Suffolk reached Fleming in London. Domestic dogs were allowed into churches with their owners so finding a dog in a place of worship would not have seemed unusual to Fleming. However, Fleming embellished the dog to make it a more suitably awe-inspiring vehicle for his godly message.

For centuries pet dogs had been allowed into churches with their masters or mistresses, a practice that continued into Tudor and Stuart times.

In David Loggan’s late seventeenth century engravings of Cambridge there are dogs everywhere… King’s has a dog on the lawn and two fighting inside the chapel (Christ’s and Trinity, by contrast, employed a special servant to keep dogs out of the chapel).  

In Elizabeth’s reign parishioners took their pet and working dogs to services with them and sometimes these dogs became unruly. For this reason churches such as St Mary’s in Bungay employed “dog whippers”. The whipper was a man specifically employed to remove ill-behaved animals that disrupted church services by literally whipping them out of the church. If a dog was particularly dangerous or uncooperative the whipper would grab it with “dog tongs”, large pincers made of iron, and drag it out of the building. Whipping was an ongoing necessity; an entry in the Bungay accounts for 1575 reads “Item for whipping dogges out of the church for i half yeere”. In 1577 Bungay’s whipper was John Hindes and he regularly received payments “for whipping dogges out of the churche”. There is additional evidence that a dog whipper’s assistance was required around the time of the storm on 4 August 1577. Written just a few lines above the entry describing the tempest was “Itm paid

---

78 LRO 1116/E1/1, f. 158. (See also the illustration of a Paul’s Cross sermon on p. 272 of this thesis.)
79 Ibid. f. 162.
to John Hindes for whipping dogges owt of the church at prayerr tyme”. 80 Two further payments were made during 1578.

The evidence in this thesis means that a realistic account of what happened in St Mary’s Bungay on 4 August 1577 can now be constructed. There was an unusually fierce storm that caused severe damage to the church. Lightning or falling masonry killed two parishioners. Domestic dogs were very likely in the church on 4 August 1577 and it is more than likely that these dogs reacted to the tempest by becoming distressed and behaving badly. Perhaps such a dog running about in the confused darkness of the nave, its shape distorted by lightning flashes and shadows, had been mistaken for something more sinister. 81 By the time news of the event was printed and sold the dog had become the horrible beast illustrated on Fleming’s pamphlet.

Whilst it was inspired by a pet dog, Fleming’s black dog is a literary device with its roots in a number of traditions. The idea for the dog may have come from closer to Fleming’s London residence. In his Survey of London Stow noted he had “oft heard my father report” of this storm and apparition at St Michael’s Cornhill, and was also told of this incident by “one of the [bell] ringers [who] lived in my youth, whom I have oft heard to verify the same to be true”. On St James night (no year given) during a tempest, an “uglie shaped thing” appeared in St Michael’s Cornhill. The “thing” left deep claw marks “like those of a lion” in a stone windowsill. 82 Stow does not give an exact date, but the incident apparently happened within living memory of the man who told Stow the tale when Stow was a boy. This places the apparition in St Michael’s somewhere in the early sixteenth century, well before

80 LRO 1116/E1/1, f. 158, f. 166.
81 There are strong similarities between the symptoms of Fleming’s victims and those experienced by the “bewitched” residents of Salem, Massachusetts in 1692. It has been suggested that the mass hysteria of Salem was caused by the residents accidentally eating ergot-infected rye bread. Ergot is a naturally occurring fungus containing toxins and hallucinogens that can infect crops during damp summers. Its victims “saw” large cats and dogs and suffered sensations of being burned or bitten in their hands and feet. The research carried out for this thesis suggests that in Suffolk the summer of 1577 had indeed been warm and damp although there is not enough evidence to demonstrate whether or not the people of Bungay were suffering from ergotamine poisoning and had imagined seeing and being bitten by what they construed to be a monstrous dog in the already charged atmosphere of this storm.
Fleming’s pamphlet, but if Stow was aware of such mythology then Fleming most likely was as well, and it may have inspired him when he wrote *Wunder*. Details such as the accompanying storms, rents in the church stones and the description of the “uglie” and “horrible” shaped creatures are very similar. It is perhaps worth mentioning that St James’ day was one of the most important national celebrations in catholic Spain, so perhaps it is more than coincidental that Stow’s “uglie shaped thing” appeared on that “popish” day, just as it was more than coincidental that Fleming’s black dog had targeted the rood of Holy Trinity, Blythburgh, a key feature of pre-Reformation churches.

The roots of Fleming’s dog most likely go back for centuries before Stow’s ugly apparition. The Saxons had a plethora of wolf- and dog-related words to describe heathens, killers and villains. Medieval England had also had its legends of frightening dog-wolf hybrids and monstrous dog-bear cross-breeds and this deep-rooted wealth of dog-lore, both oral and written, was familiar to educated men like Fleming. He was certainly aware of the types of dogs commonly described in the British Isles. In 1576, the year before writing *Wunder* he translated John Caius’ *De Canibus Britannicus* from Latin into English. Fleming’s *Of Englishe Dogges* (hereafter *Dogges*) became a best-seller and ran to several editions (the most recent in 2005). There are a number of creatures to be found among the pages of *Dogges*, each with a quality or characteristic that surely came to Fleming’s mind as he wrote about the East Anglian phantom.

Fleming may have been inspired by the incredible swiftness of the “*leporarius*” or greyhound. The dog in *Wunder* is explicitly described as being incredibly swift; it appeared to “fly” within the church in Bungay and then appeared almost simultaneously seven miles away at the church in Blythburgh. However, Fleming found the greyhound’s temperament “to be wonderful by the testimonies of histories”. The greyhound was no killer but other
The "Tumbler" or vertagus was used to lull prey into a false sense of security, dancing about "circlewise" to fool its target before suddenly "griping" them. The Wunder pamphlet dog also ran about "griping" people, but the Tumbler was "somewhat smaller than a grehound" and more interested in luring "connyes" [rabbits] from their "connyeboroughs" than attacking people. Fleming had also translated Caius' description of a "Nyghtcurre" (Canis furax). It sounded sinister enough, but this type of dog simply "smelt out connyes in the night". None of these three breeds was the hell-hound in Wunder, but a mixture of these three animals would have created a very fast dog capable of "griping" people in the darkness.

A more likely inspiration for Fleming's black dog was the "Bloudhounde" or Sanguinarius. Large and ugly enough to be the horrible vision purportedly seen in the churches, it had "lippes of a large syze and eares of no small length" and a habit of chasing "beasts both alive and dead". This breed was described as "greedy" and lay hidden in "wylde woods" where it "lurked in hollow holes". Bloudhoundes were ceaseless pursuers of felons. Their owners, Fleming assured his readers, kept them in "close dark channels" by day and only let them out by night. They also had great "swiftnesse".

In the borders of England and Scotland these kindes of Dogges are very much used and they are taught and trayned up first of all the hunt Cattell as well of the smaller as of the greater growth and afterwrdes... they are learned to pursue such pestilent persons as plant theyr pleasure in such practises or purloyning.

---

83 Abraham Fleming, Of English Dogges (1576), p. 9. Greyhounds were considered to be good dogs as demonstrated in the legend of “St Guinefort”, popularly called the patron saint of children. Guinefort, a greyhound, saved a baby from a wolf by hiding the child under a cradle and wounding the wolf. However, the greyhound’s master, unable to find his child and seeing the dog covered in blood, assumed Guinefort had eaten the baby. He killed the dog and only realized his mistake when the baby started crying. A cult developed around “Saint Guinefort” although it was never acknowledged by the Church. See [http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/source/guinefort.asp], last accessed 29 December 2011.

84 Fleming, Dogges, p. 11.

85 Ibid. p. 12.

86 Ibid. pp. 7-8.
With time and training the bloudehound became “cunning in running” and also gained “forsight what is to be done”.  

Fleming also wrote about “Dogges of a course kind […] Of the Mastive or Bandogge in Latine *Villaticus* or *Catherarius*”. These were “vaste, huge, stubborn, ougly and eager, of a hevy and burthenous body […] terrible and frightfull to beholde and more fearce and fell than any Arcadian curre [a hybrid of *Dogge* and *Lyon*]”. Fleming’s mastiff was described as heavy and “of little swiftnesse”, but had other characteristics found in the *Wunder* dog. For example it was certainly big and strong enough to worry a man. The Bandogge was used to guard farms “against robbers, night wanderers, spoylers” and to take the bull by the eare, when occasion requireth. One dogge or two at the uttermost, sufficient for that purpose be the bull never so monsterous, never so fearce, never so furious, never so stearne, never so untameable.  

The mastiff was also used for bear and bull baiting and Fleming’s later accounts of spectator sports in Holinshed’s Chronicles revealed that he was a fan of bull and bear baiting. The mastiff fought “without any collar to defend their throats” and was trained by men armed with swords, clubs and pikestaffs as this “render[ed] the dogge more sturdy and strong”. It was kept in chains to guard property and it had a formidable bark. If Fleming had borne one specific breed in mind for the horrible monster in *Wunder*, it was most likely the mastiff.  

Many characteristics of the *Wunder* dog have been described already. Fleming was aware of wanton dogs of enormous size such as the bloodhound and mastiff. These animals were unafraid, bold and aggressive, while other breeds provided the incredible speed and ability to seek quarry in the dark which made the *Wunder* dog so fantastical. Fleming’s dog was also a messenger bringing a warning from God, since he also implies that those killed by the phantom animal were victimized for a reason: they only “seemed” to be praying. There is a  

---

87 Fleming, *Dogges*, pp. 9-11.  
hound in *Dogges*, which Fleming described, called *Canes defensores* or “Defending Dogges”. Like a darkly vengeful Greyfriars Bobby, *Canes defensores* “stay[ed] by its master even if its master is dead”. It endured “famishment and tempests” to watch over his master’s “carkass” then killed his murderers “or else by barking, by howling, by furious jarring and snarling and such like meanes betrayeth the malefactor”. However, according to Fleming, there was a more deadly kind of defending dog.

The third [kind] are deadly, for they flye upon a man without utterance of voyce, snatch at him, and catch him by the throate and most cruelly byte out collopses of fleashe. Feare these kinds of Curres (if thou be wise and circumspect about thine owne safetie).

There existed an extensive and well-known repertoire of popular breeds from which Fleming could have concocted the hellish dog-like creature that appeared in his *Wunder* pamphlet in 1577. Since *Dogges* was written as a serious guide to dog breeds, it is interesting that these somewhat unlikely crossbreeds should be included, as their addition suggests that Elizabethans believed in monstrous hybrids living “within the coastes of this country”. The first of these “other dogges” was a feasible wolf-dog hybrid. The second was a less-likely cross between a dog and a fox. The third was *Urcanus*, a fabulous cross between a bear and a mastiff, and this creature seems to have struck fear into the heart of the author:

*The Urcane which is bred of a beare and a dogge…*  
*Is fearce, is fell, is stoute & stronge*  
*And byteth sore to fleshe & bone*  
*His furious force indureth long*  
*In rage he will be rul’d of none.*

The passage continued:

*This dogge exceedeth all other in cruel conditions his leering and fleering lookes, his stearne and savage visage maketh him in sight fearful and terrible, he is violent in fighting & where-soever he setteth his tenterhooke teeth, he taketh such sure & fast hold that a man may sooner teare and rend him in sunder then lose him and*

---

90 Ibid. p. 32.
separate his chappes […] and may (I think) be companion with Alexander's dogge which came out of India.\textsuperscript{91}

Fleming knew a great deal about different types of dog, both real and mythical. It was this knowledge that inspired him when he wrote the \textit{Wunder} pamphlet, which is unusual in that it has an illustration of the black dog on its title page. The woodcut on the front page of \textit{Wunder} looks more like a bear than a dog. This illustration is small but clear, the wavy hair of the dog's coat can be seen as can its tiny eye, its ear and small, sharply pointed claws. This suggests that the woodcut was not an old, worn one from Godly's existing stock but that the illustration had been made especially for the pamphlet, possibly to Fleming's own specification (see p. 267).

Fleming's \textit{Wunder} dog can clearly be seen as embedded in a long tradition of using dogs as metaphors. Each breed described in \textit{Dogges} had its own characteristic actions and, whenever possible, Fleming included a moral explanation for a breed's behaviour. The book worked on two levels: as a spotter's guide or handbook for those interested in dog breeds; and, as a work steeped in moralising comments. \textit{Wunder} also worked on two levels. Firstly the pamphlet claimed to record accurately a newsworthy event in much the same way that a newspaper would today. On a second, deeper level the pamphlet was a social commentary with a clear message: God used His agents, in this case a dog, to punish those who were sinful, and interpretations such as this were conventional.

In pamphlets such as these the divine message interpreted and conveyed was almost always a doom warning. This is true of the \textit{Wunder} pamphlet in 1577. In keeping with most of his works, and certainly his later devotional writing, Fleming started the \textit{Wunder} pamphlet with a godly preface to the reader, hinting at the cautionary tale that was to follow:

\textsuperscript{91} Fleming, \textit{Dogges}, pp. 35-7. It is likely that Fleming, as Caius had done before him, drew on Pliny's classical natural history as crossbreeding wolves with dogs to produce war-dogs was known to the Romans and their predecessors.
Among men it is grown in custome, to have forwarnings of afterclaps, as beacons built on hills... Alarum belles serving to the same purpose [so that] every man can arme himself, when hazard is at hand to save him. Jesus, how painfull and venturous wee bee.

The pain and adventurousness which he deplored referred to sinful men straying from the path of true faith. Fleming emphasized the point in his next paragraph: “God warneth us by signes from heaven, by ferie apparances from the aire, by wonders wrought on earth Straunge and unusiall”. God was not happy that men had strayed from the true path, hence unusual phenomena and supernatural ‘alarm bells’ had been witnessed. The pamphlet was intended as a warning, or at least Fleming's interpretation of an event served as a warning. The world according to Fleming had fallen into chaos, “miserable murtherers [...] insurrections [...] detestable treason on this side the seas, by tumults and uprores between Princes of forreigne nations”, and there was a genuine fear of God wreaking “Sodomiticall or a Babylonian destruction”. Fleming went on “The occasion that I have wrote this warning was a wonder lately wrought in Norfolke”. 92

Fleming’s reaction to the events he went on to describe was a common one, as Keith Thomas has noted: “it was customary for national disasters to be regarded as God’s response to the sins of the people”. 93 The storm alone would have been warning enough, but Fleming added the “horrible shaped thing”. He described his dog as “the devil in such a likenesse (God knoweth all and worketh all)”, indicating that the dog had been created and sent by God.

This divine agent “passed between two persons, as they were kneeling in prayer, or so it seemed, wrung the necks of them bothe at one instance [...] where they kneeled they straungely died”. 94 Fleming may have meant that the dog seemed to pass between the people at prayer. Alternatively, and more likely, he meant that the people only seemed to be praying.

He described this double death as “a wonderful example of Gods work, no doubt to terrifie

---

92 Today Bungay and Blythburgh, the two towns in which the incidents took place, are actually just within the Suffolk border.
94 Fleming Wunder, p. 11 (italics my own).
us, that we might feare him for his justice”. In other words it was necessary for worshippers to be genuine and truly believe in God when they prayed, or punishment would follow.

Fleming felt the need to create a spectacular pamphlet including not only an extreme tempest, two damaged churches, five deaths and several injuries but also a fabulous dog. Compared to a less devastating event such as a monstrous calf born with two heads, the level of warning described in the Wunder pamphlet suggested that some very serious crisis was afoot. The inclusion of the churches indicates that it was most likely a religious crisis. The summer of 1577 had, so the godly held, presented God with good reason to vent a tempestuous warning. The English church was in turmoil following the suspension by Queen Elizabeth of Archbishop Grindal, a hero to godly protestants, earlier that summer. There would therefore have been a sizeable and worried readership wanting to find out the latest portents and their meanings.

Fleming himself and the pamphlet’s printer Francis Godley had to strike while the iron was hot. Godley was likely to be experienced in producing and selling such pamphlets and booklets, since the earliest reference to him related to a 1562 ballad about a monstrous child born in Chichester. An opportunity such as the storm just weeks after Grindal’s fall was too good to miss. Fleming worked fast in order to seize upon this catastrophic event. News reached London where Fleming conceived and wrote the 2,000 word text. He had it typeset, illustrated and printed, then circulated. The whole process could not have taken longer than three weeks because on 2 September the Privy Council noted a pamphlet about a “straing accident” in Bungay. In reality production was probably much quicker than that and rapid circulation was necessary for a number of reasons. Primarily, the account was topical and a pamphlet purporting to contain a warning about a resolved or old situation would have been

96 Tessa Watt, Cheap Print and Popular Piety (Cambridge, 1991), p. 266. Watt’s reference to this ballad about a monstrous child is not referenced clearly, her implication being that it was published with Wunder as one title under one STC number (6177). In her main text she also implies that Wunder was a “tiny one sheet octavo,” which it was not. Wunder’s STC number is 11050.
97 See pp. 52-3.
yesterday’s news. Secondly, Fleming worked quickly in order to stamp his godly
interpretation onto the event before another religious group used it (one catholic writer
named Roland Jenkes did produce an alternate version although this was banned by the
Bishop of London). Fleming wanted to make the most of the terrible event to produce a
lucrative, popular publication before anyone else did.

There was probably another reason why Fleming responded so promptly to the incident in
Suffolk. Other agencies were at work to ensure that interpretations of divine acts that could
have been damaging or embarrassing to the establishment were swiftly blocked. The Privy
Council desired that all printing was licensed, even though many publications were not
registered, in an attempt to reduce the number of unwholesome or anti-establishment
pamphlets circulating in London. Queen Elizabeth had suspended Archbishop Grindal in
June 1577 and there had been outrage among the godly. Fleming’s pamphlet warning about
the tempest and divine messenger in Suffolk followed early in August and was not licensed,
nor was it “seen and allowed”, meaning the Privy Council were aware of and had approved
the text. This suggests that Fleming wanted to produce this little book and sell as many as
possible before it was noticed and risked being recalled by the Privy Council. Fleming’s
pamphlet was not banned; however at least one other pamphlet about the terrible deaths in
Suffolk was recalled with harsh consequences for its author.

The timing of the tempest, which followed Grindal’s suspension so closely, would have
made the event seem more significant. This almost certainly explains why the account in the
pamphlet is so spectacular when compared to other contemporary versions of the event. The
account incorporated into Holinshed’s Chronicles, for example, which does not seem to have
been written by Fleming but was almost certainly edited by him, is staid and objective. The
recently consecrated Bishop of London, John Aylmer, was alerted to a pamphlet account of
the storm. On 2 September 1577, less than a month after the tempest, this entry was recorded
in Acts of the Privy Council:

98 See fn 100, p. 53.
Unlicensed Publications: A letter to the Bushoppe of London signifieng unto him that where there hathe been latele published to pamphletes, the one concerning a straing accident sade to have happened within the parishe church of Bounge, neere unto Norwich, and the other touching the late mortalitie at Oxforde.99

Superficially this seems to refer to Fleming’s pamphlet and under Fleming’s name in STC the entry for Wunder (number 11050) says that the Privy Council looked into the unlicensed printing of this pamphlet. Wunder is rare and survives as a unique copy today. This could be explained by the Bishop of London having recalled and destroyed the print run. However, two pamphlets were mentioned by the Privy Council but no authors were named, so there is a possibility that this entry may not refer to Fleming’s pamphlet at all. A similar pamphlet appeared in Rouen the year after Straunge and Terrible Wunder was produced, and the development of this second, French pamphlet can be traced to a catholic printer called Roland Jenkes. In 1577 Jenkes wrote a pro-catholic account of a series of deaths in his home town of Oxford, for which Jenkes was condemned and harshly punished for sedition.100 Jenkes fled England for France where he settled in Rouen and opened a new print shop. Rouen was known as a safe haven for catholic exiles, particularly printers, and a culture of expatriate literature developed there. Here in 1578 Jenkes produced a pamphlet entitled Histoire Mervelleuse, which was a word-for-word translation of Fleming’s Wunder.

However, Jenkes removed the godly prayer Fleming wrote to close the account and replaced it with a catholic ending: “perseveren toujours en sa saincte foy Catholiques Apostolique & Romaine”.101 The two pamphlets mentioned in Acts of the Privy Council are therefore likely to be Jenkes’ English precursor to Histoire Mervelleuse which also contained the account of a Strange Mortalitie in Oxford. After these were recalled and Jenkes was punished for

100Jenkes was nailed to a pillory by his ears and then cut free, which would have been extremely painful and left him disfigured for life. See R.B. McKerrow (ed.), A Dictionary of Printers and Booksellers in England, Scotland and Ireland, and of Foreign Printers of English Books (1968), p. 156.
101“‘Persevere in His holy Catholic Apostolic and Roman faith’, this is the very last paragraph in the pamphlet.
sedition in 1577, he exiled himself to France and published the French version of Wunder and the deaths in Oxford. It seems that Fleming’s godly interpretation of the event was an agreeable one; the Wunder pamphlet did nothing to impede his career as a writer.

Why Jenkes translated Fleming’s pamphlet word-for-word is not known, but he might have acted out of jealously or spite, motivated by a sense of unfairness at his treatment when Fleming had escaped punishment. Rivalry and jealousy existed between writers and printers as the Stationers’ registers contain numerous instances of fines and compensation meted out to settle copyright disputes. The punishment Jenkes received certainly demonstrates the swiftness with which the Privy Council could act and the harsh treatment of those who defied the establishment, particularly during the crisis following Grindal’s fall. Bishop Aylmer was known for his severity with anyone who differed from him on ecclesiastical questions, whether puritan or catholic.

To understand the wider significance of the tempest happening in Suffolk, it is necessary to appreciate what had happened within the Church prior to 1577, particularly in Suffolk where Fleming’s pamphlet was set. By the time Fleming wrote Wunder, England had endured five decades of religious upheaval. The unrest had started with Henry VIII’s schism and dissolution of the monasteries followed by Edward VI’s radical reformation. Next came Mary’s bloody counter-reformation during which around 300 protestants were burned; a fifth of the victims were from Suffolk. Finally Elizabeth’s religious compromises made possible a period of comparative stability, although this stability was difficult to maintain in East Anglia.

Many case studies from Suffolk demonstrate the turmoil and paranoia that peaked at this time. In 1550 the churchwarden of St Mary’s Priory church, Bungay paid his man Edward Molle “for taking away the high altar”, which was not needed for protestant worship under
Edward VI. However, under Mary the church accounts in Bungay show that as late as 1558 some catholic images were restored:

\[\text{Itm paid to Edward Molle and his man for a daies worke for setting uppe the ymages of St. Marie and St. John on the Roodloft.}\]

Rood screens were important features in pre-Reformation worship. Fleming’s fictional black dog targetted the rood screen of Holy Trinity church and ran up and down on top of it, thereby drawing attention to this contentious part of the building.

The Marian restoration of the saints’ images in Bungay triggered a fresh wave of protestant dissent. Some East Anglians deliberately courted heresy charges. The sole surviving court book for the Archdeaconry of Sudbury indicates that acts of petty religious defiance were rife. These ranged from refusing to attend services, refusing to genuflect to the rood and privately using the Tyndale translation of the Bible, which had been banned since 1543. Diarmuid MacCulloch has documented numerous seditious incidents such as regular meetings of reformers, often over a hundred strong, and one parishioner from Lidgate shocked the townspeople by declaring that there was no devil in Hell. During Mary’s reign the communities of Suffolk gradually developed their deep-rooted anxieties and religious unrest that formed the core of the event Fleming was to present in his pamphlet.

Suffolk was therefore a divided county when Elizabeth came to the throne. Mary’s catholic revival had proved “a trauma which had forced people to take sides” and “was bound to have left dangerous tensions”. While the laity of Stoke-by-Nayland defended conservatism, the people of Bury were only too happy to demolish their “Images, Roodes, Roodloftes and

---

102 LRO 1116/E1/1, f. 79.
103 Ibid. f. 105.
104 Ibid. f. 176. Note the refusal to genuflect to the rood. The rood was a key symbol of the catholic faith and references to it appear time and time again during this period. Bishop Nix apprehended four shoemakers from Eye who were intent on burning the rood of Eye Priory Church (ibid. f.155). In his Wunder pamphlet, Fleming stated that the black dog ran up and down the beam where the rood once stood.
other superstitious monuments”. Similar acts of religious vandalism raged for another decade and in Bungay the long-suffering Edward Molle was contracted for a third time; the churchwardens’ accounts made a note of his wages this time “for taking downe the [saints’] ymages” while his colleagues broke them up and destroyed the altar.  

In 1559 the queen appointed Matthew Parker as Archbishop of Canterbury. Parker had been Anne Boleyn’s chaplain and, although he had held radical opinions, he followed Elizabeth’s policy of compromises. Others likely tried to follow Parker’s example. In the west country in 1562 “one peace-keeping parishioner asked his neighbours to cease their quarrelling over a rood screen, the removal of which had recently been ordered: ‘let us agree to have it down, that we may be like Christian men again of holy time’”. Other individuals were not prepared to compromise and this is particularly true of Suffolk in which Fleming’s pamphlet was set. Throughout the 1570s reformers objected to Counter-Reformation Catholicism abroad because of its priestly caste and rituals. They also objected to Elizabeth’s church; although not Roman, in their opinion it was not fully reformed. Some towns, for example Ipswich under the radical aegis of Sir Francis Walsingham, were relatively stable. Other areas, such as Bury St Edmund’s, were not. This constant jockeying for power between people of different religious persuasions resulted in ongoing clashes throughout these decades. To puritans, the whole country had been corrupted by the Devil, by “wolves and foxes” that crept out in the absence of “good shepherds”. “The bishops are to blame”, wrote one chronicler in 1577, “they admit, they say, unworthy men. See the craft of Satan, falsely to charge the worthiest pillars of the church with the ruin of the church”.

---

106 MacCulloch, Suffolk and the Tudors, p. 182.
109 Reeve, Bungay, p. 12.
110 Strype, Annals, p. 145.
111 Ibid. p. 146.
The townsfolk of Bungay were divided on religion. Some remained covertly catholic, others supported Elizabeth’s compromises while the puritans lurked on the sidelines. In 1575 extensive repairs to St Mary’s church were needed following what was surely an act of zealous vandalism.

Itm paid to the glaser for a pain of glasse in the west window cout viii foote; Itm paid to the same for the lytle pain of glasse in the north window cout one foot; Itm paid to Hampsher for viii oz Barre of yron for the west window & for mending and other Barre & hook for the church gate; Itm paid to the glaser for mending all the windows in the bodye of the church & for sowder. 112

Less than two years after these repairs were made, the tempest described by Fleming caused further upheaval, although the parishioners persisted in carrying out wanton acts of destruction in the weeks before the storm. One long passage in the churchwardens’ accounts described how two puritan supporters named Fylld and Mannock attacked the rood, a divisive symbol of pre-Reformation belief. On “the last day of Aprill” 1577, two church reeves, John Mannock and Edward Fylld, were cited for destroying the Rood, despite being forbidden to do so. 113 John Edwards recorded the incident in the church register and described the rood as being “very comlye & decentlye made, according to the queen her majesties Laws”. 114 The reformers’ argument continued as next to John Edwards’ entry is written in another hand “Jhon. Edward here Lye for it was full of Immagery not defaced”. 115

Despite these often heated exchanges, normal church services continued. The next entries were “for Breed & wyne for the communyon the second of aprill […] the xv of aprill xvi & xvii april, the xviii, xix & xxth of apryll [and] for skoryng the communion cups”. 116

---

112 LRO 1116/E1/1, f. 160.
113 Ibid. f. 162.
114 Ibid. In Reeve’s Bungay the note is transcribed as ‘Thos. Edwards here lye…’ with the comment that Thomas Edwards was a shoemaker. The Parish Burial Register does mention a “Thomas Edwards sen[ior] shoemaker” who was interred on 1 March 1581 (LRO 116/D1/1, f. 15). However, Reeve mis-transcribed the name in his book: the marginal note actually says Jhon [John] and the same John Edwards is mentioned again on f. 162 “In Primis payd to John Edwards for ingrosing the church book – xii d”. John Edwards’ name reappears on subsequent pages as well.
115 LRO 1116/E1/1, f. 162.
116 Ibid. f. 160.
However, a later entry from the same book suggested that those in favour of further reform had at last destroyed the saints’ images. Mr Nobbes was paid to clear up the mess:

Itm paid to nobbes the sexton for makyng cleane the churche after the pulling downe of the partycon [rood] betwene the chancellle & church […] contrarye to a comandement before sent by the Lord Bisshopp off norwiche by one John Bowbright his man to the inhabitance.  

A marginal note says “Taking down the great organ”. No reason is given for taking the organ down, but there were no ensuing payments made for a new organ, neither were there payments for repairing the old one. This is significant as organ music had been a key part of catholic church services and, while queen Elizabeth was not averse to church music, it was a tradition despised by the “hotter” sort of protestant reformists. Further entries probably support the systematic eradication of catholic decoration in the church: “Itm paid for a cheldor of lyme […] Itm paid to beckett & his mane for xxiii daies work and for their borde at ii d the daye for whiting the church […] Itm paid for lyme to white with all”. This might simply have been maintenance work, but almost certainly the whitewash was intended to cover up popish church decoration.

The situation came to a head after Edmund Grindal became Archbishop of Canterbury. Elizabeth asked him to encourage the clergy in his archdiocese to conform by wearing the surplice, but Grindal objected. Neither would Grindal suppress “prophesying”. As Collinson has explained:

The crisis arose from Grindal’s hostile reaction to a suggestion that the number of preachers might be ‘abridged’ and from his outright refusal to transmit a royal command for the suppression of the learned ‘exercises’ of preaching and conference known as ‘prophesying’. These meetings were devoted to studying and debating the passages used by those who had preached, and could also involve members of the godly laity, in the hope of improving the learning of all present.

117 LRO 1116/E1/1, f. 164.
118 Ibid. f. 162.
119 LRO 1116/E1/1, f. 162-3.
120 Collinson, Grindal, p. 232.
Archbishop Grindal saw no harm in prophesying but the queen suspected that these meetings were the prelude to trouble. Although asked on several occasions to stop the meetings Grindal stubbornly replied in writing to the queen that he would rather offend her than offend God. He was suspended in June and kept under virtual house arrest at Lambeth Palace, so to all intents and purposes thereafter England had no Archbishop of Canterbury. 121

It is known from parish records that St Mary’s church in Bungay suffered vandalism in the weeks following Grindal’s suspension. Strange portents and phenomena that were viewed by many people as signs of God’s anger also occurred during the weeks after Grindall’s fall. For example, a “blazing starre” or comet shaped like a horse’s tail was seen across the land, causing consternation and prompting the queen to take advice from her astrologer Dr John Dee. 122 There was also the tremendous thunderstorm described in Fleming’s Wunder pamphlet that wrecked the churches of St Mary’s, Bungay and Holy Trinity, Blythburgh shortly after Grindal’s suspension. The burial records for St Mary’s Bungay described the deaths of Adam Walker and John Fuller, the two men killed by “the Tempest of Thunder” that also destroyed the church steeple. So unusual and unnerving was this tempest that it was mentioned in the margin alongside an entry in the accounts book next to details of the payments for repairing the clock, also damaged in the storm.

Fleming wrote Wunder just two years into his publishing career. Yet he had already produced or contributed to at least eight published translations of other writers’ books including Virgil’s Eclogues and Bucoliks, and Select Epistles of Cicero as well as Of Englishe Dogges. The Wunder pamphlet stands out among these early texts because it was written by Fleming and it demonstrated Fleming’s own godly beliefs. This thesis argues that Wunder is also significant because prior to 1577 Fleming was busy but relatively unknown;

121 Collinson, Grindal, p. 236 and p. 248.
122 Strype, Annals, pp. 151-2. There is also a reference to the queen consulting Dee about this blazing star in Benjamin Woolley, The Queen’s Conjurator: the Life and Magic of Dr Dee (2002), p. 93 and pp. 161-2. Fleming produced a treatise about the comet, see p. 138 and pp. 155-9 of this thesis.
after *Wunder* was printed, his career took off and he began working with some of London’s renowned writers and printers.

Fleming’s pamphlet claimed that the fabulous was true, and his credulous readers might even have believed that God sent a messenger in the form of a dog. The dog proceeded to weed out the sinful members of a congregation before it drew attention to the empty rood beam. Almost simultaneously, a second congregation seven miles away was attacked. Yet this apparition was almost certainly invented by Fleming, who drew on existing myth and his own knowledge of dogs in classical literature, derived from his earlier *Dogges*, to create a fabulous devil in canine form. No other accounts or records of the storm included a black dog. Fleming’s story was such a powerful one that his black dog remains to this day the emblem of Bungay. When Fleming created the black dog, he might have been motivated by money since a pamphlet featuring both an extreme tempest and a fabulous creature was much more likely to sell than an ordinary account of a storm. However, he possibly regretted embellishing his elaborate tale and any official attention it might have brought him through Jenke’s plagiarism. Fleming never alluded to the fabulous dog in any of his future writing; neither did he ever write another fantastical pamphlet like *Wunder*. Despite this he was one of the pioneers of popular printed books.

Fabulous and supernatural events had always been commented on, but Fleming’s *Wunder* was an accessible book produced for the public sphere. Furthermore, a study of the titles in the Stationers’ registers suggest that Fleming’s fabulous pamphlet was published at least three years before this literary genre of really took off.\(^{123}\) He knew how to capitalize on an event and had the ability to write quickly and effectively. He understood what everyday readers wanted to read and created a series of affordable texts on a range of themes to suit the market, without being patronising or over-simplifying the texts he produced. *Wunder* is

\(^{123}\) It was not until 1580 that the Stationers’ registers started recording further fabulous titles based on strange phenomena, such as the birth of ‘monsters’. See pp. 160-1.
unique in that it represents the only known text by Fleming to be printed on the Continent; even if Fleming would not have approved of its catholic orientation it still introduced him to foreign readers. His compelling writing style in *Wunder* demonstrates Fleming at his urgent best, writing directly to his readers and capturing their attention. Yet Fleming’s ability to judge the market and his readers, plus the *Wunder* pamphlet’s popularity (possibly even notoriety) proved to be the vehicle which took him away from cheap, popular texts. After 1577 Fleming was destined to move in more elevated and educated circles, as will be seen in the following chapter.
Chapter Three: 

The Footepath of Faith and the Diamond of Devotion

In 1581 two small but lengthy devotional tracts by Fleming were on sale in St Paul’s Churchyard. The first was entitled The Footepath of Faith leading to the Highway of Heaven. Compiled and made by A. Fleming and by him newlie altered and augmented (hereafter Footepath). The second book was called The Diamond of Devotion cut and squared into six severall points: namely 1. the footpath to felicitie. 2. a guide to godliness. 3. the schoole of skill. 4. a swarome of bees. 5. a plant of pleasure. 6. a grove of graces (hereafter Diamond). Whilst they shared much content, the books were different in layout and in the way their content was arranged. They were both published in the same year but by different printers and for different sellers. The books had a superficial lack of similarity and were different in appearance, which presumably led to a considerable difference in the price of each title and meant that there was room for both Footepath and Diamond on the market.

In spite of these differences Footepath and Diamond had much in common beyond their author. The first chapter of Diamond was called ‘Footpath to Felicity’, similar in both sound and meaning to Footepath of Faith. Duplicating the word “footpath” in the title and subtitle of respectively Footepath and Diamond has caused muddled cataloguing and confusion in some institutions as to whether they were one and the same book. This confusion has been exacerbated by the content of the two books. Almost all of the text in Diamond was taken directly from Footepath and reused word for word, although the order of use was greatly altered.

Footepath was undoubtedly written first. When the earliest known edition was printed by Henry Middleton in 1581 the title included the phrase “newlie altered and augmented” suggesting that this Footepath had an antecedent, most likely printed three years earlier when the title was registered with the Stationers’ Company in July 1578. This is supported by evidence in the Stationers’ register that Edward White was selling a book called Footepath of
Faith in 1580. Therefore the earliest surviving copies of Fleming’s Footepath were printed a year later in 1581 and are second editions. Also that year Denham printed the first editions of Diamond (although Diamond was not registered with the Stationers’ Company until 1587). The layout of Footepath is hard to follow despite being “newlie augmented”. The finished text appears rushed as though it was produced quickly in response to an event or sudden niche in the market for palm-sized “comfortable”, spiritual guides. By comparison the appearance of Diamond suggests that greater time and thought was invested in compiling this text, as one might expect in a book produced in the quality print shop of Denham. The content of the two books, the prose and poetry itself, remained almost identical. Fleming in his role as author did little to the text of Footepath when he remodelled it to form Diamond; instead Fleming in his role as learned corrector cut Footepath down and re-ordered its chapters and sections. As a result Diamond was a more considered book. The intricate relationship between Footepath and Diamond, not to mention the contexts within which they were produced and the relationships between the people they connected have, until now, never been explored.

**The Footpath of Faith**

Prior to writing Footepath the majority of Fleming’s literary outpourings had been short ‘pamphlets’, translations or contributions to other writers’ books. Footepath represents his first lengthy devotional work. It also represents his first wholly original piece of devotional writing as Fleming’s previous projects were largely translations of existing Latin works into

---

124 The Stationers’ registers are useful but these years might mean little as registering with the Stationers’ Company had little bearing on when books were actually printed. A search of the registers reveals that this was quite usual. Many titles were registered and never printed at all while other books associated with Fleming were printed but never registered, for example Scot’s Discoverie of Witchcraft (1584). Other titles were printed first and then registered later (as was the case with Fleming’s 1589 translations of Virgil’s Georgiks and Bucoliks). Arthur Golding’s True beleefe of a Christian Man (containing a prayer and letter by Fleming) was printed in 1581 or 1582 but not registered until 1615 when it was reprinted.

125 Here a parallel can be drawn between Footepath/Diamond and another ‘pair’ of Fleming’s texts. In April 1580 Fleming produced his broadside Epitaph as an immediate response to Lambe’s death. Later that year Fleming wrote the longer and more detailed Memoriall […] of W. Lambe. Epitaph was clearly quickly produced while Memoriall was far more considered and detailed.
English. During Fleming’s lifetime *Footepath* was only printed once. After his death two further editions were produced. The existing first and second editions of *Footepath* (1581 and 1619) were sextodecimo in size and share the same STC number, 11039. Despite the book’s pocket-sized dimensions, *Footepath*’s 442 leaves teemed with devotional words, comforting thoughts and spiritual advice. The third and last known edition printed in 1624 was slightly larger in size at duodecimo and was allocated its own STC number, 11040 as it had a slightly different title to the 1581 book (the 1624 edition was called *Footpath of Faith* rather than *Footepath of Faith*).

*Footepath* was registered with the Company of Stationers by William Hoskins. Hoskins served a long apprenticeship with the highly regarded printer Richard Tottell, for whom Fleming had worked in the late 1580s. Hoskins’ apprenticeship ended in 1571 when he was freed and began his career as both a printer and a bookseller. Not only was he associated with Tottell but later Hoskins went into partnership with the printer Peter Short. Short was the successor of Denham, which explains why Denham printed the earlier editions of Fleming’s *Diamond* but the later editions were produced by Short. Like Hoskins, Denham had also been an apprentice of Richard Tottell. It was surely because the fine quality of Fleming’s written work was familiar to the former apprentices Hoskins and Denham that Tottell employed Fleming as his editor or learned corrector in the late 1580s.

Understanding the associations between different printers and sellers is valuable in deciphering why the different editions of Fleming’s books seem to have passed between different presses and shops. In this way *Footepath* (and also *Diamond*) can reveal a great deal about the way in which printers and sellers operated, farmed out and recycled their existing books. It also sheds light on how writers and learned correctors networked in order to get work with printers and sellers, as in Elizabethan London it was often the sellers who decided what should be written and then farmed their ideas out to their house writers.
Hoskins intended to print and/or sell Footepath when he registered the title with the Stationers’ Company on 23 July 1578. It would seem that he did produce at least a limited first run of Footepath that was on sale in 1580 but this has not survived. On 25 April 1580 Fleming’s Footepath re-entered the Stationers’ Company register, which shows the title had been assigned to the bookseller Edward White senior. Middleton produced the first surviving edition of Footepath of Faith “newlie altered and augmented” in 1581. Edward White then sold it from his shop The Gun at the North Door of St Paul’s Churchyard.

No other editions of the early Footepath are known to have been produced during Fleming’s lifetime. However in 1619 the book was reprinted with a slightly different title, Footpath of Faith leading to the Highwaie to Heauen with the Bridge of Blessednesse by Ralph Blower of Fleet Street.126 There is evidence that Blower knew Fleming personally, since in the dedication to William Totthyll (son of the noteworthy printer Richard Tottell) that Blower added to the 1619 edition he described himself and Fleming as having been Tottell’s “servants” or apprentices. However Fleming was a university graduate and, according to the early book trade expert Peter Blayney, there are no known incidents of university educated “learned correctors” completing the required seven-year apprenticeship in addition to their degrees.127 Blower on the other hand is known to have been Tottell’s apprentice as confirmed in contemporary records and more recent research into the book trade.

Examining the dates that Blower was apprenticed to Tottell and the dates that Fleming was in a position to work in Fleet Street an overlapping period becomes apparent. McKerrow states that Blower started his apprenticeship with Tottell possibly in 1585 or more likely in 1587.128 An apprenticeship lasted around seven years therefore Blower would have been freed in around 1594 or 1595, which is precisely the year that he did take up his freedom and

126 Blower’s last entry in the Stationers’ register was in 1618 and he died before 1626.
127 I had the good fortune to meet Professor Peter Blayney to discuss at length the role of apprentices and learned correctors with him. See also Peter Blayney, Bookshops in St Paul’s Cross Churchyard (1990).
started his own business on Fleet Street near Middle Temple Gate, initially selling books but later printing them too.

It is likely that at some point during Blower’s apprenticeship in Tottell’s Fleet Street print shop Fleming also worked there as a learned corrector, the equivalent of a modern copy editor. Tottell is likely to have employed graduates and apprentices as well as undergraduates to perform the variety of tasks associated with book production in his busy printing house. Therefore Fleming might have been associated with Tottell before he was awarded his degree in 1581. However, a printer of Tottell’s considerable reputation most likely wanted a more experienced graduate as a corrector and from 1581 Fleming was a graduate with several years’ experience as both a writer and indexer. There is some evidence to support this theory: Fleming was actively involved with 39 titles between 1575 and 1581, but from 1582 onwards there was a steep decline in the number of books that Fleming put his name to. A possible explanation for this might be that Fleming was working anonymously for Tottell and therefore had less time available for his own projects that bore his name. Coincidentally the surviving books that were printed by Tottell were godly and scholarly, and these were the kinds of titles that Fleming himself was writing or contributing to from 1581-2. Whether, as Blower suggests, he and Fleming were both in Tottell’s employ from the time Blower’s apprenticeship started in 1585 is doubtful as in the mid-1580s Fleming was most likely compiling Holinshed’s Chronicles: he might not have been working exclusively on this book but it is unlikely that he had time to collate and edit this text and also work for Tottell at that time.

Blower’s dedication is valuable because it is currently the only evidence we have that Fleming did work with Tottell. As such it allows us to fill a gap in Fleming’s career and also say something of Fleming’s status and abilities as a writer and corrector. Cooper did Fleming
a disservice when he described him as just an antiquary and poet, and a “poor poet” at that.129
Unfortunately Cooper’s synopsis of his abilities clouded subsequent academic views of
Fleming. Clegg’s recent summary of Fleming is more considered but still perpetuates the
opinion that Fleming was at best “serviceable […] despite strong Protestant and anti-Papal
sentiments”.130 His contemporaries, including the foremost printers of the day, clearly
thought a great deal more of Fleming, and his popularity was because of his strong godly
protestant sentiments, not in spite of them.

While the sextodecimo format and the main text of the 1619 Footepath remained the same as
the original, Blower had added considerably to the prefaces of the book. This edition
included several pages of academic calendars and tables of significant historical dates and
memorable events. Blower and Clarke leave us in no doubt that the readers of the 1619
edition were not only educated but included academics and clerics in need of such data. In
much the same way that modern pocket diaries contain conversion tables, public holidays
and other handy reference material, surely this edition of Footepath was designed to be
carried in a pocket or satchel so that the book was to hand, referred to for daily spiritual
guidance and of use to scholars as a reference tool and calendar.

Blower’s last entry in the Stationers’ Company registers was made in March 1618 but that
does not mean that he had stopped working in 1618, as this edition of Footepath printed a
year later demonstrates. The 1619 Footepath is, though, a significant one because Fleming
had been dead for twelve years when it was printed and Blower was reaching the end of his
own career in the book trade. Footepath was most likely the last book Blower printed and he
probably died shortly afterwards. The original Footepath had been out of print for 30 years.
It is testament to Fleming’s reputation that Blower made a point of mentioning Fleming in
the dedication; it is also testament to the on-going relevance of this book that the elderly

Blower prepared his presses one more time and produced another edition of Fleming’s Footepath, which was sold by John Clarke.\textsuperscript{131}

It is unlikely that Blower printed this book solely in memory of Fleming. Many of Fleming’s books were printed and sold to coincide with events or recent phenomena. It is possible that his 40-page Wunder pamphlet was ready for sale within a week of the terrible thunderstorm that it portrayed. Similarly Fleming’s Epitaph was commissioned, written, printed and sold within days of Lambe’s decease. While other scholars persisted with translating Virgil’s Aeneid, Fleming was the first to translate the agrarian Bucoliks into English in 1575; possibly this was a response to the occasional crop failures and fear of famine that periodically affected England during Elizabeth’s reign. Publications such as these demonstrate that Fleming was an opportunistic writer with his eye on current affairs, although Fleming himself did not necessarily profit from these texts. When his English translation of Nausea’s Blasing Starres was written in 1577 it commemorated a “hairy star” or comet which was seen over London in November of that year. In 1618, eleven years after Fleming had died, Blazing Starres was reprinted for two sellers because another comet was seen over England.\textsuperscript{132} This coincided with the severe unease that had swept across James’ realm following the outbreak of the Thirty Years War in Europe.

There was no coincidence that certain titles and topics were more popular in certain years. Reprinting a godly book like Footepath in the year 1619 was equally significant. During the previous year a clash between predestinarian Calvinists (favoured by King James) and Arminians favouring free will had occurred at the Synod of Dort, and religion was once again a high priority not just in England and Scotland but across Europe. Also in 1618 a religio-political war had broken out across Europe. It was seen not so much as a

\textsuperscript{131} Almost nothing is known about John Clarke except that, according to McKerrow’s Dictionary, he was active in 1608. Footepath of Faith provides evidence that Clarke was still actively selling books 11 years later in 1619, although by 1624 Footepath was being sold by White.

\textsuperscript{132} This was \textit{STC} 18413.3 and 18413.7; see pp. 157-9. All the books mentioned in this paragraph are discussed in more detail throughout Chapter Five.
straightforward battle between catholics and protestants but rather a fight between the fundamental forces of good and evil.

James had made considerable efforts to avoid war between his kingdom and Catholic Europe, particularly Spain. In 1618 James relaxed the recusancy laws to alleviate the harassment of Catholics. Also in 1618 James executed the unfortunate Walter Raleigh who, ill and confined to his quarters, had been unable to stop his crew looting a Spanish town whilst looking for gold in South America. Before war broke out James had been negotiating a Spanish match for his son and heir Charles, and even contemplated Charles’ resultant offspring being brought up as Catholics.

Despite trying to maintain a peaceful ecclesiastical impartiality and making considerable efforts not to antagonize the Catholic emperor, James found himself involved in this European war. His daughter Elizabeth had married Elector Frederick, a protestant who in August 1619 had left his reformed Rhineland Palatinate in order to become the elected leader of Bohemia. Bohemia was, though, important to King Ferdinand, who was one of the Austrian relations of the Catholic Habsburg dynasty. Three days after Frederick had accepted the Bohemian crown, his opponent was declared Emperor Ferdinand II. The Spanish Habsburgs had rallied to the aid of the Austrian Habsburgs and Frederick’s protestant forces were quickly defeated. By late 1620 James’ daughter Elizabeth and Frederick his son-in-law had fled Bohemia; they had also lost the Rhineland and were living as refugees in The Hague. There was a real danger that England and Scotland would be drawn into this pan-European war, later called the Thirty Years War, and a tangible fear that Catholicism would again dominate England. A godly protestant and “comfortable” book such as Fleming’s Footpath was needed to soothe its readers and reaffirm protestantism’s cause in England.

A further edition of Footpath was printed in 1624. This may have been concurrent with King James’ agreement that Prince Charles and Buckingham should negotiate Charles’ marriage to the French Catholic princess Henrietta Maria. In the previous year negotiations to match
Prince Charles with the Spanish Infanta came to nought (much to the delight of the English crowds who greeted Charles’ return from Spain, *sans fiancée*, with cheering and fireworks). Charles’ proposed marriage to Henrietta Maria resulted in a genuine fear that he would convert to Catholicism. (A similar national apprehension had probably prevented Elizabeth marrying the Catholic duke of Anjou.) England would not tolerate the idea of a Catholic on the English throne and turned once again in 1624 to *Footpath* for godly consolation.

This last version of *Footpath* was slightly larger than the last, being duodecimo in size, and has its own STC number. The 1624 edition had been assigned to Edward White. White senior died in or before 1612 so the White in question must have been his son who was also a bookseller. However records suggest White junior died in 1624 because Mistress White assigned her property to E. Allde on 29 June of that year. Possibly the 1624 edition of *Footpath* was printed and sold by Allde, although it seems more likely that White was still alive when *Footpath* was reprinted and intended to sell the printed books himself once they were finished by Allde. This enables the assignation of *Footpath* to Edward White Jr to be narrowed down to sometime between New Year’s Day (then in March) and June 1624.

The original *Footpath* was divided into several sections. These sections were subdivided and given indicative headings to aid the reader in finding what they were looking for. On occasion the subsections were divided further. The first instalment and, at 266 pages, the longest was the section from which the book took its title: ‘The Footpath of Faith leading to the Highway to Heaven’. The next much shorter section was entitled ‘Bridge of Blessednesse’ and comprised 30 pages. The third section ‘Christian exercises short sweet’ was followed by ‘A necessarie and right godly praier’, and this was further divided into ten subsections. The fifth section ‘Exhortations or lessons Alphabetical that is to say in the order of the ABC crisse crosse row single’ contained 24 verses each beginning with a sequential letter of the alphabet. There was no letter ‘j’ in the alphabet as the letter ‘i’ was used for both ‘i’ and ‘j’; the letter ‘z’ was not included either. Within this fifth section was also ‘Exhortations or lessons Alphabetical […] crisse crosse row double’, which contained
48 alphabetically arranged verses (again the two ‘j’ and ‘z’ verses were left out). The last subsection in this fifth chapter was ‘Exhortations or lessons Alphabeticall […] crisse crosse row treble’ made up of 75 acrostic verses, three for each letter of the alphabet (this time Fleming included three ‘z’ verses; as previously ‘i’ still stood for both itself and ‘j’). The following section was entitled ‘A Hive of Bees’. The penultimate chapter was called ‘Graces to be said before and after meals’, and the concluding section in Footepath was ‘Handfull of Holy Hymnes and Spirituall Songs’.

Footepath was dedicated to Sir George Carey, 2nd Baron Hunsdon. Fleming’s decision to dedicate his first lengthy and original devotional work to Carey was a bold one, for Carey was the son of Anne Morgan and Henry Carey, the queen’s personal bodyguard. As well as being close to the queen for protective reasons, Henry Carey was widely accepted to have been the illegitimate son of Henry VIII and his mistress Mary Carey (sister to Anne Boleyn and wife of William Carey, Esquire of the Body to Henry VIII). Therefore it is possible that Henry Carey had been Elizabeth’s illegitimate half-brother and George Carey was Elizabeth I’s nephew. Regardless of whether or not Henry VIII was his grandfather, Carey was still a cousin of the queen through his Boleyn grandmother. As one of Elizabeth’s few living relatives, the queen valued his counsel and he was a court favourite. By dedicating Footepath to Carey, Fleming surely hoped that his devotional book would come to the queen’s notice.

As well as dedicating Footepath to Carey, Fleming added a dedication ‘To the Christian Reader’. This reveals who he anticipated his audience to be: Christians, meaning godly protestants. The acrostic poem (which spells “Abraham Fleming” vertically) suggests that his readers would be not only educated enough to be able to read “verse rhythmical” but also well-read enough to see Fleming’s acrostic signature in the text.

The dedication to the reader also describes the way in which Fleming viewed himself in relation to his readers:
Loe here a short lesson,
whereon if thou looke
Thou shalt perceive quickly,
the summe of this Booke.

Fleming described the dedicatory poem that followed as a ‘lesson’, a word loaded with biblical and educational meaning. Fleming’s audience was likened to a congregation listening to a sermon or lesson from the Bible. Although Fleming was not ordained until 1588, he probably saw himself as a teacher or conduit through whom his readers became his students; the “A, B, C” format of ‘Schoole of Skill’ (the third chapter in Diamond) supports this notion, as does the corresponding chapter in Footepath, which was called ‘Lessons Alphabetical’. 133 Other texts by Fleming also had an educational theme, particularly the work he did on his dictionaries for students and “yong beginners”. 134 Of greater comparative relevance here is Footepath because it contains pedagogical terminology such as “instructions” to his Christian readers. One section was entitled ‘Christian exercises short and sweet’, a term reminiscent of the classroom. 135

The Diamond of Devotion

Diamond was a pocket-sized duodecimo book and at 320 pages in length it was a slimmer volume than Footepath. There were five editions of Diamond. The first edition was printed in 1581 by Denham and sold in his shop at Paternoster Row, the lane that ran along the north edge of St Paul’s churchyard. This first edition has the STC number 11041. On 9 January 1582 Denham was ordered to make a payment to White, the bookseller who had been assigned Footepath in 1580. Diamond and Footepath appear to have been different texts but Diamond did actually consist of large sections of Footepath. Sometimes the recycled passages had been altered, given different sub-headings and re-ordered although the content and wording remained recognisable. However, other sections were direct copies of the text.

133 Fleming, Footepath, 1619 edn, pp. 359-78. The copy referred to here is BL 4400.f.2.
134 This is discussed on pp. 193-5.
135 Fleming, Diamond, 1602 edn, pp. 180-207. The copy referred to here is BL C65.aa.19.
Modern writers own the copyright to their work so by today’s standards this would not have been problematic because Fleming had, after all, written both books. In Elizabethan England however, it was the booksellers who owned the copyrights to any books they sold. In printing Diamond Denham had committed a breach of copyright because the book borrowed heavily from Footepath. White was aggrieved and won compensation. Denham was fined and told to omit the identical sections thereafter. This would have caused major problems for Denham as almost all of Diamond was taken directly from the pages of Footepath. Despite the apparent seriousness of the charge against Denham in January 1582, there is no record of his paying White compensation; subsequent editions of Diamond continued to use substantial sections of text taken from Footepath.

Books printed by Denham bore the motto “cum priviligio regiae majestatis” meaning that he held the monopoly on printing certain types of books, in this case devotional works. By the time he printed Diamond in 1581, Denham had been a free member of the Company of Stationers for nearly 20 years. The demand for Denham’s services and books was so great that at one point he operated four presses. Denham had served his apprenticeship with Tottell. Denham was evidently a consummate professional and an experienced printer who took great pride in his work. He was furnished with a large and varied assortment of letters, his blacks being noticeable for their clearness and beauty, while his nonpareil and other small sizes are remarkable for their regularity. Denham also had a varied stock of initial letters, ornaments and borders, many of which were extremely good… Many of his smaller initials are noticeable for their grace.\footnote{McKerrow, Dictionary, pp. 88-9}

It was these fine borders, regular small letters and graceful smaller initials so characteristic of his work that Denham used in Diamond. Denham’s involvement gives some indication of the importance of this book and the sort of elite readers it was hoped the book would attract. A second edition of Diamond was printed, again by Denham, in 1586 (STC 11042) and was
registered with the Stationer’s Company on 30 January 1587 under the assign of William Seres. Presumably the 1582 copyright suit had been forgotten.

The third edition of Diamond was printed in 1598, this time by Peter Short of The Star in Bredstreet Hill (STC 11043). Short and Richard Yardley had inherited Denham’s business and copyrights some time after 1589, the year that Denham is presumed to have died since he was no longer mentioned in the Stationers’ registers. Short was also responsible for the fourth edition of Diamond in 1602 (STC 11044). The fifth edition was printed in 1608 (a year after Fleming’s death) by J. Waggard under the assign of the Company of Stationers (STC 11045). In 1620 Diamond of Devotion was entered into the English Stock.137

A rounded understanding of Footepath and Diamond will never be reached unless the books’ production is first understood. Printers and booksellers in the sixteenth and seventeenth century were, in many ways, more important to a book’s creation than the author. Blayney’s Bookshops, McKerrow’s Dictionary of Printers and Booksellers together with Arber’s transcription of the Company of Stationers’ records all provide invaluable information on the printers and sellers Fleming was involved with, not to mention the books produced. Yet these modern studies are all based on records and sources such as the Bishop of London’s accounts and the Privy Council’s records, on property leases and the Company of Stationers’ registers. It would be unrealistic to expect modern scholars to have scoured every early book in existence to look for supporting evidence or inconsistencies in the relationships between the printers and sellers. The difficulty of such a task would be exacerbated by the fact that library catalogues are sometimes incomplete; rare or unique books might be kept abroad, and some books have been listed under erroneous titles (as Diamond has been) and collaborative books may only be listed under one author but not the other. Furthermore, colophons usually stated who the printer of a particular book was, but not always who the book seller was.

137 The English Stock was a charitable concern formed in 1603 in order to provide work for printers fallen on hard times. Books entered into the English Stock were popular titles, predominantly almanacs, printed and sold by the Stationers’ Company in order to raise money for those members who needed financial support. That Diamond was chosen to be used in this way strongly suggests that it was a proven best seller. I am indebted to the Stationers’ Company archivists for this clarification.
Whilst the Stationers’ Company registers usually stated who printed and sold a book, not all books were registered with the Stationers. Finding evidence of the relationships between printers and sellers has not been included in projects such as Arber’s because the problem of cross referencing sources and evidence is an immense one. Therefore Fleming’s Diamond is a useful book because with comparatively little effort and few resources (namely the Stationers’ register, Blayney’s Bookshops, Arber and McKerrow’s Dictionary) it possible to reconstruct a number of relationships, such as that between Fleming and Denham, Denham and Tottell, and Denham, Short and Yardley.

Diamond is much easier to follow than Footepath since the book was clearly divided into six chapters, or as Fleming put it, his gem was “cut and squared into six severall points”. Each chapter had a distinct title page decorated with fine borders courtesy of Denham. By comparison Footepath had eight chapters that ran into each other and were only separated by subheadings. Perhaps Fleming realized Footepath had been unclear in its layout and set about making Diamond a better organized book. Possibly the experienced Denham had suggested that these alterations were made. Either way, organising and reordering a potentially complicated series of headings and subheadings stood Fleming in good stead for his later, more ambitious works, for example reorganising the 1587 edition of Holinshed’s Chronicles (also with Denham).

The chapters within Diamond are all alliteratively titled and rurally themed, echoing the Virgilian pastoral ideals Fleming had been so familiar with when he translated Bucolicks and Eclogues in 1575. Indeed chapter four of Diamond is entitled ‘A Swarme of Bees’, reminiscent of Virgil’s fourth Georgik. Pliny eulogized bees and thought the insect surpassed humans in many respects; Fleming is known to have read and translated Pliny’s letters in his Panoplie of Epistles (1576). The bee was (and still is) seen as industrious, self-sacrificing, humble and obedient. The qualities ascribed to bees stemmed from a long classical tradition of attributing bees with desirable virtues and then suggesting humans adopt the ethics of
these cooperative and hard-working, if anthropomorphized, creatures. Fleming’s ‘Bees’ were no different as these excerpts demonstrate:

17 Bee prouident in Summer what shall serue thee in Winter least thou haue not to supply thy want.\textsuperscript{138}

73 Be not a controller of thy betters: for in so dooing thou dooest run among thornes and thistles.\textsuperscript{139}

The bee, or rather its hive, had another connotation. The papal tiara bore a strong resemblance to a “skep” or traditional dome-shaped straw beehive. In 1579 Fleming had added tables or indexes to a translation of Isaac Rabboteneu’s \textit{Beehive of the Roman Church} so he was obviously well aware of the parallel made between the catholic church and the hive in Rabboteneu’s protestant satire.\textsuperscript{140} Diligent and meek as his bees may be, the examples set by Fleming’s swarm of bees are principally godly, as he explains in the introduction:

Euen so this swarme of Bees, which I, not by the sounde of a bason, but by the painfullnesse of my pen, haue gathered together out of the pleasant Garden of Gods most holie worde, where I found them scattered heere and there among the fragrant flowers, and sweete beds of wholesome hearbes, making most comfortable Honie, and offering thee a taste thereof, are not lightlie to be esteemed, considering that the issue and euent of their trauell wel ordered and vsed, is so beneficiall, as nothing more, if anie thing like.\textsuperscript{141}

Further into the chapter Fleming’s lengthy swarm of 200 bees instructed the reader on how to live a godly life, as the following examples demonstrate:

94 Bee mindefull of thy dutie to God, & euerie morning and euening magnifie his holie name.\textsuperscript{142}

\textsuperscript{138} Fleming, Diamond, 1602 edn, p. 217
\textsuperscript{139} Ibid, p. 239
\textsuperscript{140} The full title of the Fleming’s English version of Rabboteneu’s book is \textit{The Beehive of the Romish Church} wherein the author a zealous protestant, under the person of a superstitious Papist, doth so driely refell the grose opinions of Popery. This text is discussed on p. 179 and p. 183.
\textsuperscript{141} Fleming, Diamond, 1602 edn, pp. 211-2.
\textsuperscript{142} Fleming, Diamond, 1602 edn, p. 228.
25 Bee a worshipper of the Lorde thy God, and in the day of thine
hunger hee will refresh thee.

55 Bee not a lier, and a forger of untruths, for such doth the Lorde
abhor: but they that deale truly please him.\footnote{143}

The hardworking and godly bee was not the only rustic theme to be used in \textit{Diamond}. At
times this book can seem repetitive and contrived but then it is essentially a series of long
godly sermons creatively written by a passionately anti-papist, establishment man doggedly
making his point. Look beyond the sermonising and \textit{Diamond} can be seen as steeped in
literary traditions of which Fleming was well aware. Rustic metaphors and themes echo not
only Virgil but also in the popular writing of Fleming’s contemporaries and colleagues, for
example Spenser and Sydney. Fleming’s alliterative title pages seem to have been inspired
by Whetston’s \textit{Rocke of Regard} (1576) which Fleming was aware of because he had
contributed poetry to Whetston’s book.\footnote{144} The floral themes in Timothy Kendall’s \textit{Flowers of
Epigrammes} (1577), to which Fleming had contributed a recommendatory poem, may also
have inspired the “flowres” found in the ‘Plant of Pleasure’ within \textit{Diamond}.

The first “point” or chapter in \textit{Diamond} was ‘Footepath to Felicitie’. This corresponded with
the second section entitled ‘Bridge of Blessednesse’ in \textit{Footepath of Faith}. The second
chapter in \textit{Diamond} called ‘Guide to Godlinesse’ was made up of the third and fourth
sections in \textit{Footepath of Faith}, ‘Christian exercises short sweet’ and ‘A necessarie and right
godly praier’. The third chapter entitled ‘Schoole of Skille’ is almost identical to
‘Exhortations or lessons Alphabeticall’, which form the fifth section of \textit{Footepath}.

\textit{Footepath}’s sixth section, a ‘Hive of Bees’ provided the text for \textit{Diamond}’s fourth chapter
‘A Swarme of Bees’, although Fleming shortened the text and there were more “Bees” in
\textit{Footepath}. Similarly \textit{Footepath}’s seventh section ‘Graces to be said before and after meals’
formed the basis for \textit{Diamond}’s fifth chapter ‘Grove of Graces’. The title of the last chapter
in \textit{Diamond} was ‘Plant of Pleasure’ and this was directly copied from \textit{Footepath}’s last

\footnote{143}{Ibid. p. 236.}
\footnote{144}{See pp. 162-3.}
section ‘Handfull of Holy Hymnes and Spirituall Songs’; yet these two chapters corresponded exactly and were both full of floral metaphors.

Diamond can be seen as the pinnacle of Fleming’s devotional writing. It was engineered as a show of his skills, each section was not only carefully thought out but also carefully laid out on its pages in order to display Fleming’s prowess in as many literary conventions as possible. On a technical level Fleming uses alliteration, blank verse, couplets, acrostic verses and uses a variety of metrical feet to good effect, particularly trochee. The fashionable reader would also have recognized and enjoyed Fleming’s use of agrarian themes, which had been popularised by Spenser in his Shepheardes Calendar of 1579.

Scholars and those interested in numerology would have appreciated Fleming’s understanding of significant numbers. Numbers like nine and seven (and multiples thereof) were loaded with special meaning because there were believed to be nine kinds of angels and seven celestial bodies. Spenser’s ‘Garden of Adonis’ from the Faerie Queene (1590) had nine lines per verse and his Hymn of Heavenly Love (1596) used seven lines per verse. The names ‘Abraham’ and ‘Fleming’ both contained seven letters and Fleming frequently deployed the letters in his name to form the basis for seven-line verses, notably in ‘Plant of Pleasure’. Each section or flower of the ‘Plant’ starts with a letter which spells out ABRAHAM FLEMING; the first letter of each verse within each section also spells out ABRAHAM FLE[M]ING, as the ‘Sixt Flowre’ here demonstrates:

[Abrah][A][m]
1. An humble heart O God,  
   vnto thy seruants giue,  
   Be thou to them a louing Lord,  
   whiles in this world they lieu;  
   Regard thy little flocke,  
   be thou to them a shield,  
   And them defend from greedy Wolues,  
   least overcome they yeeld.  
2. Haue mercie on vs all,  
   whose wayes most wicked are  
   And to the path of Paradice,  
   our speedy steps prepare.  
   Make vs to loue thy law,
and therein to delight,
For that is an oblation
most pleasant in thy sight.
3. Let me so leade my life,
that what I thinke or say,
Extend vnto the laud and praise,
of thee (my God) always.
In faith and in good workes (O God)
vouchsafe I may abound.
Nothing, though high of price,
and glorious to the eie,
Grant mightie God from thy precepts
may draw my feet awrie.

The entire ‘Plant of Pleasure’ is not only acrostic but also built around multiples of the number seven. In short, every section of Diamond was different in style to the previous one and would have given readers something godly to occupy their minds and comfort them. Any readers whose attention started to stray could have entertained themselves looking for words and numbers hidden in the text. It seems highly probable that Fleming wrote Diamond in order to confirm and secure his place as one of London’s foremost writer-correctors.

As discussed earlier in this chapter, Footepath had been dedicated to Sir George Carey, a significant choice of potential patron. Fleming also dedicated Diamond to Carey but this time included his wife “Ladie Elizabeth” in the dedication. In 1574 Carey had married Elizabeth Spencer, a relation of the poet Edmund Spenser, and they had a daughter also named Elizabeth. Carey was a keen patron of the arts and, like his father Henry Carey, supported the Lord Chamberlain’s Men, the acting troupe to which Shakespeare belonged. Both Lady Carey and later her daughter patronized artists and writers of the time, including their cousin Spenser.

Fleming’s choice of dedicatees demonstrates him doing four things: firstly, as with Footepath, he wanted to be patronized by one of Elizabeth’s closest courtiers, and likely hoped that Carey would perhaps pass the book on to the queen herself. Secondly, Diamond demonstrates Fleming hedging his bets: if Diamond did not win Sir George’s attention then perhaps Lady Carey would have enjoyed Diamond and patronized Fleming instead. Thirdly,
Fleming recognized that there was a highly literate female readership. The majority of these women were not taught Latin, but were more than capable of reading and appreciating the literary devices he demonstrated in *Diamond*. By dedicating *Diamond* to a woman Fleming acknowledged that there was a female audience that was not only in need of spiritual guidance and religious comfort but also in need of witty and cleverly constructed texts.

Fourthly, Fleming might have hoped that through Lady Carey his name would become known and perhaps he would be invited to work with the other fashionable literary writers of his era, such as Spenser. Fleming was most likely given editorial work by printers and sellers who needed an in-house corrector to edit and revamp texts that needed “polishing”.

However, his recommendatory poems might either have been commissioned by printers or Fleming might have been asked to provide prefatory material by his friends for their books (just as Newton provided the poem *Carmen Chronologicon* for his friend Fleming).145 Therefore dedicating books to people such as Lady Carey who were known to patronize other writers may have been another way in which Fleming could advertise his skill as a contributor and corrector to other writers.

There is no evidence that Lady Carey read *Diamond* and no evidence that the writers she patronized ever worked with Fleming, although Fleming possibly lodged with Gabriel Harvey, a close friend of Spenser’s.146 Yet something positive might have come from Fleming’s persistence in dedicating first *Footepath* and then *Diamond* to the Careys. Sir George Carey’s sister Catherine married Charles Lord Howard of Effingham. Shortly after Fleming was ordained he became chaplain to Howard. There could have been many ways in which Lord and Lady Howard became aware of Fleming and employed him as their chaplain. However, given the godly content of *Diamond* and the connection between this book, the Careys and the Howards it is likely that *Diamond* helped to bring Fleming to their attention.

145 See p. 197 and fn 347 also on p. 197.
146 See p. 209.
Fleming’s book was intended for a much wider audience than just courtiers and it is evident from within the text that Diamond was for both men and women. Thomas Bentley’s devotional work Mirror for Matrones (1582) stated in its title that his book was “for both sexes”. Diamond’s title gives the modern reader no such obvious clues as to Fleming’s intended audience. The gemstone borders are self-explanatory and not necessarily indicative of the status or gender of the book’s readers;¹⁴⁷ its title was after all Diamond of Devotion. and it follows that Denham, who was famed for his borders, would find or design a woodcut of a gemstone border for the pages of a book with such a title. The small size of the book, the flower metaphors and pretty gemstone borders might imply that Fleming’s target audience was in the main female comprising literate women who could read and understand the spiritual advice within the book and enjoy the wordplay Fleming had devised. Diamond might even have been a late girdle book, although the fashion for girdle books had waned considerably by the 1580s and there are no surviving clues as to how the books were originally bound.

The sermonising text, use of commas and alliteration make Diamond very easy to read out loud. Possibly the book served a dual purpose: it could be read quietly by adults and older children or read aloud to a younger child or a family group. The “A, B, C” format of Diamond’s ‘Schoole of Skill’ together with the colourful metaphors and pleasant garden imagery support the argument that this book was used by mothers to entertain and educate their young children. Certainly there is a hint of Erasmus’ teachings on etiquette and schooling about Fleming’s text.¹⁴⁸ Diamond’s ‘Grove of Graces’ was constructed in a similar way to modern children’s books, simply and clearly instructing the reader (or listener) to develop a daily routine of praying before and after meals. Perhaps when Fleming dedicated

¹⁴⁷ Elizabethan men were drawn to gems and diamonds and this gemstone, which represented the Sun, were considered a masculine stone for centuries.

¹⁴⁸ It is not known if Fleming read Erasmus but as an early English humanist and Calvinist, Erasmus’ views on predestination would have been of interest to him. Diamond could be seen as the next generation of educative texts that had been founded with Erasmus’ De Civilitate Morum Puerilium, which set out what a child should strive to achieve.
Diamond to Sir George and Lady Carey in 1581 he was aware that their daughter Elizabeth was then aged five, old enough to start learning the alphabet and absorbing godly lessons.

Diamond was not intended for an exclusively young or female readership since there was plenty of advice for gentlemen to be found within its pages. The following “Bees” advised attentive husbands to:

14 Be not delighted with an harlot for she is as bitter as wormwood, and as sharpe as a two edged sword.

15 Bee not pleasant and sportfull with a common woman, and embrace not the bosome of an harlot.149

19 Bee at defiance with a wicked and naughtie woman, for her house is the high way to hell…

22 Be conuersant with thy wife, and with such as bee of vnder-standing keepe companie.150

83 Bee a companion with honest women, but of wanton minions beware: for they are the verie doores of death.151

‘95 Be sober and continent among young women, in the presence of thy wife, least she burne in iealousie ouer thee.152

Almost certainly Diamond was intended for middle class or elite households and families. Readers who were well educated and familiar with the classical references and literary conventions of the day would certainly have gained a lot more from reading Diamond than a less literate reader. If the highly decorated Diamond was too pricey then the plainer Footepath printed in the same year was also available to buy.153 It is reasonable to assume

149 Fleming, Diamond, 1602 edn, pp. 230-1.
151 Ibid. p. 226.
152 Ibid. p. 228.
153 To give an idea of the cost of books at this time comparisons can be drawn from other titles whose values are known. Fleming’s 1579 book Conduit of Comfort containing sundrie comfortable prayers is almost identical in size to Diamond, having 368 pages and 16” format. A copy of Conduit was valued in the inventory of Cambridge student “Anon. 22” at one shilling in 1588. However, the value of books was dependent on a number of factors such as quality of paper or binding, which the buyer could choose themselves to suit their budget: Rev. William Anderson’s copy of Aelian’s A Registre of Hystories ("Englished" by Fleming) was valued at four shillings and six pence in 1586; Richard Collet’s copy of the same book was valued two years later at just eight pence. Those unable to afford an entire book might just purchase the quires they wanted unbound for a few pence.
that, as Denham printed Diamond and it was very carefully laid out and decorated with Denham’s famous borders, of the two Diamond would have been more expensive. This thesis argues that Diamond was intended for literate, middle class or higher ranking men and women and their children. This is echoed in the book’s dedication to Carey and his wife. Even a child, such as their young daughter, could have enjoyed listening to passages from the book, learning the A, B, C and looking for hidden words in the text.

Identifying Fleming’s intended readers has proven easier than identifying the various editions of the titles he produced. Certainly Footepath and Diamond have been the subjects of confused cataloguing in the past. Pollard and Redgrave made clear distinctions between the two titles in STC; the different editions of Diamond have their own STC numbers as do the two earlier editions of Footepath and the later Footpath. The British Library, Huntington Library and Harvard also make clear distinctions between the two titles. Other catalogues are less clear. For example the Folger Shakespeare Library’s “Hamnet” catalogue entry for Diamond (1581) brings up details for STC 11041, which is the correct STC number.

However the Folger’s records for Footepath (1581) bring up identical data with the same STC number (instead of the correct number 11039), which suggests Diamond and Footepath were the same book. This is positively misleading for anyone consulting the Folger’s catalogue because the two titles were produced by different printers and were not the same. Library binderies have also made their contribution to the confusion surrounding which book is which. The Folger copy of Diamond from 1586 was bound by Lewis and Sons who embossed what they supposed to be the title on the spine in gilt letters: “Fleming’s Footepath to Felicitie”. As has been discussed in this chapter, ‘Footepath to Felicitie’ was the name of a chapter within Diamond and not the title of this particular book.

Ultimately much of this confusion had been caused by Fleming himself: Fleming gave the first chapter of Diamond the heading ‘Footepath to Felicitie’. Therefore, any bewildered archivist in a hurry, who simply glanced at the title or contents page of Diamond, could make the assumption that Footepath was in fact the sub-title and not a book in its own right.
The religious messages in *Diamond* have also been called into question, in recent years at least. It is clear that *Diamond* was a godly book but since 1997 David Wootton has argued that *Diamond* was a Familist book and that Fleming himself was a member of the Family of Love.\(^{154}\) It is a highly improbable claim for a number of reasons. Wootton’s argument was founded on the relationship between Fleming and Reginald Scot. Fleming had contributed poetry and Latin translations to Scot’s *Discoverie of Witchcraft* in 1584. Wootton noted that Scot, a Kentish man, had contributed a section on Dover harbour to *Holinshed’s Chronicles*. In addition Fleming was given a biography written by Scot to commemorate his kinsman Sir Thomas Scot (presumably for inclusion in a further edition of *Holinshed’s Chronicles*). Scot, said Wootton, was a member of the Family of Love and as such he associated with other Familists such as Fleming with whom Scot worked closely. But this thesis argues that Scot and Fleming were not close. If, as Wootton claimed, Scot was a Familist, it is unrealistic to assume that Fleming was also, just because they occasionally contributed work to one another’s books. Fleming was employed by printers, booksellers and other writers to “polish” and embellish their books. In this way Fleming was associated with dozens of people throughout his career, of whom Scot was just one. There is no evidence that Scot and Fleming were particularly close, as one might expect had they been “brothers” within the Family. In fact it is unlikely that the two men ever met since Scot spent his life in Smeeth in rural Kent.\(^{155}\)

Wootton went on to comprehensively misinterpret Fleming’s career. He agreed with Patterson that Fleming was “insignificant”, “an easy target for gentle ridicule” and a “minor litterateur” with a “drab career”. This is not the case. Fleming was a significant figure, at times he may even have been a household name. He worked with a variety of London’s writers and leading printers; he wrote on an equally varied number of subjects, some of

---

\(^{154}\) Wootton, unpublished paper. This paper was revised to become Wootton’s ‘Reginald Scot/Abraham Fleming/The Family of Love’, in Stuart Clark (ed.), *Languages of Witchcraft*, (2000), pp.119-38. I refer to the latter.

\(^{155}\) See p. 179 and fn 322 on p. 179.
which were at the cutting edge of popular information. **Bushie Hair** (1579) was a scholarly translation of Bishop Synesius’ classic philosophical riposte *In Praise of Hair*, a witty book but hardly meriting ridicule as Wootton suggested. Fleming was an educated and motivated litterateur who gauged audiences well and was clearly respected by his colleagues. Fleming was evidently a good writer and editor and much in demand. Once ordained Fleming worked in the household of the Lord High Admiral and preached at Paul’s Cross, which was a pulpit reserved for safe, establishment preachers as opposed to the followers of cults. Fleming’s career has clearly been misunderstood by Wootton and was anything but drab.156

Wootton wrote that Fleming was “deferential to authority”, but verged on subversion. The only real evidence that he ever rebelled against authority came in a series of unpublished letters to the Privy Council relating to the castrations made to *Holinshed’s Chronicles*. These seem to be born of sheer frustration rather than a desire to be subversive because, after his spending three years overseeing, compiling and finishing *Holinshed’s Chronicles*, the Privy Council wanted some of these hard-won pages cut out of the printed book.157 Had Fleming been suspected of subversion, surely he would not have been accepted into the household of Howard of Effingham, a cousin of the queen and a Privy Counsellor. Neither would he have been allowed to preach at Paul’s Cross. Wootton also used Fleming’s “doom warning” writing as further evidence that he was a subversive Familist. If there was a propensity in Fleming’s writing to focus on terrible events then these must be seen in context: he frequently implied that he was short of money and such stories sold well. A look through the Stationers’ Company register attests to the popularity of pamphlets and ballads on subjects such as violent murders and monstrous births, savage dogs, tempests and lightening. Texts and passages on such topics illustrate Fleming in his role as popular reporter and crowd pleaser, not as Wootton wrote “verging on subversion”.

---

156 Wootton also states that Fleming was a respectable clergymen in 1579, which is inaccurate as Fleming was not ordained until 1588.
Wootton next claimed that Fleming was a catholic sympathizer, again misinterpreting his involvement in blatantly anti-catholic satire such as *Beehive of the Romish Church* (1579) and *Godly and Learned Exposition upon the Proverbes of Solomon* (1580). Wootton also passed over Fleming’s countless references to the Pope as antichrist (many of which can be read in *Diamond*, the very book Wootton uses to support his erroneous argument). Wootton also neglected to mention that Fleming entered the household of the admiral who defeated the Spanish Armada. The only catholic text associated with Fleming was the French version of *Straunge and Terrible Wunder* (1577) translated by Roland Jenkes in 1578 and printed in France (as explained on pp. 51-2). Jenkes was entirely responsible for the pamphlet’s catholic sympathies since Fleming’s original is godly bordering on puritanical, and there is no evidence that Jenkes had any dealings with Fleming personally. Fleming was a protestant sympathizer; this is confirmed by his involvement with texts such as *Certain comfortable expositions*, which commemorated the protestant martyr Bishop John Hooper. Similarly Wootton wrote that Scot was a Sadducee, despite “[Scot’s] own insistence that he is not a Sadducee.”

Throughout his career Fleming’s *modus operandi* was to take inaccessible Latin texts and ‘English’ them, making them accessible to a much wider audience. He said so himself in the preface to *A Registre of Hystories*: “I thought I should highly honour God, and do great good to this lande if I undertooke the translation of the same.” Since almost everything Fleming wrote was in English, this thesis argues that he disliked keeping information from others and preferred transparency. Fleming wanted to make religion accessible to as many people as possible in order to spread a *godly* message. To claim he was part of the secretive Family of Love is wholly inconsistent with Fleming’s own agenda. Furthermore, *Diamond* was an openly *godly* book containing godly protestant references to predestination and the passages within it suggest that Fleming was familiar with the Geneva version of the Bible. Fleming openly uses the word ‘godly’ throughout the text. It is true that there are hidden words in *Diamond*’s pages, but this demonstrates Fleming’s love of hiding his own name in his

---

158 Wootton, ‘Abraham Fleming’, p. 121
poems; there are no subversive messages in the text. Similarly in Scot’s Discoverie Fleming hid his identity by using the mysterious and exotic “Gnimelf Maharba”, his name written backwards. Yet this pseudonym was surely tongue-in-cheek as the whole point of Discoverie was to dispel the existence of mysterious forces.

Diamond was printed in 1581, a year which Wootton believed was significant. The founder of the Family of Love, Hendrick Niclaes, is thought to have died in 1580 and the following year the cult came under attack in England. Several Familists were arrested and a royal proclamation against the cult was issued. Part of Wootton’s argument in favour of Fleming being a Familist rests on Diamond being printed in 1581 in order to support the cult in its hour of darkness. However, fundamentally Diamond was a reworking of Footepath, which had been written and published in 1578 so Diamond itself was not necessarily written specifically to support the Family of Love. Furthermore Fleming was involved with six books in 1581. In each year between 1575 and 1580 Fleming’s output had been a mixture of scholarly, popular and godly titles, but 1581 is unusual in that all six of his works were godly: he reworked Footepath and Diamond; he collated Manuall of Christian Prayers made by [...] Godlie men such as Calvin, Luther etc.; he contributed a ‘Godly and fruteful prayer’ to Golding’s puritan text True Beleefe of a Christian Man; he contributed a letter to John Aylmer (who had been ordained by the puritan Archbishop Grindal) in True Beleefe; and Fleming translated Savonarola’s book Meditations on the 31st and 51st Psalms. It could be more accurate to say that his concern with promoting godly writing was a reaction against cults such as the Family of Love, and not to support the Familists.

Much of Wootton’s evidence for Fleming being a Familist rests on construing certain words or phrases which appear in the text of Diamond and other books: “love”, “loving friends” (a term later adopted by Quakers) and “familie”. Wootton argued that Fleming and Scot had used such words in significant parts of their texts because they were Familists. This thesis argues that Fleming was responsible for approximately four-million words going to print during his literary career. Statistically many of these words must have been the same as those
used by Familists. Wootton did not discuss the fact that Fleming also referred to concepts such as election and predestination, which were unambiguous protestant terms.

Wootton went on to say that Fleming was neither a “superstitious papist” nor a “cavilling schismatic” (quoting from Diamond). This is hardly proof that Fleming was a Familist doing battle with all other Christian denominations. Instead, if taken in context, it is entirely in keeping with Elizabeth’s dislike of all religious extremists, hence her removal of the “hotter sort of protestant” like the godly Archbishop Grindal and her preference for moderate men such as Matthew Parker. Diamond is an establishment book dedicated to the queen’s cousin and entirely in keeping with current mainstream thought on religion.

Wootton also placed great store in Fleming’s and Scot’s reading of the Bible as metaphor rather than historical fact. This use of metaphor was not exclusive to Familists or their texts. Fleming’s black dog in Wunder was a metaphor of God’s wrath, as were the earthquakes and comets Fleming wrote about. Fleming also referred to the Bible as a “looking-glass”, a word that Wootton said had Familist significance. However, Fleming used the mirror metaphor in other titles as well, for example Panoplie of Epistles or a looking glass for the unlearned (1576) contained letters by Tully, Pliny, etc. gathered and translated by Fleming. Mirrors were popular metaphors throughout the period Fleming was active and they appeared in the titles of many books such as Calahorra’s Mirror of Princely deedes and knighthood (1578), A Looking-Glass for London and England by Thomas Lodge (1594), and Higgin’s Mirour for Magistrates (1610).

Wootton’s final claim was that Familists had friends in high places. His evidence for this claim is that Familists dedicated their books to certain people of rank. The example Wootton used was Fleming’s dedication in True Beleefe to the Bishop of London because Aylmer was a fellow Familist, but Wootton was mistaken. Writers did not necessarily dedicate books to their friends or people they already knew. Instead, writers dedicated books to people who they wanted to attract the attention of in order to get patronage. Therefore dedicatees would
be prominent figures. If what Wootton said was true and Familists were dedicating books to their existing “friends in high places” then not only was Fleming a Familist but in 1591 he had become a friend of the Earl of Leicester, even though Leicester had died in 1588. The evidence in this thesis demonstrates strongly that Fleming was a godly man and an establishment man. Wootton’s links between Scot, Fleming and Familism are interesting but certainly not “genuine”, nor are the claims as “robust” as Wootton said they were. Fleming was a godly man, possibly he was a Calvinist but he was not a member of the Family of Love. Diamond demonstrates Fleming at his godly protestant best.

****

Footepath of Faith and Diamond of Devotion are interesting and important books. They mark a high point in Fleming’s career where he moved away from short, popular collaborations and began to write his own lengthier books. Denham’s involvement with Diamond in particular illustrates that Fleming was a highly regarded author: London’s leading printer produced this book, as well as some of Fleming’s other projects. Both Footepath and Diamond were dedicated to high-ranking courtiers, Sir George and Lady Carey. This indicates that Fleming was trying to move himself and his career away from the less influential characters on the periphery of Elizabeth’s court (to whom his earlier works had been dedicated) and secure himself a well-placed patron. A few years after writing Diamond, Fleming was indeed employed by Carey’s brother-in-law, the Lord High Admiral of England.

Putting aside the individual people involved with these books, Footepath and Diamond reveal a lot about the wider audience reading these books. They were an educated readership.

---

159 In 1591 an edition of Fleming’s Alphabet of Prayers, originally by James Chancellor, was “newlie drawn into order” by Fleming and printed with a dedication to Robert Dudley. Dudley was dead but the Fleming left the dedication in the book.

160 Fleming had dedicated three earlier books to Sir William Cordell, an agent of Lord Burghley, and wrote that he did not crave a new patron. However Cordell died in 1581 leaving Fleming in need of a new patron.
able to understand the different metrical and poetical devices Fleming used. Readers were capable of understanding his word-play and of enjoying looking for words and patterns of letters within the different chapters. They were probably family people with a small household who may have gathered together at the end of each day to listen to sections from _Diamond_ being read aloud.

_Footepath_ and _Diamond_ also reveal something of the climate of their day. They were pocket-sized books suggesting that buyers wanted reading material to carry with them. A gentleman could tuck a copy into his sleeve pocket, or possibly a lady reader might have hung the little book from her girdle. It is more likely that _Footepath_ and _Diamond_ were kept close to hand because they were spiritually comforting and reassuring; _Diamond_ in particular was laid out in such a way that its sections could be dipped into and referred to quickly should consolation be required. It must be remembered that when _Footepath_ and _Diamond_ were printed and reprinted England was in fear of assassination attempts on the queen (endorsed by the Vatican) and the threat of invasion from catholic Spain. Any godly reader worried about catholicism would have found _Footepath_ and _Diamond_’s pages “verie comfortable” because of their anti-catholic overtones. Yet they were not overly puritanical either. This not only demonstrates Fleming’s role as a popular and successful writer firmly ensconced within Elizabeth’s England, but also his continued relevance well into the seventeenth century. Interest in Fleming’s next major book, _Holinshed’s Chronicles_, continued for four centuries after it was printed, and it is this book that is the subject of the next chapter.
Chapter Four:

Fleming and the development of Holinshed’s Chronicles (1587)

In January 1587 one of the most ambitious literary projects ever realized finally went to press. This was the second edition of Holinshed’s Chronicles or, to use its full title The first and second volumes of Chronicles comprising 1 The description and historie of England 2 The description and historie of Ireland 3 The description and historie of Scotland: first collected and published by Raphaell Holinshed, William Harrison, and others: now newlie augmented and continued (with manifolde matters of singular note and worthie memory) to the yeare 1586. By John Hooker alias Vowell Gent. and others. With conuenient tables at the end of these volumes. The third volume of Chronicles, beginning at Duke William the Norman first compiled by Raphaell Holinshed and by him extended to 1577, nowe newlie continued to 1586.

The complete text comprised three folio-sized volumes bound as two books. In the first binding were Volumes I and II, which had their own title pages. Volume I, originally by William Harrison, was titled “The Description and historie of England”. Volume II’s title was “The second volume of Chronicles: conteining the description, conquest, inhabitation and troublesome estate of Ireland,” by John Hooker. ‘Annexed’ at the end of the Irish section of Volume II was “The description of Scotland” by Francis Thynne, who based this section on Harrison and Holinshed’s text from the first edition of Holinshed’s Chronicles (1577), which was in turn based on a translation of Boethius. Volume III was bound on its own and titled ‘The third Volume of Chronicles, beginning at duke William the Norman […] first compiled by Raphaell Holinshed and by him extended to the yeare 1577. Now newlie recognised […] to the yeare 1586’. At the end of Volume III was a 58 page “table” or index. The other two volumes had their own indexes as well.

Holinshed’s Chronicles is the only one of the works associated with Fleming to have been studied in any depth and although the extent of his contribution to the text has caused
contention in the past, Fleming’s editorial role is now generally agreed upon by most scholars. It would be impossible to describe and discuss all aspects of Holinshed’s Chronicles within the context of this thesis. There exist elsewhere comparisons and analyses of the text, the excisions, the replacement material and of the political climate that necessitated the development of Holinshed’s Chronicles. These studies, the most recent by Oxford University’s “Holinshed Project” team, have largely been text-oriented, analysing the physical evidence from 1587. The precise role played by Fleming has never been established and this thesis argues that without Fleming the second edition of Holinshed’s Chronicles would have been little short of impossible. This chapter will therefore clarify and add to what has already been established about Fleming’s work on Holinshed’s Chronicles. It will also provide new insights into the role he played in order to show the extent to which he was responsible for the book. This chapter will argue that no other candidate for the position of overall editor had an established relationship with Holinshed’s Chronicles’ printer. Fleming also had developed working relationships with both the Privy Council and the syndicate who initiated the second edition of Holinshed’s Chronicles. Uniquely among those involved with Holinshed’s Chronicles production, Fleming had the knowledge and experience of writing, ‘gathering’, editing and indexing that was crucial to the book’s compilation.

The edition of Holinshed’s Chronicles printed in 1587 was compiled by contributing antiquaries over at least three years who drew on dozens of antiquarian sources and accounts. A syndicate of five London printer/booksellers financed Holinshed’s Chronicles’ production and one of the syndicate, Denham, was responsible for printing the entire text. Understandably given its enormous scope, Holinshed’s Chronicles was approximately three-and-a-half million words long. An inventory of Dr Andrew Perne’s library stated that his copy of Holinshed’s Chronicles was worth 33 s 4d in 1589, a very large price tag to match a

---

161 The Stationers’ Company register shows that Holinshed’s Chronicles was initially registered to a syndicate of five printer/sellers on 6 October 1584 and again to the printers Henry Denham and Ralph Newberie on 30 December 1584. Denham aside, the syndicate comprised booksellers, not printers.

162 Booth put this figure into real terms: the 1587 Holinshed’s Chronicles was the same length as the Bible, the complete dramatic works of Shakespeare, Samuel Richardson’s Clarissa, Boswell’s Life of Johnson, and Tolstoy’s War and Peace combined. See Booth, Holinshed’s Chronicles, p.1.
very large and lavish book. It is likely that the book was lavish because the Privy Council instigated this second edition of Holinshed’s Chronicles as a propaganda exercise. Almost as soon as the book went on sale the Privy Council withdrew it and ordered that pages of politically sensitive text be removed, a process that was repeated when the amended version became available. Those copies already sold were recalled (although a handful of examples of the cancelled pages survived, allowing subsequent generations a glimpse of the sensitive material they contained).

By the time it was finished, the 1587 text was not so much Holinshed’s as Fleming’s Chronicles, as the second edition was dramatically different from its predecessor. It was printed on larger pages and two hundred woodcut illustrations were taken out in order to make more room for text, and to modernize the overall look of the book. With content almost doubled, the second edition was at least one-and-a-half-million words longer than the first edition. Fleming contributed text throughout the entire book; notably he reworked Volume I, Harrison’s 1577 ‘Description and Historie of England’. He also liaised closely with the Privy Council throughout Holinshed’s Chronicles’ production, not just at the end when the rounds of censoring took place, and he wrote the replacement sections following the censoring. Fleming checked the references to other writers’ works, cross-referenced the text and he also created the indexes. When Holinshed’s Chronicles was finally printed Fleming took a complete book from the first run and went through almost every page proof-reading and correcting the text. This was a lot of work, so Fleming enlisted three antiquaries to help him compile some of the text.

163 See the inventory of Perne’s private library in Peterhouse archive. 33 s 4 d would have a relative worth of about £280 today [http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/currency, accessed 20 April 2011].
164 PRO PC 2/14 f. 264, 1 February 1586/7.
165 The reasons for the Privy Council’s amendments are explained on pp. 114-7.
166 Compare this quantity of additional text to a standard copy of the Bible, which is 773,692 words in length, or to the lengthy third edition of Samuel Richardson’s Clarissa (1748) at just over one million words in length.
167 This corrected copy is now called the Melton Holinshed and is in the Huntington Library, shelfmark HL.478000.
Fleming and the contributing antiquaries:

The first edition of Holinshed’s Chronicles had been compiled and edited by Raphael Holinshed until he was joined in June or July 1576 by William Harrison, who consented to write the ‘Description’ that formed Volume I. This borrowed heavily from Harrison’s own unpublished ‘Chronology’. Together they had reworked and drawn on a very large range of sources from other writers, both dead and living, whom they acknowledged in an alphabetical list at the start of the book. Remarkably some sections had been written by third parties such as known catholics Edmund Campion and Richard Stanihurst, who were considered experts in their field (in their cases Irish history). Although Holinshed’s Chronicles was rooted in protestantism, it would seem that Holinshed and the contributors set aside their religious differences and came together as subject specialists in order to produce an authoritative text. In 1580 Holinshed died; Campion was executed in 1581 for his staunch catholicism and refusal to acknowledge Elizabeth as queen of England and Stanihurst had left England to pursue his interest in alchemy and catholicism. William Harrison was the only original contributor available for work on the 1587 edition of Holinshed’s Chronicles but he did not play an active role on the second edition, since he had only reluctantly written the ‘Description’ for Holinshed’s first edition. From 1583 Harrison was trying to produce his own three-volume ‘Chronology’. Like Holinshed’s Chronicles this contained a history of England’s monarchs from 1066 to 1593, when Harrison died. Fleming reused Harrison’s ‘Description of England’ from 1576 and augmented it with the section entitled ‘Of the Divisions of the Whole Earth’. However, the second edition required

168 Glyn Parry, ‘William Harrison’, in ODNB vol. 25, (2004), pp. 538-9; p. 539. See also online version: Glyn Parry, ‘Harrison, William (1535-1593)’ [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/12453, last accessed 8 June 2011]. Harrison only consented to help Holinshed after being promised that he could publish his ‘Chronology’ within Holinshed’s Chronicles, but this promise was never fully realised.
170 Harrison’s manuscript is in the British Library, shelfmark BL Add MS 70984.
171 Parry, ‘William Harrison’, p. 539. Parry suggests towards the end of this biography that Harrison made the revisions to ‘Description of England’ in 1587. However I would argue that Harrison was absorbed with his ‘Chronology’ and, following his experience in 1577, possibly disillusioned with Holinshed’s Chronicles and was therefore not actively involved with this text in the 1580s. It also seems unlikely that Harrison would compile his own ‘Chronology’ whilst simultaneously working on a rival chronicle. A parallel might be drawn with John Stow, see. p. 97.
fresh writers and they were Francis Thynne, John Stow and John Hooker. Thynne put together the material for the Scottish sections in Volume II; Stow provided many of the sources behind much of the text and also provided some passages of his own; according to its title page Hooker “newlie augmented and continued” Volume I (Harrison’s ‘Description’ aside) and contributed the Irish section to Volume II. Exactly how much each of the antiquaries contributed to the text and the nature of their contributions has been open for debate in the past, although there is sufficient evidence provided by the antiquaries themselves to help settle such questions.

Thynne (alias Francis Boteville) was born in Kent in about 1544 or 1545. He led a colourful life as a herald, historian, alchemist, scholar of Chaucer, and from 1591 a member of the College of Antiquaries. Throughout his life Thynne endured chronic financial problems, even destitution, and spent two years imprisoned in Southwark for debt. He died in November 1608 after suffering from “unmercyfull Gowte” that he said “mannacled my hands, fettered my feete to the sheet”. 172

As with Fleming, Thynne’s contributions to Chronicles have been overlooked and misunderstood in the past. He was a prolific antiquary and, as well as providing the Scottish sections for Holinshed’s Chronicles, contributed information about people and places in the form of his lists; examples include his list of ‘English treasurers’, ‘England’s chancellors’ and ‘Lords Cobham and lords warden of the Cinque Ports’. 173 Many lists were removed from Holinshed’s Chronicles before it was printed, although these excisions were likely to do with content rather than the monotony that modern scholars have ascribed to Thynne’s work. His contemporaries viewed Thynne as a good scholar and central figure in the College of Antiquaries, and he attracted the patronage of Lord Burghley and Lord Cobham among others. Yet, despite his scholarly reputation and powerful connections, where Holinshed’s Chronicles was concerned Thynne answered to Fleming.

173 Ibid. p. 738.
Thynne has never been put forward as a serious contender in the debates to establish who was in overall charge of Holinshed’s Chronicles. This is because he took himself out of any future debate: Thynne’s list “Particular catalogue of all such who have purposlie in severall histories of this realme” catalogued English historians by name only but uniquely Fleming’s name was followed by “posterior in hisce chronicis detergendis atque dilantandis, una cum aberrimorum indicum accessione, plurimum desudavit”. Translated this reads “Abraham Fleming sweated heavily in the correction and expansion of these chronicles, together with the addition of the very useful indexes”. Thynne thereby acknowledged Fleming as the editor, indexer and main contributor. The roles of Fleming’s other contributors have been less easy to define.

Stow (c.1524–1605) is perhaps the best known of all those involved in Holinshed’s Chronicles and his fame is well deserved as he was “the most productive historical writer of the sixteenth century”. Stow was a compulsive manuscript buyer; he had purchased Reyner Wolfe’s collection of Leland’s antiquarian writing that formed the basis for the first edition of Holinshed’s Chronicles. Much of the material in the second edition of Holinshed’s Chronicles attributed to Stow was in fact taken from Leland; this was accepted practice as the role of an antiquary was to preserve and interpret older sources. Stow was a focused yet irascible character and throughout his life felt wronged and bore grudges. He became bitter at the lack of recognition he had received for his efforts on Holinshed’s Chronicles and, in his Annales of England (1592), Stow claimed Holinshed’s Chronicles as his own book. However, it was Fleming who was the book’s editor and compiler.

The evidence against Stow being the main editor of Holinshed’s Chronicles, or even a sub-editor, has always been evident in the text of Holinshed’s Chronicles itself. The following

\footnote{175 See pp. 111-2.}
anonymous editorial note from Volume III, which is written in the first person, refers to Stow in the third person, so this editor’s comment was not written by Stow:

Thus farre I have continued this collection of the English histories, noting breflie in these yeares, such things as I find in the abridgement of Richard Grafton, and in the sumarie of John Stow, increased somewhat (as may appeare) in places with such helpes as have come to my hand.\textsuperscript{176}

Stow’s name did appear in Holinshed’s Chronicles. For example, the title page of the ‘Continuation’ reads:

THE CHRONICLES OF England, from the yeare of our Lord 1576, where Raphaell Holinshed left; supplied and continued to this present yeare 1586: by John Stow, and others.\textsuperscript{177}

Although this suggested Stow as principal author of the ‘Continuation’ the title was followed by a folio-length introductory ‘Epistle’ that closes with a short poem:

\begin{center}
\textit{Cui vitam, studiumque Deus, regni\ae\que coronam}
\textit{Perpetuet, beet, \& tranquillo prosperet usu:}
\textit{Postque, hanc exactam vitam, stadium atque coronam,}
\textit{Coelesti vita, studio, diademate donet.}
\end{center}

\textit{A.F.}\textsuperscript{178}

Fleming was “A. F.”, he wrote the epistle and much of what followed. Where Stow’s name appeared elsewhere in the text it is in this or a similar form: “Abraham Fleming from John Stow”. Dodson has noted that this “argues strongly that Stow was not supervising the main narrative himself but was furnishing parts of the material for Fleming’s use”.\textsuperscript{179} Stow himself was openly jealous of Holinshed’s Chronicles, and in the conclusion of Annales (1605) he vowed to produce a “farre larger” and better volume hitherto prevented “by printing and reprinting (without warrant or well liking) of Raigne Wolfes collection and other late

\textsuperscript{176} Holinshed’s Chronicles vol. III (1587), 1267. The copy referred to is the Melton Holinshed in the Huntington Library, California, which I visited to see at first-hand.

\textsuperscript{177} Ibid. p. 1268, again from the Melton Holinshed’s Chronicles in the Huntington Library.

\textsuperscript{178} Ibid. p. 1269. The struck through “n” and superscript “r” were added by hand, this particular copy being the one that was proof read and corrected.

comers, by the name of Raphael Holinshed his Chronicles”. Had he been in charge of Holinshed’s Chronicles, Stow would presumably have shown pride rather than the animosity he displayed towards the book.

This evidence argues strongly that Thynne and Stow were subordinate to Fleming and provided material for his use in Holinshed’s Chronicles but a third contributor, Hooker, is still considered by some to be the book’s main editor. Hooker was educated at Oxford then Cologne, where he studied Law. He travelled Europe and lived with Peter Martyr in Strasbourg before returning to England where he was employed by Miles Coverdale, Bishop of Exeter. Hooker loved Exeter and wrote extensively about the city and surrounding county of Devon.

Throughout the nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries it was thought that Hooker had been the man in charge, he was a well-known antiquary with a glowing entry in the original DNB. However, in his more recent ODNB entry for Hooker, Mendyk concedes that the antiquary was at one time thought to be the principal editor; that position is now more often ascribed to Abraham Fleming, but Hooker’s contribution was certainly a major one.

Hooker’s ‘Order and Usage’ was incorporated in the English section of Holinshed’s Chronicles and he also provided the ‘Epistle Dedicatory’ for Volume II. He furnished Fleming with an updated history of Ireland, which included a translation of Gerald of Wales’ Expugnatio Hibernica and a condensed version of his own ‘Life of Sir Peter Carew’.

However, other scholars still champion Hooker despite the weight of evidence being in Fleming’s favour. In his ODNB entry for Francis Thynne, Louis Knafla made his opinion clear:

---

183 Ibid.
After the death of Raphael Holinshed in 1580, Thynne, together with Abraham Fleming and John Stow, was employed by John Hooker, who acted as editor, to continue Holinshed’s Chronicles.  

The text and marginal notes throughout Holinshed’s Chronicles show that Hooker’s submissions, as well as those of the other contributors, were made via Fleming. For example:

But for the further and cleerer explanation of these stratagems, or rather civill tumults [in 1470] it shall not be amisse to insert in this place (sith I cannot hit upon more convenient) a verie good note or addition received from the hands of maister John Hooker, chamberlaine of Excester.

Clarifying Fleming’s role:

Fleming’s contemporaries acknowledged him as the editor and contributor responsible for the second edition of Holinshed’s Chronicles. Obvious evidence can be seen in the book itself. A prefatory poem ‘Carmen Chronologicon’ by Thomas Newton, poet, not only named Fleming but added “Doctaque Flemingi lima polivit opus”. The word lima had been used since classical times to describe those who perfected and revised literary works. The word opus is given without qualification: Fleming was the man who revised and polished the entire work. His contemporaries also knew that Fleming was collecting manuscript sources to help him write sections of Holinshed’s Chronicles. Newton handed Fleming a copy of the speech made by Queen Elizabeth in Cambridge in 1564. This had been “lieng among my [Newton’s] papers these twentie yeares and more, I thought it good now to send it to you [Fleming], that if anie occasion be fitlie offered in the discourse of hir highnesse reigne, you maie (if you please) insert it.”

---

185 Holinshed’s Chronicles, vol. I (1587), 675; a close inspection of the marginal signatures in this section of the text shows that Fleming wrote the chapter, drawing on Hall and Hooker as sources.
186 Newton also wrote of his friendship with Fleming in a poem prefixed to A Shorte Dictionarie in 1586. See fn 348, p. 197.
188 Newton to Fleming cited in Miller, ‘Samuel Fleming’, p. 93.
Thynne’s ‘Particular Catalog’ of English chroniclers referred to Fleming “posterior in hisce chronicis detergendis atque dilantandis una cum uberrimorum indicum accessione, plurimum desudavit”. Fleming “sweated heavily in the correction and expansion” and additionally compiled the “very useful indexes”. His contemporaries knew that Fleming was the researcher behind, editor of, major contributing writer to and the indexer of Holinshed’s Chronicles. Despite this, academics have queried and disputed Fleming’s role. It has only been within the last few years that Fleming’s leading role has begun to be understood in terms of the production of Holinshed’s Chronicles. But even the research of Donno and Clegg has not yet explored the complex and established communication network that lay behind Holinshed’s Chronicles.

The first half of the twentieth century brought little clarity to the question of who exactly was behind Holinshed’s Chronicles and, with renowned antiquaries like Stow and Hooker in the running, Fleming was not considered a serious contender. Probably this was because of Cooper’s dismissive biographical entry on Fleming in DNB that barely mentions Holinshed’s Chronicles, other than to list it towards the end of the article as “newlie digested” and “enlarged” by Fleming. 189

The early studies of Holinshed’s Chronicles were narrowly focused on Shakespeare because the playwright referred to this book (as well as other chronicles and histories) when he composed thirteen of his history plays. 190 Scholars fixated on establishing which sections Shakespeare had used and a reference volume titled Shakespeare’s Holinshed was

189 Cooper, ‘Abraham Fleming’, in DNB, pp. 271-3. Cooper used a number of earlier bibliographic sources including Lowndes.

190 Booth listed the plays for which Holinshed’s Chronicles was the sole source as King John, Richard II, both Henry IVs and Henry V. Holinshed’s Chronicles was one of the sources for King Lear, Richard III and Shakespeare’s three Henry VI plays. Holinshed’s Chronicles was also a major source for Macbeth. Shakespeare relied heavily on Holinshed’s Chronicles for Cymbeline, while the book was closely followed in Shakespeare’s Henry VIII.
subsequently printed.\textsuperscript{191} To date the studies of \textit{Holinshed’s Chronicles} have been predominately “Shakespeare-centric”:

> The vast scope of the book, and the lack of a complete scholarly edition, has meant that it has eluded systematic analysis. With one or two exceptions such work on Holinshed as we’ve got centres on the sections dramatized by Shakespeare.\textsuperscript{192}

The work by Oxford University’s Holinshed Project team moved away from this “Shakespeare-centric” use of the book and aimed to “stimulate comprehensive reappraisal of the \textit{Holinshed’s Chronicles} as a work of historiography and a source for imaginative writers”.\textsuperscript{193} The way in which \textit{Holinshed’s Chronicles} was put together, the problems surrounding removing and replacing the excised text and the reasons for censoring the sections that were altered continue to inspire today’s scholars. The reasons for the book’s recall and the role played by \textit{Holinshed’s Chronicles} in English politics, as well as \textit{Holinshed’s Chronicles}’ use as propaganda are problems that are steadily being clarified. Like \textit{Holinshed’s Chronicles} itself, Fleming’s role needs a comprehensive reappraisal.

Previous studies have left too many errors and gaps in our understanding of his work on the book.

Cooper’s \textit{DNB} entry did no more than repeat what \textit{Holinshed’s Chronicles}’ title page said to show that Fleming responsible for portions of the second edition of \textit{Holinshed’s Chronicles}, namely the ‘Historie of England’ and third volume.\textsuperscript{194} It would seem that the first brief studies of Fleming gave him considerable responsibility as editor but questions regarding evidence from \textit{Holinshed’s Chronicles}’ content were unsolved problems. Scholars who began examining \textit{Holinshed’s Chronicles} most likely concentrated on the better established


\textsuperscript{192} See the Holinshed Project home page at \url{http://www.cems.ox.ac.uk/holinshed/} (accessed December 28, 2010).

\textsuperscript{193} The Holinshed Project editorial team members are Dr Felicity Heal, Dr Paulina Kewes, Dr Henry Summerson and Dr Ian Archer.

\textsuperscript{194} Venn and Venn’s \textit{Alumni Cantabrigienses} entry in 1922, which was based on Cooper’s \textit{DNB} entry, echoed this. Walker described Fleming as “editor of Holinshed”, see Walker, \textit{Peterhouse Biographical Register} (1927), p. 290.
antiquaries Stow and Hooker because they could not reconcile Cooper’s dismissal of Fleming with this large, complex and historically important book.

Several lengthier studies were also produced. Dodson’s ‘Abraham Fleming, writer and editor’ (1955) and Miller’s ‘Abraham Fleming: editor of Shakespeare’s Holinshed’ (1959), which both seated Fleming firmly at the editor-in-chief’s desk. Dodson conceded that her study was based on Holinshed’s Chronicles’ title pages and signatures rather than a study of the main text. Her evidence was that each contributing writer clearly labelled his contribution with his name or initials. In the case of Thynne for example, his lists and chronological records are very obviously “by Thynne” or “F.T.”. Sections written by Stow have his name or initials (“I.S.”) next to them in the margin, although these are rarer. Similarly the sections by Fleming have “Abr. Fl.” or “A. F.” or his full name beside them.

Where Fleming drew on a source he annotated the section, for example “Abraham Fleming from John Stow”.

Dodson continued:

The fact that nearly all the added allusions to Stow are put in this form argues strongly that Stow was not supervising the main narrative himself but was furnishing parts of the material for Fleming’s use.

Fleming’s contributions to Volume I of Holinshed’s Chronicles are therefore easy to spot and very numerous. Dodson noted that some contributions were first-hand accounts by Fleming “spectator and auditor”. Certainly he attended and wrote about Dr Richard Caldwell’s surgical lectures of 1582; moralising and godly passages were likely Fleming’s.

---

196 The marginalia in earlier print runs are in many instances different to those of copies printed later. There are a few instances in her article in which Dodson cites a marginal signature that does not actually exist in some copies of the printed text. For example she says on p. 59 of her article that “in the margin Fleming is named as the author of the story on the Babington conspiracy (p. 1553)”. However, neither the British Library’s copy nor the Book Club of California fragment had this marginal reference on p. 1553. Dodson was likely using a later, updated copy of this edition, possibly the Huntington Bridgewater copy. Similarly, Dodson said that on p. 1349 of Volume III “Fleming indicates in the margin that he was a spectator and auditor when Dr. Richard Caldwell delivered an address in Latin”. There is no marginal note of this kind on p. 1349 of the Melton copy of Volume III of Holinshed’s Chronicles but in the transcription by the Holinshed Project this note is in the margin.
197 Ibid. (Abraham Fleming writer and editor), p. 58.
198 Ibid. p. 58.
such as the passage closing the history of Mary Tudor’s reign signed “Abr. Fl. ex I. F. martyrologio”. 199

There is, though, evidence which Dodson missed that demonstrates Fleming was the man who not only ‘gathered’ the contributions to Volume I but also wrote Volume III of Holinshed’s Chronicles. Fleming included accounts of Sir Martin Frobisher’s three voyages to find the Northwest Passage in the mid-late 1570s (pp. 1262, 1270 and 1271 of the ‘Continuation’). 200 Fleming had contributed celebratory poetry to two first-hand accounts of the voyages written by Frobisher’s crew. 201 He was able to draw on these accounts, which were likely to have been “seen and allowed” by the Privy Council and carefully composed so as to advertise England’s greatness at sea. These were exactly the sort of stories the Privy Council wanted in Holinshed’s Chronicles because they enhanced the image of the English and their achievements. Dodson did not connect the account of “strange sickness at Oxford” that occurred in July 1577 (p. 1270-1271 of the ‘Continuation’) with Fleming. This fatal sickness followed Jenkes’ arraignment for sedition and it is likely that Jenkes was the author of a banned English pamphlet account of the mortalities that included a catholic version of Fleming’s Wunder. 202 The Holinshed’s Chronicles’ account of Jenkes’ arraignment and the ensuing mortalities at Oxford was longer than the entire section given to Frobisher’s expedition. This suggests that the condemnation of Jenkes carried as much weight as Frobisher’s pioneering ventures. It is likely that Fleming used Holinshed’s Chronicles to remind readers that Jenkes

199 Meaning “Abraham Fleming from John Foxe martyrologist”. Holinshed Chronicles vol. I (1587), 1162.
200 Ibid. p. 64.
201 These were Dionysis Settle’s True report of the Laste Voyage into the west and north-west regions (1577) and Thomas Ellis’ True report of the third and Laste Voyage [of] Martin Frobisher (1578), which are both discussed on pp. 164-7.
202 As discussed on pp. 52-4.
had twisted his godly pamphlet. This section was written by Fleming: “Ab. Fl. ex relatu W. B. impress, 1577”.

Dodson’s evidence included the first-hand accounts of the discovery of the Babington plot and Mary Queen of Scots’ downfall, signed “by A. F.” However, Dodson did not connect these passages with a number of manuscript sources in Fleming’s possession that described the plot and Mary’s trial. Linking Fleming’s papers with his first-hand account strengthens his position as sole author of the ‘Continuation’.

Similarly, Dodson noted Fleming’s account of the engineering works at Dover carried out by Sir Thomas Scot in 1586, but did not consider the link between Sir Thomas Scot and Fleming. That link was Sir Thomas’ cousin the demonologist Reginald Scot, whom Fleming had assisted in 1584. Their association, albeit a long-distance one as Scot lived in rural Kent, meant that Scot could have furnished Fleming with first hand material on Sir Thomas’ engineering feats and enabled Fleming accurately to research as well as write this detailed section for Holinshed’s Chronicles.

Miller developed Dodson’s argument that Fleming was not only a major contributor to but also editor of Holinshed’s Chronicles’ (“learned corrector”). Miller described Fleming as a reputable editor already endowed with considerable responsibility and authority over the books produced in Denham’s shop. He also demonstrated that Fleming wrote his prefatory

---

203 Who Fleming’s source “W. B.” was is not yet known. The fatalities were “verie well perceiued by sir William Babington” and Fleming wrote that “W. B.” “was present himselfe with Babington”, but this might be a device to suggest Babington was not the source, when in fact he was (see Holinshed’s Chronicles vol. III, 1270). “W. B.” might allude to the printer William Brome or Broome who later produced Commonplaces of Peter Martyr (see pp. 185–8) and Scot’s Discoverie of Witchcraft (see pp. 179–81), on which Fleming had worked. Possibly Brome had produced an account of the Oxford fatalities that Fleming drew on but which is now lost.

204 Dodson, ‘Abraham Fleming writer and editor’, p. 59. Dodson took this quotation from p. 900 of the 1808 reprint of Holinshed’s Chronicles. For Fleming’s marginal signature and account, see ‘Continuation’ in Holinshed’s Chronicles vol. III (1587), 1553.

205 Peck described the manuscripts as “A large account of Babington’s Plot, as the same was delivered in a speech at Fotheringhay, at the examination of Mary Q. of Scots XIII Oct. MDLXXXVI. by Judge Gawdy. MS. inter MSS. Fleming” and, “The ruful rhyme of Chidioc Tichborn (one of the chief Conspirators in Babington’s Plot) wrote between the Time of his Condemnation & Execution, which was on the xx. Sept. MDLXXXVI. MS. Manu Flemingi”. Several other papers relate directly to Mary Stuart.

206 Dodson used the 1808 reprint of Holinshed’s Chronicles, book IV, 845-868.
matter as an editor setting policy would do.\textsuperscript{207} Furthermore, Miller confirmed that Fleming was responsible for the layout of the text, quoting Fleming’s preface:

\begin{quote}
The order observed in the description of Britaine [Harrison’s ‘Description’ first used in the 1577 edition] by reason of the necessarie division thereof into bookes and chapters growing out of the varietie of matters therein conteined, seemed (in my judgement) so convenient a course devised by the writer, as I was easily induced thereby to digest the historic of England immediatelic following into the like method: so that as in the one, so likewise in the other, by summarie contents foregoing everie chapter, as also by certeine materiall titles added at the head of everie page of the said historie, it is a thing of no difficultie to comprehend what is discouersed and discussed in the same.\textsuperscript{208}
\end{quote}

Miller did not, however, develop his argument or quote supporting evidence from the text. For example, he did not consider this passage, which demonstrates Fleming’s ownership of the text:

\begin{quote}
Thus far I have continued this collection of the English histories, noting breeflie in these later yeares, such things as I find in the abridgement of Richard Grafton, and in the summary of John Stow, increased somewhat (as may appeare) in places with such helpes as have come to my hand; humblie beseeching the reader to accept the same in good part, and to pardon me where I have not satisfied his expectation: sith herein I must confesse, I have nothing contented my selfe, but yet at the request of others have done what I could & not what I would, forwant of conference with such as might have furnished me with more large instructions, such as had beene necessarie for the purpose.\textsuperscript{209}
\end{quote}

Unlike Dodson, Miller did consider some of Fleming’s unpublished papers as evidence, particularly “\textit{Censurae aliae diverserorum Hominum malevolentium sed nimium subtilium in eadem Chronica; cum Responsionibus Abrahami Flemingi}”. However, Miller did not connect this angry letter to Fleming’s outbursts that were printed in \textit{Holinshed’s Chronicles}:

“If the reader be not satisfied with this table, let him not blame the order, but his own concept.”\textsuperscript{210}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{207} Fleming, \textit{Holinshed’s Chronicles} vol. III (1587), 1268-9.
\textsuperscript{208} Fleming as quoted in Miller, ‘Abraham Fleming, Editor’, pp. 91-2.
\textsuperscript{209} Fleming, \textit{Holinshed’s Chronicles} vol. III (1587), 1267.
\textsuperscript{210} Ibid. p. 1593.
\end{flushright}
The next study was Booth’s *A book called Holinshed’s Chronicles* (1968), which drew on Dodson and Miller. This considered *Holinshed’s Chronicles* in its entirety and referred to Fleming as “Holinshed’s successor”, clearly indicating that Fleming was in charge.\(^{211}\) He did say a little about Fleming’s role as general editor and provided a short biography that starts:

> Whatever the general title page may say, the man who deserves almost all credit or discredit for the 1587 Chronicles is Abraham Fleming… but most commentators have taken the word of the title page that John Hooker was the man in charge… he [Fleming] did all the work of an editor for the whole book. He is the only contributor to the new version who made a qualitative as well as a quantitative change in the *Chronicles*.\(^{212}\)

However, Booth did not provide any evidence nor did he discuss why Fleming (still considered a minor character) had such a prominent role. Paradoxically, despite attributing such a major role to Fleming, Booth did not discuss Fleming in any depth and focused instead on Harrison, Holinshed, Thynne and Hooker.

Twenty years after Booth’s book, Donno’s ‘Some aspects of Shakespeare’s Holinshed’ (1987) and ‘Abraham Fleming: a learned corrector in 1586-87’ (1989) were published. According to Donno, Fleming was a “very competent antiquary” who “functioned as the primary editor”.\(^{213}\) She attributed the “typographical excellence of the text” to Fleming and Denham but simultaneously called Fleming only “competent” and gave him little recognition as a writer.

Donno mistakenly believed that Stow was the author of the ‘Continuation’. It is true that Stow’s name is on the title page and his initials “I.S.” do appear next to sections of the text, but so do the initials “F. T.” (Francis Thynne) and “A. F.” (Abraham Fleming). Stow was a source drawn on by Fleming. Donno relied on the title page and as a result she

\(^{211}\) Booth, *Holinshed’s Chronicles*, p. 2 and p. 15  
\(^{212}\) Ibid., p. 61.  
\(^{213}\) Elizabeth Story Donno, ‘Some aspects of Shakespeare’s Holinshed’, *Huntington Library Quarterly* vol. 50 (1987), pp. 229-48, p. 231. Although Donno described Fleming as an antiquary, he is not known to have joined the College of Antiquaries and I would argue that he did not consider himself to be an antiquary.
underestimated Fleming’s input. In her later article Donno acknowledged that Holinshed’s Chronicles’ title pages can be misleading: the 1587 title page states that John ap Vowell (a.k.a. John Hooker) was the book’s editor “but it has been recognized for some time that it was Abraham Fleming who served as the general editor.”

Donno’s articles did attempt to understand Fleming’s reaction to the excisions the Privy Council made to Holinshed’s Chronicles:

Fleming, who was in charge of typographical matters, necessarily bore the onus of corrections and revisions; [from] his papers and accounts of the censorship [the lost manuscripts... ] it is clear that the earl of Leicester, the chancellor Thomas Bromley, and Lord Burghley, together with “aliae diversorum Hominum malvolentium sed nimium sutilium” were the primary movers in the in the expurgations and that Fleming (like Thynne and Bancroft) provided written responses to them.

Unfortunately this is as far as Donno went in discussing Fleming and his manuscript responses to the excisions.

The next published study, Patterson’s Reading Holinshed’s Chronicles, described Stow as Holinshed’s Chronicles’ main contributing writer. Her evidence was that Stow’s initials appeared in the text’s margins. However, she was mistaken in thinking that the initials were the author’s signatures, rather they acknowledged that Stow provided the sources. Stow was certainly an important source but in terms of overall workload, Patterson failed to recognize that Fleming was by far the greatest contributor to the text as a whole. Patterson was also misled by Stow’s increasingly embittered glosses in his own Annales in which he refered to Holinshed’s Chronicles as being his book, even though it was not. However, Patterson wrote very little about Fleming.

The most recent study of Holinshed’s Chronicles was Clegg (ed.) Facsimile from Holinshed’s Chronicles 1587 in 2005. The purpose of this book was to compare the different

---

surviving copies of the ‘Continuation’ and the cancellandia. In Facsimile Clegg developed Donno’s argument that Fleming was editor and also main writer of Holinshed’s Chronicles. In this excerpt from her ODNB biography of Fleming, Clegg supported Fleming as editor-in-chief using evidence that had not been published before, the relationship between Fleming and Holinshed’s Chronicles’ printer.

Denham placed the project in the hands of Abraham Fleming, who had working extensively for him for the past three years. Donno has demonstrated that it was Fleming, and not John Hooker, alias Vowell (as the title-page claims), who served as the edition’s general editor.216

There is further evidence in the form of manuscripts in Fleming’s collection of personal papers which further indicates that he was not only the editor of and contributor to this edition of Holinshed’s Chronicles, but that he was also in the process of compiling a third edition. Fleming had a manuscript obituary to Sir Thomas Scot that Peck catalogued and described thus:

An Epitaph upon the Death of the famous & renowned Knight Sir Thomas Scot of Scots-Hall in Kent, who died xxx. Dec. MDXCIV. & was buried in Braborn Church among his Ancestors; with divers Historical Notes. The whole written by Mr. Reynolde Scot (Author of Discovery of Witchcraft) & sent, as thought, to be inserted in the late new Edition of Holingshed; but not permitted. A curious Thing. MS. Manu Flemiingi.

Sir Thomas Scot died in 1594, so the “late new Edition of Holingshed” for which the obituary was intended could not have been the 1587 edition. In 1594 Fleming was an ordained chaplain and rector but that would not necessarily have impeded him from producing another book; Peck himself was a minister, antiquary and author, and his parish duties did not prevent him from writing. This manuscript strongly suggests that Fleming was overseeing and compiling material for a third edition of Holinshed’s Chronicles that was never printed because it was “not permitted”.

That this 1594 manuscript was intended for a “late new edition” of Holinshed’s Chronicles is very suggestive of a third edition but one document does not constitute the mass gathering

of information that might be expected if the ‘Continuation’ was indeed to be updated. However, Fleming did not have just one such document among his papers, he had dozens. Many have already been discussed and were the raw material for the 1587 edition of Holinshed’s Chronicles. Some were clearly private papers, for example a letter from his brother and another titled “Abraham Flemingi de Praeparatione sua ad mortem” (c. 1605). Some papers were clearly concerned with Fleming’s parish or that of his neighbour Roger Fenton of St Benet Sherehog; these were unlikely to have been nationally important. Yet other manuscripts refer to Fleming’s role as chaplain and preacher, for example copies of his Paul’s Cross sermons. These may have been intended for inclusion in an updated ‘Continuation’ if they were preached in response to nationally important events.

Many of the manuscripts were accounts of unusual or notable deaths, exactly the type of material that Fleming would have included in Holinshed’s Chronicles, but were dated too late for the 1587 edition. These would include ‘The resolute spirit of Philip Howard Earl of Arundel, who died in the Tower xix Nov. MDXCV’; ‘The meditation or prayer of a rare learned Man of Oxford [Dr Richard Lateware] when he lay sick of Consumption & given over by his Physicians, as Mr Fleming had it of Mr Thomas Speight, the editor of Chaucer’s Works [c. 1598]”; and, ‘An epitaph on Mrs Ratcliffe, one of Queen Elizabeth’s Maids of Honor, who died xxiii March MDCII’. Further papers echoed the patriotic passages from the printed Holinshed’s Chronicles. These would include “The Danger of Innovations in a Commonwealth, or the poison or sectaries, & how perilous it is to shake Religion at the Root by licentious Disputes & Doctrines. A copy of Verses presented to Queen Elizabeth, which greatly pleased her. MS. Manu Flemingi”. The second edition of Holinshed’s Chronicles had included verses and rhymes as well as accounts of speeches and advice given to the queen. (This particular manuscript suggests that Fleming had personally given these verses to Elizabeth.). This evidence strongly suggests that Fleming intended to reprise his role as editor of Holinshed’s Chronicles.
Background to the second edition of Holinshed’s Chronicles:

Fleming had nothing to do with the first edition of Holinshed’s Chronicles but he does appear within its pages and it was this edition that he inherited along with some of the people involved in its production. Among the descriptions, records and lists within Volume III of the 1577 Holinshed’s Chronicles is Harrison’s catalogue of ‘Writers of our Nation’. Fleming’s name is found towards the end of the list next to Reginald Scot. Harrison gave no specific order to his list of writers and said that he wrote each name as it “shall come to my memorie”.

When the first edition of Holinshed’s Chronicles was printed and Harrison’s list of writers was compiled, Fleming had not completed his degree and had only a handful of known books in print. Two were definitely printed before Holinshed’s Chronicles: his 1575 translations of Virgil’s Bucoliks, one in prose and the other in verse. Three more titles came out in the same year that the 1576 Holinshed’s Chronicles was published: A Registre of Hystories, Of Englishe Dogges and Panoplie of Epistles. It is likely that these were in circulation before Holinshed’s Chronicles was, given the date on the latter but Fleming’s 1576 books may not have been in print when the list of writers was compiled; Fleming may have been added to Harrison’s list on the strength of his translations of Virgil. As Holinshed’s Chronicles was compiled and set, Harrison, Holinshed and Bynneman surely spent time together in one of the Paul’s Cross properties where they might have come into contact with Fleming as the young translator took manuscripts to his printers, or had a look at his printed books in the shops of the sellers. For example, Thomas Woodcocke, who sold Fleming’s Bucoliks (1575), certainly had a shop in Paul’s Churchyard (and would later finance the second edition of Holinshed’s Chronicles). Although not directly involved with the 1577 edition of Holinshed’s Chronicles, Fleming was already on the periphery of Holinshed’s circle and becoming known to the men who would produce the lengthier second edition.

218 Ibid.
The second edition of *Holinshed’s Chronicles* was an almost unrecognisable version of its predecessor. The book’s development began more than four decades before Fleming became involved with the text. In 1530 the Protestant bookseller Reyner (or Reginald) Wolfe settled in London where, as a result of the later Dissolution, he was able to purchase land around St Paul’s Cathedral. He joined the Stationers’ Company as a printer and opened a shop on a thoroughfare in Paul’s Cross churchyard. This area, which already thronged with scribes and clerics, was a popular meeting place; on sermon days the area would have been packed with potential customers. When he died in 1573 Wolfe’s “known holdings formed a continuous stretch of more than 120 feet of the best bookselling frontage in England.”

The book that would become Fleming’s edition of *Holinshed’s Chronicles* was begun in 1548 when Wolfe started writing a ‘Universal Cosmography’, a complete history and geography of the known world complete with descriptions of people, places and comprehensive maps. Much of ‘Cosmography’ was based on his collection of John Leland’s antiquarian manuscripts. Wolfe enlisted his assistant Raphael Holinshed and the antiquary William Harrison to help compile this ambitious text, but when Wolfe died ‘Cosmography’ was still unfinished. Holinshed later explained that he was compelled to take this ambitious project over:

> After five and twenty years travail spent therein – so that by his untimely decease no hope remained to see that performed which we had so long travailed about. Nevertheless those whom he put in trust to dispose his things after his departure hence, wishing to the benefit of others that some fruit might follow of that whereabout he had employed so long time, willed me to continue my endeavour for their furtherance in the same.”

Holinshed had to reduce the scale of the project as the maps “were not found so complete as we would have wished”, and an issue with Wolfe’s executors led to a problem with the book’s financiers. “When the volume grew so great they that were to defray the charges for
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219 Peter Blayney, *The bookshops of Paul’s Cross churchyard* (1990), p. 19. Some small shops were barely a yard wide so Wolfe’s 40 yards of frontage is remarkable.

220 Holinshed quoted in Booth, *Holinshed’s Chronicles*, pp. 4-5.
the impression were not willing to go through the whole, they resolved to publish the histories of England, Scotland, and Ireland, with their descriptions.”  

Despite being reduced in scope and scale, Wolfe’s ‘Cosmography’ was still two million words in length when it was finally finished by Holinshed in 1577. It was known simply as Holinshed’s Chronicles.

The men who financed the first edition of Holinshed’s Chronicles were George Bishop, Lucas Harrison and Wolfe’s son-in-law John Harrison. The latter had several other shops in the area including The Greyhound and Lucas Harrison’s The Crane was next door. Bishop had a shop called the The Rose two doors east of Lucas Harrison on the other side of The Greyhound. Bishop may also have shared The Crane with Lucas Harrison as the two were frequent business partners. These shops had all been owned by Wolfe. The printer who produced the finished book, Henry Bynneman, had been Wolfe’s apprentice and he most likely knew Holinshed. On Wolfe’s death Bynneman had acquired Wolfe’s stock of letters and used these to produce the text. It is likely that Bynneman’s shop was also in one of Wolfe’s former properties. The people involved with Holinshed’s Chronicles were almost all under one roof and all had been connected to its originator, Wolfe. The book was the product of close established relationships and would continue to be so when Fleming took over its production.

This first edition of Holinshed’s Chronicles was printed in 1576 or 1577 and registered with the Company of Stationers on 1 July 1578 with an unprecedented licensing fee of 20 shillings. Licensing a book was not mandatory but did guarantee the printer and/or seller exclusive rights, and this early form of copyrighting was to influence the syndicate with which Fleming later worked.
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The second edition syndicate and Fleming:

The production of the second edition of Holinshed’s Chronicles shared a great deal with that of its predecessor. It too was a team effort made possible by close and long term partnerships between neighbouring printers and booksellers. The syndicate which financed, produced and sold the second edition comprised George Bishop, John Harrison, Thomas Woodcocke, Ralph Newberie and Henry Denham. They came together through necessity: Bishop and John Harrison still owned the rights to Holinshed’s Chronicles from 1578 while Woodcocke had purchased Lucas Harrison’s rights. Holinshed’s Chronicles could not be reprinted without their combined involvement. By 1587 Denham and Newberie, who was an associate of Bynneman, owned the patent to print histories and chronicles, so Holinshed’s Chronicles could not be printed without their involvement either. With the exception of Denham, the syndicate was based in neighbouring shops around Paul’s Churchyard as the original syndicate had been, bringing continuity and stability to the project. Unlike the other syndicate members who contributed money to the production of the second edition, Denham was far more involved with Holinshed’s Chronicles: he was responsible for getting the books printed. Denham ran four presses, which indicates not only that he had the facilities to print a very large book like Holinshed’s Chronicles but also that he was successful and in demand.

In the case of a huge project like Holinshed’s Chronicles, each syndicate member would have owned a share of the finished books in accordance with the percentage of money they put into the project. The members are likely to have invested heavily and needed someone they could rely on to get the book finished and published. Harrison and Bishop had the least experience of working with Fleming but Denham, Newberie and Woodcocke had all handled

225 In her foreword to A Peaceable and Prosperous Regiment of the Blessed Queene Elisabeth: A Facsimile from Holinshed’s Chronicles (2005), Clegg wrote that Chronicles was printed by Denham in Paternoster Row, but this is incorrect: the other members of the syndicate had bookshops in Paternoster Row but Denham’s presses were in Aldersgate Street in 1587. It is true that Denham began his career in Paternoster Row but Holinshed’s Chronicles’ colophon states that the book was printed “in Aldersgate Street at the signe of the Starre”.
manuscripts and books written by Fleming from as early as 1575. The syndicate members were well known to each other long before a second edition of *Holinshed’s Chronicles* was considered and this thesis demonstrates that Fleming was well known to them too.

Bishop had experience of working with Fleming on one book, *Godly and learned Exposition upon the Proverbes of Solomon* (1580). Fleming had compiled the 639 pages of text and then indexed the book. If Bishop or Harrison had any doubts about Fleming’s capabilities they had only to turn to the other syndicate members for reassurance. Prior to 1587 the *Holinshed’s Chronicles* syndicate members printed and/or sold 22 books associated with Fleming (almost half his total output). This indicates that the syndicate members repeatedly bought his original manuscripts or turned to him when they had work which needed doing.

Woodcocke was the first of the syndicate to establish a relationship with Fleming whose earliest surviving book, Virgil’s *Bucoliks*, was sold by Woodcocke in 1575. It is likely that Woodcocke printed Fleming’s now lost *Elegues* as well. The following year Fleming’s translations of Aelian’s *A Registre of Hystories* and Nausea’s *Of all blasing Starrs in General* were “Imprinted at London for Thomas Woodcocke” by Henry Middleton and sold at Woodcocke’s shop, The Black Bear.

Newberie sometimes printed books but more often, like Woodcocke, he farmed the printing out to Middleton or Denham. In all Newberie sold six known titles associated with Fleming. *Panoplie of Epistles* (1576) was written by Fleming and printed by Middleton; Googe’s *Zodiake of Life* (1576), which Newberie printed included a recommendatory poem by Fleming; *Fort for the Afflicted* (1580) was edited by and contained an address to the reader by Fleming; *Certaine sermons in Defense of the Gospell* (1580) was printed and probably sold by Newberie, and had been compiled and indexed by Fleming. A *Dictionarie in latine and English* (1584) was printed by Denham and Newberie and edited by Fleming; and, *Nomenclature of Hadrianus Junius* (1585), which was printed by Denham, sold by Newberie and compiled and indexed by Fleming. The sixth was of course *Holinshed’s Chronicles*. 
Newberie often gave quite large texts to Fleming for editing or indexing. Other Fleming-related titles printed by Middleton might have been sold by Newberie or Woodcocke but without Woodcocke’s name on the books’ colophons or in the Stationers’ Company registers it is impossible to add these to the list of titles associated with the Holinshed’s Chronicles syndicate.

The relationship between Denham and Fleming could be considered quite exceptional. It is possible that Fleming “corrected” first runs printed by Denham in the same way that he proof read Holinshed’s Chronicles as the two appear to have worked together very closely. Denham certainly printed twelve books that were written or worked on by Fleming. Their association began in 1579 when Denham printed Fleming’s translation of Synesius’ Bushie Haire. A further 11 books bearing their names followed during the eight years prior to Denham printing Holinshed’s Chronicles: Fleming’s Conduit of Comfort (1579); the Epitaph and Memorial to William Lambe (both 1580); Bright Burning Beacon (1580) also compiled and written by Fleming; the Alvearie or four-language dictionary (1580); Diamond of Devotion (1581); Monomachie of Motives in the Mind of Man (1582), translated and edited by Fleming; the Common places of Peter Martyr (1583) indexed by Fleming; the Latin-English dictionary that he printed with Newberie and Fleming edited in 1584; and, Scot’s Discoverie of Witchcraft (1584), to which Fleming added a number of poems; Nomenclator of Adrianus Junius (1585), which contained a large dictionary-index by Fleming. Their next and last known production together was Holinshed’s Chronicles. When Denham ceased printing Fleming stopped writing books for publication.

It is significant that from December 1589 when Denham ceased to be active (he most likely died shortly afterwards), Fleming appeared to lose interest in producing books. Fleming did not work exclusively for Denham but they do seem to have been close with much in
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227 Later editions of Fleming’s books continued to be printed with or without his input. However Fleming’s last new book was a translation of Virgil’s Bucoliks and Georgiks printed in 1589 by Orwin for Woodcocke, and dedicated to Archbishop Whitgift. This is likely to have been written to secure preferment from Whitgift rather than because Fleming was active in the book trade.
common and they made a good team. They had both worked with Tottell, Denham as his apprentice until 1560 and Fleming later as his “learned corrector”. They were both fastidious workers: Denham printed precisely and used very clear type while Fleming was very particular and exacting when proof-reading and correcting his work and that of others.

Denham had been involved in a syndicate production in 1583. On that occasion his fellow investors had been the booksellers Brome, Chard and Maunsell. Together they had produced The Commonplaces of Peter Martyr divided into foure principall parts, as collected and translated by Anthony Marten. Denham had printed the book with Middleton and Fleming provided the index. It was a difficult task: the British Library copy shows that, unusually for a book printed by Denham, its many hundreds of pages were numbered erratically in places, and some sections had no pagination at all. It is possible that the sheer difficulty of indexing such a text was the reason Fleming was preferred. The finished index comprised 64 folio sides, each side having four columns of index in a very small font. So, when it came to indexing the thousands of pages in Holinshed’s Chronicles, Denham would have been able to give the proof copy to Fleming with complete confidence in his ability. Both men were thorough and exacting with high standards, exactly the qualities needed when preparing a lavish and important text as long, involved and profitable as Holinshed’s Chronicles.

The first edition of Holinshed’s Chronicles was the product of a close-knit and long-established team of financiers, printers and writers working out of neighbouring properties in St Paul’s Churchyard, which had been the home of Wolfe when he instigated writing a ‘Cosmography’. The evidence shows that the second edition was no different in that respect. The members of the syndicate were all well connected to each other. Two members, Bishop and Harrison, were part of the original team. All except Denham were to be found in St Paul’s Churchyard. Fleming was connected to most of the syndicate long before Holinshed’s Chronicles was in production. He had established long and productive working relationships with Newberie, Woodcocke and Denham in particular for whom he had demonstrated all the
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228 Their relationships with Tottell is explained on pp. 64-6.
skills that Holinshed’s Chronicles’ investors were likely to require: writing, compiling, translating, indexing and editing. This provides further evidence that it was Fleming and not Stow or Hooker who edited the text, since neither Stow nor Hooker had an established relationship with Holinshed’s Chronicles’ printer and the syndicate.

As well as being well acquainted with the Holinshed syndicate, Fleming is likely to have had friends and acquaintances in London who provided him with manuscript accounts of events for inclusion in the text. Few of the studies and articles published on Fleming have touched on the contents of Fleming’s manuscript collection, or what is left of them. Although the papers themselves are lost, Peck wrote a short description of the contents of each manuscript, which has proved very helpful in ascertaining the kinds of material that Fleming had amassed. Fleming was not an antiquary by disposition and did not have the same motivation for collecting manuscripts possessed by a true chronicler and antiquary like Stow or Thynne. The fact that Fleming amassed such a large collection of manuscripts indicates that he acquired them with some purpose in mind and not just as a collector. This thesis argues that the reason was because he was the editor and compiler of Holinshed’s Chronicles.

Many of the papers in Fleming’s collection were there because men who wanted to contribute to Holinshed’s Chronicles had given them to him. This in turn supports the idea that Fleming was widely known by his peers to be the man responsible for Holinshed’s Chronicles. One such donor was George Closse, who furnished Fleming with A large Account of an offensive Clause in a sermon preached at S. Pauls Cross, vi March MDLXXXV. by Mr George Closse a London Preacher [...] Together with an Account of a second sermon preached by the said Closse [...] Also of the Proceedings against the said Preacher [...] The whole verbatim under the said Preacher’s Hand, as he himself sent it to Mr. Fleming, lest a false Account of those Things should have been published in the then intended new edition of Holingshed’s Chroncile. MS. Manu ipsius Geo. Closse.229

229 Peck, Desiderata Curiosa, xxvii.
Similarly Peck described “MS. Manu ipsius Reg. Scot” concerning Sir Thomas Scot to be included in Holinshed’s Chronicles. Other manuscripts, for example the three below, were not intended for publication, yet demonstrate that Fleming was Holinshed’s Chronicles’ editor and that he was not entirely happy with the censoring of the book:


Censurae aliae diversorum Hominum malevolentium sed nimium subtilium in eadem Chronica; cum Responsionibus Abrahami Flemingi. MS. Manu Flemingi.

Abrahami Flemingi (qui praerat Typis & Praelo) de Modo Castrati; Reformandiq; Chronica predicta brevis & vera Relation. MS. Manu Flemingi. 230

The “castrations”

Denham began printing Holinshed’s Chronicles sometime in January 1587 at The Star in Aldersgate Street. The first copies issued prior to the censoring that took place described Mary Queen of Scots as alive in Fotheringhay castle. She was executed on 8 February of that year. This provides evidence that Denham produced the book in January and it was for sale at the end of that month. He therefore worked very fast, most likely using all four of his presses. Complete copies from the first run certainly were available before 1 February 1587, for this is the date on a letter written to the Privy Council about the contents of this newly published book:

Whitgift Archbishop of Canterbury’s letter to Thomas Randolph, Henry Killigrew, Esqrs. & Mr. Dr. Hammond, touching the Examination & Reformation of the Additions to the new Edition of Holingshed’s Chronicle on Thursday i. Febr. MDLXXXVIII. MS. Manu Flemingi. 231
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The recipients of this letter, a copy of which was in Fleming’s possession, are surely Elizabethan diplomats well known for their connections to Mary. Killigrew had taken messages from Elizabeth to Mary during the 1560s and Randolph was an English diplomat based in Scotland who was trusted by Mary until her marriage to Darnley. It is probable that Whitgift, who monitored printed material closely, wanted them to clarify certain points made about the Scottish queen. This hitherto forgotten letter helps to explain the way in which Holinshed’s Chronicles was censored and demonstrates how closely Fleming was involved with the Privy Council’s censoring of the book.

A great deal has already been written and continues to be written on the subject of the castrations or excisions made to the 1587 edition of Holinshed’s Chronicles in an attempt to try and understand why the material that was removed was considered too sensitive for inclusion. There is little new to be added to the studies made by Clegg who has carried out comparisons of entire copies, castrated texts and the surviving cancelled pages in order to establish exactly what alterations were made and why. She has also carried out close analysis of the topics that were amended and the content of the replacement text in order to establish what exactly the Privy Council wanted removed. The purpose of this thesis is not to repeat Clegg’s work but to understand how Fleming participated in and responded to the Privy Council’s suggested alterations.

Fleming was probably in charge of the typesetting in Denham’s shop; the editor’s marks he made on the Melton Holinshed indicate that he did not just edit the printed text but also the gaps between words, layout of headings and pagination. This excerpt from Holinshed’s Chronicles indicates that someone had power over the editor:

humblie beseeching the reader to accept the same in good part, and to pardon me where I have not satisfied his expectation: sith heerin I must confesse, I have nothing contented my selfe, but yet at the request of others have doone what I could & not what I would, for want of conference with such as might have

232 “Dr Hammond” remains unidentified at the time of writing.
furnished me with more large instructions, such as had beene necessarie for the purpose.\textsuperscript{233}

Holinsed’s Chronicles was not recalled by the Privy Council in 1587 because the writers had created anything subversive or rebellious. The first edition of 1577 had likewise undergone a close examination and alteration at the request of the Privy Council and such inspections of the text were normal. Holinsed’s Chronicles can be seen as the result of the Privy Council creating a partnership with the syndicate and Fleming. Holinsed’s Chronicles was part of “a deliberate movement to elevate the stature of England, English letters, and English language through writing and publishing maps, histories, national epics, and theoretical works on English poetry”.\textsuperscript{234} Holinsed’s overall dedication to William Cecil in the complete 1577 edition describes how he (and Wolfe before him) had received support from Cecil, by then Lord Burghley, who was familiar with their cosmographie/chronicles project; the 1587 edition “likewise enjoyed a privileged status”.\textsuperscript{235}

The excisions of 1587 took place in three waves and can be summarized as follows. The first recall, dated 1 February 1587, came at a very sensitive time. The royal proclamation securing Mary Queen of Scots’ execution had been issued on 4 December 1586, but Elizabeth withheld the execution order so that appeals from Mary’s powerful allies could be heard. However within a week of Holinsed’s Chronicles’ recall the Scottish queen was dead. Catholics in Europe including English recusants were outraged. In order to lessen the impending damage to England’s image, Holinsed’s Chronicles demonstrated how reasonable the English had in fact been towards Catholics. As Holinsed’s Chronicles was essentially an instrument through which England’s good reputation could be upheld, it was necessary to limit the amount of text that narrated the harsh treatment of Catholic notables by the English. This pre-emptive process began even before Mary was dead. Two pages of text was removed from the section on Edmund Campion’s decline and execution, leaving the finished account just under eleven pages in length. Fleming worked not only on the Campion

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{233} Miller, ‘Abraham Fleming: Editor’, p. 92. 
\textsuperscript{235} Ibid. p. 139.}
account but also helped to create an updated narrative on the life and death of the Scottish queen. When Peck published the outline of his intended second volume of *Desiderata Curiosa* (1732-5), ‘*Liber IV*’ was intended to contain 20 of Fleming’s papers, all concerning the censorship of *Holinshed’s Chronicles* or Mary Queen of Scots. These papers had been grouped together by Peck who was able to read the manuscripts, so it is fair to assume that the censorship related to the Scottish queen.

The second tranche of excisions was made to a section dealing with Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester. In 1585 Leicester and his troops were sent to the Low Countries, demonstrating English support for the protestant rebels there. By 1586, however, Leicester had suffered some setbacks and by 1587 he had overstayed his initially warm welcome from the Dutch. In the first run of the 1587 *Holinshed’s Chronicles* Leicester was hailed as a hero and a great deal of page space was devoted to him, as well a two-page “Discourse on the earles of Leicester”.

The third round of excisions took place during the 19-day period between Mary’s execution and public knowledge of her death. Fleming had dedicated page after page to the Babington conspiracy, to Mary herself and to her trial. To exclude the long-awaited conclusion of the Scottish queen’s life was unthinkable; a section on Mary’s death was inevitable. Once Mary was known to be dead (the Spanish ambassador was informed on 19 February 1587) the political situation shifted considerably, even dangerously. The Privy Council had to make sure that Elizabeth was portrayed as a just and considered ruler, and *Holinshed’s Chronicles* was one of the vehicles used to promote this image. *Holinshed’s Chronicles* was intended to preserve and proclaim England’s greatness, but, once published, the printed word was indelible and could be used against England. The book was also dedicated to a number of powerful noblemen including Lord Burghley. Elizabeth’s enemies would have known *Holinshed’s Chronicles* was endorsed by the government, so the government had to consider how the printed material therein would be interpreted by catholic critics in a heightened state of sensitivity. The reformed second print run of *Holinshed’s Chronicles* made it clear that
Elizabeth had vacillated over the issue and shown great reluctance in issuing the execution order. It was not until around 27 February that Mary’s death was publicised as this is the date that the first “ditty” or ballad about the Scottish queen’s demise was registered with the Stationers’ Company. This suggests that the revisions had been made and the new sections printed and inserted into Holinshed’s Chronicles by the end of that month.

So by the time Holinshed’s Chronicles was in the shops early in February 1587, the most up to date account of English history was about to become out of date. It might be argued that all books reporting on the latest news are out of date as soon as they are printed, and Fleming would have known that there must be a cut-off point; he could not go on amassing, adding and formatting accounts of events forever. Possibly, as Mary’s fate had lain undecided for 20 years, he thought that she would stay under arrest and did not foresee her execution and the resultant censoring. The three to four weeks in February between publishing the first print run and reissuing the amended text must have been a difficult time for Fleming. He had written a great deal of the text and compiled this massive, complex book; he likely aided Denham in proof-reading the whole text too.

It is little wonder that Holinshed’s Chronicles heralded Fleming’s departure from the book trade, and the angry tone of the letters in his collection reveal something of the frustration he endured at that time.\(^{236}\) The Campion pages, two pages of text, were only a tiny percentage of the overall size of the book, but it would still have made considerable work for Fleming and Denham as they tried to reconcile the text and pagination without disturbing too many of the existing quires that could be reused. The references, marginal glosses and the indexes would then need checking for accuracy and updating and the pagination likewise. It is known that Fleming did pay attention to all these small details because the Melton Holinshed, which bears his editorial marks, confirms that Fleming corrected even the smallest imperfections.

\(^{236}\) As described on pp. 117-8.
Fleming might or might not have been told of the exact reasons why *Holinshed’s Chronicles* was recalled as by 1 February 1587 only those closest to Queen Elizabeth would have been party to the knowledge that Mary had only days to live. However this thesis argues that Fleming sensed, or had at least surmised, that Mary’s execution could be imminent. He did after all have to re-write sections of *Holinshed’s Chronicles* from perhaps as early as 1 February, and certainly he knew of and composed text about Mary’s death three weeks before the event became public knowledge. Fleming’s discretion once possessed of this “insider knowledge” and the loyalty he demonstrated to the Privy Council as *Holinshed’s Chronicles* was censored suggest he was deserving of a reward; this might explain his swift elevation once he was ordained. Evidence demonstrates that very quickly after Fleming’s ordination in August 1588 he joined the household of the queen’s cousin and Privy Councillor Charles Howard. Within a year he was preaching at Paul’s Cross, a pulpit reserved for approved establishment preachers. Also, Fleming was granted a living in a parish by Whitgift, to whom the Privy Council had referred the censoring of *Holinshed’s Chronicles*. The number of London parishes in Whitgift’s patronage was very small; that Fleming was made rector of one is therefore suggestive of a reward, most likely given because of Fleming’s work on and discretion regarding *Holinshed’s Chronicles*.

The suggestion that Fleming deserved a reward for his services is strengthened by the contents of a dedication by Fleming to Whitgift in the 1589 translation of Virgil’s *Bucoliks* and *Georgiks*. This excerpt implies that Fleming was thanking Whitgift (possibly in advance) for some favour:

> My very good Lord, your benevolence and benefice towards me is so manifold and the dutie which I owe your grace is so great… your goodnesse heretofore most bountifully extended, and yet (to the binding of me your perpetuall votarie) gratiously intended May it now please your Grace to accept at my hands this oblation…

The choice of *Bucoliks* and *Georgiks* was a pedestrian one most obviously because Whitgift could have read them in the original Latin. They were texts that Fleming himself said
may seeme at the first blush (I confesse) too too base for you (in respect of your gravitie, of your eminence, of your employment) to looke into, to read, to like, to allow:

Yet the *Georgiks* of 1589 specifically referred to two fighting king bees, one gloriously golden, the other dowdy and grown fat. Surely these were metaphors for Elizabeth and Mary Queen of Scots. Fleming dedicated the *Bucoliks* and *Georgiks* with its quarrelling rulers to Whitgift as a memory aid: he did not want Whitgift to forget the discreet service that he had performed during the recalls of and alterations to *Holinshed’s Chronicles*.

*****

This thesis argues that without Fleming there might well have not been a second edition of *Holinshed’s Chronicles*. This is a bold claim; there might well have been other writers, antiquaries and learned correctors that could have taken on a project such as *Holinshed’s Chronicles*. There must have been other indexers who could have been employed to write the tables, and surely Denham was more than capable of working out the typesetting and fitting in the replacement sheets after the excisions without the need for Fleming. However, Fleming was unique: he could fulfil all of these roles. This reduced the number of people involved with *Holinshed’s Chronicles* and limited the number of people party to the knowledge that Mary Queen of Scots had been beheaded. Aylmer, Howard and Whitgift could discuss the excisions with Fleming alone knowing that their updated information and the reasons for removing certain sections would not have to be relayed to anyone other than Denham (and even Denham need not have been told exactly why changes were being made).

Modern scholars have not always recognized Fleming’s abilities. The faint praise he has received has been born of a lack of understanding but Fleming understood his job very well. *Holinshed’s Chronicles* was intended to bolster England’s image. It explained the country’s long history and showcased English successes both home and abroad. *Holinshed’s*

---

Chronicles confirmed the line of England’s monarchy and explained English religion and the political decisions that shaped current affairs. Accordingly the book became “a palimpsest with each layer written over the incomplete erasure of the one below”. 238 Patterson has described the book as a “history written by agglomeration in which individual writers abdicate their responsibility, leaving the reader to be their own historian”. Patterson blamed Fleming for this “fuzzy” chronicling saying that Fleming insisted on the importance of understanding the whole picture while simultaneously blurring its outlines. 239 It is, however, more appropriate to see this blurring as a useful tool. The point of Holinshed’s Chronicles was to show England as a long established and consistently powerful yet judiciously fair kingdom. In blurring the boundaries between important events Fleming was able to create and then demonstrate a seamless continuum.

In 1584 when Fleming most likely took over the project he altered not only the layout of the text but also how the book looked: the woodcut illustrations were removed. This was no real loss as studies by Elizabeth Evenden and Thomas Freeman have shown that, while some images were made specifically for Holinshed’s Chronicles, other woodcuts were stock pictures like clip art today and were not created specifically to illustrate this specific text. 240 For example, the border surrounding the title page from the 1587 edition had been used by Denham before and was not made specifically for Holinshed’s Chronicles. Holinshed may have wanted to include illustrations because Wolfe’s original plan was to have maps and other pictures to embellish his ‘Cosmographie’. Indeed one map, a plan of Edinburgh, was included in the ‘Historie of Scotland’. This was a way of retaining the original integrity of the work. It has been argued that the woodcuts were sacrificed to make room for more text without having to use more paper, thus keeping costs down for the printer and the buyer. It has also been suggested that the woodcuts were too old and worn out for use in 1587.

238 Levy in Patterson, Reading Holinshed, p. 3.
239 Ibid. p. 5.
These seem unsatisfactory arguments. The relative amount of page space or paper saved by removing the woodcuts was not great, perhaps a few pennies’ worth. *Holinshed’s Chronicles* had been a big book and was going to be a bigger book. Those able to afford it would have had to be wealthy and were unlikely to be swayed by the comparatively small amount of money saved by leaving out the illustrations. Moreover, it is likely that individual quires could be purchased. If cost cutting was required the frugal buyer could simply buy the pages but not have them bound or have them bound very cheaply. The sheer size of the book suggested that buyers would be affluent. So, removing the illustrations to save paper or space was not the main reason Fleming decided to remove the woodcuts. It has also been suggested that the old woodcuts had become too worn for reuse. This thesis argues that *Holinshed’s Chronicles* was a lavish book financed by a syndicate of prosperous booksellers. If illustrations were thought necessary then surely new woodcut blocks would have been made, particularly if the added illustrations would have increased the financial return on each copy.

A much more satisfactory explanation for Fleming’s removing the pictures was that he was a forward-thinking, modernising editor. In his study *The Business of Books*, James Raven has suggested that woodcuts echoed the illuminated pictures and patterns found in manuscripts and very early books. *Incunabuli* and early printed books included woodcuts as a link back to their predecessors so that readers would understand the printed book was part of England’s long literary tradition. When Fleming took over *Holinshed’s Chronicles* in the 1580s, people were much more familiar with books and the written word. Literacy and texts had evolved so that books did not need to look like manuscripts anymore. Neither did the increasingly literate readership need quaint pictorial depictions of what they were reading about; that clarification was no longer necessary. Printing and reading had moved on and Fleming moved *Holinshed’s Chronicles* on accordingly.

---

An examination of the two editions side by side shows that here and there a word was added, another removed or a word exchanged to give clearer meaning to a sentence. Fleming also updated spellings throughout Holinshed’s Chronicles. In places whole paragraphs or sections were moved from their original place, and this is particularly true of Harrison’s geographical description of England. This thesis has demonstrated what Fleming’s contemporaries had known: he was the editor of the second edition of Holinshed’s Chronicles and that it was Fleming who updated, transformed, modernised, proofread and indexed the book. He collated and wrote much of the third volume and the evidence strongly suggests that he single-handedly produced the ‘Continuation’. Uniquely Fleming had established relationships with Holinshed’s Chronicles’ syndicate and he also had a close working relationship with the printer of this book. No one else, or certainly no other single person, was in Fleming’s position, nor did anyone else have the experience or the range of skills needed to produce Chronicles. Rather than call the book Holinshed’s Chronicles, the second edition should be known as Fleming’s Chronicles and if the proposed third edition had gone ahead perhaps that would have been its title.
Chapter Five:

Fleming’s Printed Books 1575 – c. 1580: the Classical and Occasional Works

The previous three chapters have looked in some detail at four of the books that Fleming wrote: Wunder, Footepath, Diamond and volume III of Holinshed’s Chronicles; he also contributed to, indexed and edited volumes I and II of Holinshed’s Chronicles. These were important and substantial texts but Fleming was a professional, committed writer and editor. It is likely that he needed the income which correcting or editing texts for printers such as Tottell and Denham brought him. However, this thesis argues that he was not simply a “hack” as has been suggested in the past. Fleming’s contemporaries, for example Newton, wrote in praise of him and Fleming was often called on to provide a preface or introduction to a colleague’s book, effectively endorsing the works of his less well-established associates.

Income was just one factor that motivated Fleming during his literary career. He was also driven by a combination of religious zeal and the desire to share scholarly knowledge with those keen to learn (whom he called “yong beginners”). This motivated him to write or contribute to 52 published titles published between 1575 and 1589. His printed books and contributions were almost always written in English; only three surviving publications contained Latin contributions by Fleming. Fleming wrote fluently in Latin and there is evidence that he was proficient in Greek and French. He was also able to vary the style of the contributions that he made to other writers’ books. Fleming’s contributions took the forms of letters to the reader, dedications, poetry in various styles, recommendatory verses, indexes and prose. The titles written solely by Fleming were equally varied, ranging from a broadside to 400-page treatises. Fleming’s name can be found on the pages of dictionaries, tracts, memorials and epitaphs, travelogues, classical translations and more. Those who

242 These Latin contributions were the poem ‘Solerta non secordia’ in Googe’s Zodiake of Life (1576), a Latin letter to John Aylmer in Golding’s translation of De vera Christiani hominis fide (1581) and the preface ‘Ad philomusos’ in Fleming’s own A shorte dictionarie in Latine and English (1584). Thynne mentioned a Latin history of Mary Tudor that was written by Fleming but this was lost in antiquity and is not mentioned in other contemporary sources.
worked with him played equally varied roles within the book trade and ranged from co-authors, antiquarians and researchers to printers and sellers.243

The books which Fleming wrote, and those to which he contributed between 1575 and 1589 fall into two categories: the first group of texts produced between the years 1575 and 1580-1 consisted of those that he wrote while a student at Peterhouse and then while waiting to graduate from Cambridge. These were innovative translations of classical works by Virgil and Cicero and his short, popular books inspired by natural phenomena and events, for example the Memoriall to William Lambe. The second group spanning 1581–9 were mainly religious or devotional works and educational books that engaged Fleming in a variety of roles (as discussed in Chapter Six). From this second period came Scot’s Discoverie of Witchcraft, to which Fleming contributed poetry; the dictionaries that Fleming edited, enlarged and to which he contributed verse; and Holinshed’s Chronicles, which tested all of Fleming’s skills and experience. By 1581 Fleming was no longer writing or translating smaller “one-man” texts by himself. He had by that time become an established author with a considerable reputation; he was collaborating with established printers and writers, reworking, compiling, editing and indexing others’ works.

**Virgil’s Bucoliks and Georgiks**

The first and last books of Fleming’s career as a published writer were English translations of Virgil. The first two texts were both printed in 1575 while Fleming was still a student in Peterhouse. He chose to produce two different translations of Virgil’s pastoral idyll The Eclogues (also known as The Bucoliks), one in rhymed verse and one unrhymed. These are significant not only because they are Fleming’s earliest books but also because they reveal something of his personality. Rather than just produce a verse-for-verse translation he showcased his skills as a writer of prose as well. These texts were arguably the most

---

243 A complete catalogue of printed titles associated with Fleming and highlighting his role on each text, the printers used, the sellers and other people associated with his books together with other details for each book can be found in Appendix B, pp. 241-59.
significant of Fleming’s entire career for he was the first person ever to translate Eclogues into English; in doing so he was the first to translate a complete Virgilian text published in affordable form.

The evidence supporting this statement can be found in a study of the various editions of Virgil’s works available between 1475 and Fleming’s active period. The first attempt to “English” Virgil took the form of an abstract by William Caxton titled Eneydos reduced into Englysshe (1490). Over the next 75 years, as the STC shows, a further four English abridged translations from Aeneid (namely the stories of the fall of Troy and Dido and Aeneas) were printed but no one attempted a complete translation of the entire epic until 1584. Three Latin editions of Virgil’s Eclogues were printed in 1512, 1514 and 1529. When Fleming produced not one but two complete translations of Eclogues in 1575, one in rhyming verse called Bucoliks and one in prose titled Eclogues, he had achieved something quite revolutionary. It is likely that Fleming’s Virgils were affordable too, costing as little as two or four pence. Previously Virgil had been the preserve of students and Latinists but in 1575 for the first time almost anyone could now purchase a complete and faithful English translation of a classical Virgilian text. This was something clearly appreciated by Fleming’s contemporaries, such as John Foster who included these lines in a poem in praise of Fleming:

And though the booke a storehouse was
of many things before
Yet everyman could not in passe
tyll Fl. unlockte t\(d\)ore.  

244 Compare Fleming’s 31 page Bucoliks (1575) to Caxton’s Aenid of 1490, of which 84 pages still exist. Caxton’s text might have been the sole English language edition of Virgil on the market until Fleming’s Eclogues and Bucoliks, but Caxton’s book was larger, making it much more expensive, and it was not a true, complete translation, but an abstract or summary of the story.

245 Studies made by Elisabeth Leedham-Green of inventories of Cambridge students and masters at this time list numerous copies of Bucoliks and Georgiks, sometimes referred to as “another Virgil” or simply “Virgil”. Whilst these records do not differentiate between Latin and English editions, they do give an indication of how inexpensive a “Virgil” could be. See Elisabeth S. Leedham-Green, Books in Cambridge inventories: Book lists from Vice-Chancellor’s Court probate inventories in the Tudor and Stuart periods, vol 1 (Cambridge, 1986).

246 ‘The Poesie of John Foster’ in the preface of Fleming’s A Registre of Hystories (1576). The copy used is BL 123.b.8. It is likely that John Foster was a Cambridge alumnus who was at Queens College from 1576 and later enrolled at Peterhouse. He was awarded an M.A. from Cambridge in 1587. Foster’s (cont.)
After Fleming “unlocked” Eclogues in 1575, Virgil’s Aeneid continued to inspire English translations but no one translated Eclogues again until Fleming in 1589, when he produced his third version of this book. Also in 1589 he wrote the first ever English translation of Georgiks. Significantly no other writer translated Eclogues until 1620 or Georgiks until 1628. Therefore anyone who owned a printed English version of Virgil’s Eclogues before 1620 or Georgiks before 1628 must have had a copy by Fleming as there were no other English versions available. This is suggestive of the books being copyrighted.

Traditionally it was the seller of a book who owned the copyright to that title. It therefore seems likely that Woodcooke, the bookseller who sold Fleming’s Bucoliks in 1575 and Bucoliks and Georgiks in 1589, held the rights to these English editions, and this prevented any competitors from producing rival copies of these popular classics. The Stationers’ Company registers contain hundreds of examples of books that were entered to sellers in order to ensure that other stationers did not create copies of popular texts. Stationers inherited the rights to titles from each other or sold the rights to their books, as has been demonstrated in the way the Holinshed’s Chronicles’ syndicate came together in the 1580s and when Short and Yardley had inherited Denham’s rights to Diamond of Devotion in 1589. Stationers who produced books that had been entered to other sellers were subjected to fines. However, it would appear that Fleming as author owned the rights to translate these books. Fleming was not a member of the Stationers’ Company so if he did own the rights to any of his books they would not have been recorded in the Company’s registers, yet the circumstantial evidence is suggestive. Other translators apparently waited until Fleming had died before producing their own versions of Virgil’s rural idylls. This implies that it was Fleming himself, not Woodcooke, who held the exclusive right to produce Bucoliks and Georgiks in English. This would have been unusual, even unique, at a time when authors had no established rights.

time at Cambridge overlapped Fleming’s and, although initially enrolled at different colleges, it is likely they knew each other.
247 See pp. 74-5.
The sole surviving copy of Fleming’s first *Bucoliks* is small at 31 pages in length but, despite its modest size, this and his 1575 *Eclogues* were momentous books. Through this book Fleming enabled anyone who understood English to access Virgil the “prince of Latine poets”, whose poetry had previously been the preserve of students in grammar schools and universities. Why Fleming chose to open his literary career in this innovative way is unknown. It is possible that he had translated some or all of *Bucoliks* as part of his degree at Peterhouse, and this study became the basis for a draft. Fleming was a poor student, a sizar, who had to perform chores around his college; his own library was probably a modest one.\(^{248}\) He might therefore have developed empathy with would-be students who wanted to access scholarly books but could not afford to pay for schooling or university. Fleming therefore targeted people who were perfectly capable of understanding and enjoying classical texts but, confined by circumstance, were unable to get a good formal education. Fleming made it possible for aspiring students to buy a copy of *Bucoliks* in Latin and a copy of his literal translation of the text, and teach themselves classics. Fleming’s desire to “English” scholarly texts and make them accessible to school boys, whom he referred to as “yong beginners”, is evident in his earlier printed books. Later in Fleming’s career he developed several Latin-English dictionaries, again aimed at boys beginning to learn Latin, although this would not have precluded other social groups from using his translations and dictionaries to educate themselves.\(^{249}\)

Fleming produced three different translations of what is essentially the same book, Virgil’s *Eclogues*. In 1575 he produced a rhyming English translation called simply *Eclogues into English verse Rhythmical*. No copies of this text have survived\(^{250}\) but there is one surviving

\(^{248}\) See pp. 24-6.

\(^{249}\) Fleming’s dictionaries are discussed on pp. 190-9.

\(^{250}\) Fleming’s rhyming *Eclogues* was catalogued by Thomas Tanner as follows: *Virgili Bucolica Pr. ded. Petro Osbourne armigero. “Taking a view right worshipfull”*. See Tanner, *Bibliotheca Britannico-Hibernica* (1748), p. 287. Joseph Ames described this book as “Virgil’s Eclogues. Translated into English verse (Rhythmical)”. See Ames, *Typographical Antiquities* (1749), p. 372. This suggests that at least one copy of the rhymed *Eclogues* had survived into the mid-eighteenth century, and it was not the (cont.)
copy of its sister text, Fleming’s 1575 unrhymed English translation called *Bucoliks* (STC 24816). The full title of this book is *The Bucoliks of Publius Virgilius Maro, with alphabetcall annotations upon proper names of Gods, Goddesses, men, women, hilles, flouddes, cities, townes, and villages &c. Drawne into plaine and familiar Englishe, verse for verse by Abraham Fleming student*. There was a variant title for this same edition, which includes the phrase “with annotations in the Margent”, suggesting that there were at least two imprints of Fleming’s unrhymed *Bucoliks*. This in turn implies that the book was popular enough to warrant at least two print runs. This edition was printed quarto in size with 31 numbered pages by J. Charlewood and sold by Woodcocke; both men would feature again in Fleming’s career. The third version was published in 1589 when Fleming “newlie translated” in verse *The Bucoliks of Virgil Prince of all Latine poets otherwise called his pastorals together with his Georgiks or ruralls* (STC 24817).

The numerous editions of books by Virgil listed on Elizabethan and Stuart inventories suggest that Latin transcriptions and Fleming’s translations of Virgil’s books were once very common, so common that they were often recorded simply as “Virgil” and “another Virgil”. Presumably therefore, very few copies were thought worth keeping once they became dog-eared and worn, hence Fleming’s 1575 unrhymed *Bucoliks*, kept at the Bodleian Library, is now unique. Its survival is due to the fact that this particular copy fell into the hands of a succession of eighteenth-century bibliophiles. It was first recorded in the library inventories of a “Mr Heber”, surely Richard Heber (1773-1833) whose vast collection of books filled eight houses. Heber’s copy of *Bucoliks* then passed to a “Mr Herbert”, presumably the bibliophile William Herbert (active c.1785-90) who edited and enlarged Joseph Ames’ *Typographical Antiquities: Bucoliks* then passed to a “Mr Corser”, most likely Reverend

---


Thomas Corser (1793-1876) who had a very extensive library that was auctioned off in 30 separate days over a period of five years.\(^{252}\)

Pollard and Redgrave’s Short-title Catalogue only lists one Virgil by Fleming for 1575, namely The Bucoliks drawne into English by A. Fleming (STC 24816), but this is not a very helpful title since both Fleming’s 1575 texts were drawn into English and STC did not distinguish between the unrhymed and rhymed translations. It is likely that this vague catalogue entry resulted from and perpetuated the problem of identifying Fleming’s Virgils.\(^{253}\) The 1575 texts were very different, for example they were dedicated to different people. Fleming, still a student, dedicated his now lost 1575 “rythmicall” translation of Eclogues to Peter Osbourne (1521–92), who he describes as a “soldier”, but Osbourne was an administrator and ecclesiastical commissioner, related to John Cheke and associated with William Cecil, so it possible that Fleming had referred to Osbourne as a ‘soldier in Christ’ after St Paul rather than a literal warrior. This, the earliest of all Fleming’s dedications, demonstrates one aspect that was to colour almost all of Fleming’s future dedications: his desire to come to the attention of Cecil, later Lord Burghley. During his career Fleming never dedicated a book to Cecil himself, but almost all his dedications were to members of Cecil’s circle. He clearly sought patronage from Cecil but never approached Cecil directly, although the evidence suggests he came very close. Among Fleming’s manuscripts was a memorial poem written by Elizabeth Russell (Burghley’s sister-in-law) for Jane, Burghley’s mother, who died 10 March 1587.\(^{254}\) Her death came after the second edition of Holinshed’s Chronicles was printed, so presumably this document had been given to Fleming for inclusion in the proposed third edition of Holinshed’s Chronicles.\(^{255}\) Aside from these


\(^{253}\) Miller considered Fleming’s plain English Bucoliks and rhyming Eclogues to be one and the same, and the STC entry number 24816 that was given to Bucoliks says that it rhymes, when it does not.

\(^{254}\) The manuscript is now lost and only survives as this entry in Peck’s Desiderata Curiosa: “D. Elizabethae Russellae in Mortem Janae D. Willielmi Ceciliæ Matris (quae obiit x. Martii MDLXXXVII.) Carmina. MS. Mun. Flemingi”. See Appendix C, p. 264.

\(^{255}\) Professor Pauline Croft believes that this is an important poem for it represents a previously unknown example of an epitaph poem by Elizabeth Russell, William Cecil’s sister-in-law. Pauline Croft, pers. comm.
details, nothing else is known about Fleming’s 1575 rhyming Eclogues and no copies are known to have survived, except as entries in the eighteenth-century bibliographic catalogues of Tanner and Ames.

In 1589, a year after his ordination, Fleming returned to translating a third version of Virgil’s Bucoliks and this was to become his last new published book. Whether Fleming intended this to be his last book or not is unclear, but with hindsight it seems significant that, as his literary career drew to a close, he decided to revisit Virgil and chose to “newly translate” Bucoliks, this time in verse. Fleming also translated Virgil’s Georgics, which was notably another first. Even at the very end of his literary career Fleming was still pioneering, still taking hitherto scholarly Latin texts and making them accessible to ordinary people.

Fleming named the 1589 book The Bucoliks of Publius Virgilius Maro, Prince of all Latine poets otherwise called his Pastoralls or Shepherds meetings together with his Georgiks, or Ruralls otherwise called his husbandrie, conteyning foure bookes. All newlie translated into English verse by A.F. The different title should have created a clear distinction between the 1575 and 1589 editions of this particular work, but it has in fact caused problems for modern cataloguers and scholars because this version of Bucoliks was in rhyming verse like the 1575 Eclogues. This led some scholars to believe that this book was a second edition of Fleming’s original Eclogues, despite Fleming giving them different titles. However, the 1589 rhymed book did share its title with the unrhymed Bucoliks of 1575, and further muddled cataloguing resulted as scholars confused these different published dates. This most likely explains the STC entry for the 1575 Bucoliks which says simply that it was in English.

There are four known surviving copies of Fleming’s 1589 Bucoliks and these have caused another problem all of their own. On the front title page Fleming added the phrase “together

---

256 Three other books followed but these were later editions of older titles: a “newlie drawne” edition of Alphabet of Praiers (1591); a revised edition of A shorte dictionarie in Latine and English (1599); and, an edition of A dictionarie in English and Latine for children “augmented” with Fleming’s proverbs and verses (1602).
with his Georgiks”, which suggests that this was intended to be a single book containing both the Bucoliks and Georgiks. Both books were quarto in size and printed by Thomas Orwin to be sold by Woodcocke at his shop The Black Bear in Paul’s Churchyard.

Consequently Bucoliks and Georgiks have been catalogued as one text with the two titles sharing the same STC number. However, the British Library’s copy (shelfmark C.122.c.13) reveals a different story. The first 32 pages comprise Bucoliks, well printed with a clear title page and embellished with woodcuts of a uniform style. Georgiks does not start at page 33 as one might expect had it followed straight on from Bucoliks, but starts with a new page one. Georgiks has its own title page and a separate dedication. This book looks as though it was printed quickly and costs were kept down, although both colophons say that the books were printed by Orwin. The woodcuts used to illustrate Georgiks are of a different style too and do not match those used in Bucoliks. This indicates that Fleming’s Georgiks was intended to be a separate text to Bucoliks and the evidence also suggests that Orwin printed Bucoliks himself and farmed Georgiks out to a colleague or even to an apprentice. In addition the Bodleian Library’s copy (shelfmark CC28(3)Jur) has different wording on the title page making it a variant edition, which led bibliophiles to conclude wrongly that there were two different editions of the Georgiks. One variant was supposed to have been bound with Bucoliks and the other variant was available separately. This theory was upheld in the Peterhouse Biographical Register, which went so far as to suggest that the 1589 Bucoliks, Georgiks and Bucoliks and Georgiks comprised three distinct texts, despite examples of such bound copies having separate title pages and being quite obviously different in style.

This thesis demonstrates that there were two books produced in 1589: these were the third translation of Bucoliks and a brand new translation of Georgiks. Woodcocke’s customers could purchase one of each title and ask to have them bound as one, in which case there was a supplementary title page available that could be inserted at the front. Alternatively customers could just purchase the book that they wanted. However, Fleming’s 1589 Georgiks continues to share an STC number with the Bucoliks and is not counted as a

separate title. This is one reason why scholars have disagreed over exactly how many books Fleming is known to have published.

This thesis makes it clear that Fleming produced four distinct translations of Virgil. Because of the similarities between the texts, the ways in which they have been bound and poor scholarship in the past there has been much confusion over how many versions Fleming actually produced and which ones were rhymed. The 1575 blank verse Bucoliks (STC 24816, of which there was a print variant) and the 1575 rhyming Eclogues (lost) were two separate books. The 1589 Bucoliks and the 1589 Georgiks (both allocated STC 24817) were also two distinct books, and not simply second editions of Fleming’s earlier translations.

The 1589 Bucoliks (which, to confuse matters further, Fleming also called the ‘pastoralls’) and the separate 1589 Georgiks (which he called ‘husbandrie’) are perhaps the most interesting of these four Virgil translations for a number of reasons. A copy was purchased by the playwright Ben Jonson from a shop in St Paul’s Churchyard. Jonson inscribed the title page with his name, place of purchase and the year 1591. The inscription is evidence that Fleming’s translations were still selling two years after they were first printed. This strongly suggests that Bucoliks and Georgiks were popular and these editions were likely to have been reprinted to ensure their continued availability. Jonson’s copy later passed to John Morris (b. 1580) who was a collector of Jonson’s work, and this particular book is now kept at the British Library.\(^{258}\) Also in this copy is a printed marginal reference by Fleming to another of his printed books: a version of Museus’ History of Leander and Hero, the original of which was lost in antiquity. There is no other reference to a book about Leander and Hero by Fleming (he reversed the characters’ names from the more usual Hero and Leander) and this title is not in any antiquarian catalogues or inventories. This tiny marginal note, now badly cropped, is the only record of this elusive book by Fleming. It is likely that he did produce more than the 52 known titles attributed to him, although the question of how many other lost Fleming books there might be remains unanswered at present.

---

\(^{258}\) BL shelfmark C.122.c.13.
Attributing books to Fleming has been made easier because of his translation of *Georgiks*. He closed this text with his Latin signature tag: “FINIS propositi, laus Christo, nescia FINIS”. Where this tag closes sections within other texts, for example his indexes in *Peter Martyr* and *Nomenclator*, Fleming’s name is not always present, so having his name and motto together in *Georgiks* confirms that this Latin phrase certainly was his signature tag. It is therefore safe to say that where this tag closed sections of otherwise anonymous works, such as his indexes, the author was Fleming.

Fleming’s translation of *Bucoliks* and *Georgiks* are important for another reason. They were dedicated to John Whitgift and in the dedication Fleming thanked the Archbishop for the “benevolence and benefice” shown to him. It was this dedication that reminded Whitgift of the service Fleming had performed during the censoring of *Holinshed’s Chronicles* two years earlier, and the dedication very likely secured Fleming a living as a chaplain and rector of St Pancras, Soper Lane.259

It is impossible to know the exact reason why Fleming chose to translate *Georgiks* in 1589. However this book might be another example of Fleming writing in response to an event. In 1577 following the sighting of a comet, Fleming translated Nausea’s treatise *Quolibet alio cometa explorato* into *Blasing Stare*.260 Similarly, he produced two memorials to William Lambe when this popular philanthropist died in 1580.261 This thesis argues that Fleming’s translation of *Georgiks* was another occasional text produced in response to an event.

Virgil’s bees were male “king” bees, in keeping with the belief that the dominant bee of the beehive, the wholesome industry and hierarchy of which was a recognized model for human society, was properly male.262 Despite their gender, the dogfight between the two insects was

259 As discussed on pp. 123-4.
261 See pp. 147-55.
262 It was not until 1623 (sixteen years after Fleming died) that naturalist Charles Butler published *The Feminine Monarchy* and announced that in the hive “the males have no sway at all”. Butler’s findings did
too good a metaphorical device to ignore in the late 1580s. Fleming’s translation of the
passage about the quarrelsome ruling bees, one gloriously golden and the other considerably
less so, surely called to mind Elizabeth and Mary Queen of Scots, particularly as the youthful
golden bee defeated and ultimately destroyed the drab and broken rival. This opportunity to
allude to Mary’s downfall might explain why Fleming chose to translate *Georgiks* and why
he dedicated this book to Archbishop Whitgift, who had been party to Mary’s controversial
but necessary execution.\(^{263}\) Whitgift had also been one of the censors responsible for the
removal of the passages about Mary in Holinshed’s *Chronicles*, which Fleming had to
replace quickly and discreetly. The ambiguous meaning of the bees surely reminded Whitgift
of the service Fleming performed in 1587. Once ordained, Fleming was given the coveted
position of chaplain to the queen’s cousin and, after *Georgiks* was printed, a living in one of
Whitgift’s London parishes.

**Other classical translations and Renaissance humanist texts**

Between 1575 and 1579, almost all the books that he wrote were translations of classical
texts. In 1576 Fleming followed his two early translations of Virgil with a translation of
another classical text: Aelian’s *A Registre of Hystories conteining martiall exploites of
worthy warriours* in fourteen books or chapters (hereafter *Registre*). Each chapter had
‘alphabetical gatherings’ (a method of organising text that Fleming had seen in *Alphabet of
Praisers* and would later adopt when setting out the text for his *Diamond*). Middleton printed
this book for the seller Woodcocke. *Registre* was not a very lengthy or large book, just
quarto in size with 178 pages, but some copies must have been treasured and lavishly bound
for one copy is valued in a Cambridge inventory in 1586 at 4s 6d.\(^{264}\) Fleming dedicated
*Registre* to Dr Gabriel Goodman, a friend of William Cecil. The dedication provides
evidence that there were at least two editions of this book now very rare book. In the
dedication Fleming wrote that he had left Cambridge three years previously (“intermission

\(^{263}\) See pp. 123-4.  
\(^{264}\) See the 1586 inventory of William Anderson of Trinity College in Leedham-Green, *Books in
Cambridge inventories* vol. 1 (1986).
ab Academia”) but as he did not leave Cambridge until 1575 the dedication was surely written in 1578 and inserted into a later edition of this book. Copies of this book were regularly recorded in inventories of the late-sixteenth and early-seventeenth centuries, therefore it seems likely that Fleming’s edition of Registre was popular and reprinted several times. Inventories suggest that this title was likely to have been popular among academics. One copy was owned by William Anderson of Trinity College Cambridge, who died in 1586 shortly after being ordained, while another copy was bought by Richard Mote of Queen’s College, Cambridge who died in 1592 (the latter copy was valued at 8d, suggesting it was either very well used and dog-eared or unbound). These scholars had owned their copies of Fleming’s Registre for a decade and sixteen years respectively; clearly this book was not a cheap throw-away but rather an academic reference book aimed at the wealthy or at learned scholars.

Aelian (175–235), correctly known as Claudius Aelianus, was a Roman author who wrote in Greek and produced popular collections of historical miscellany in the third century, had been a popular author for over 1,000 years by the time Fleming translated Registre. It is likely that Fleming was drawn to Aelian because the latter was a stoical, moralising Roman and it is this stoical, moralising style that the young Cambridge student adopted in his own writing, notably Diamond and other shorter texts such as the Wunder pamphlet. What is interesting about Fleming’s translation and reworking of Registre is that he had a wealth of Aelian’s writing to choose from, everything from food and athletics to somewhat anthropomorphized natural history, social customs, natural phenomena and instructive allegorical reworkings of myths. Fleming selected some of his material for Registre from this wide ranging subject matter. However, as the book’s title suggests, he chose to concentrate on warfare, notably the martial exploits of Roman soldiers. This surely explains why there were four manuscripts in Fleming’s collection concerned with Roman conquest, for example “De Discrimine inter Triumphum & Tropoeum”, which almost certainly refers to the second-century monument erected in present day Romania to mark Trajan’s victory over the Dacians. In another translation printed in 1576, Panoplie of Epistles, Fleming included letters
from the well-known Roman writer and lawyer Pliny the Younger (61–112), who had corresponded with Trajan on a number of themes including that of war and the army. This might provide one reason why Fleming was particularly interested in Pliny’s letters. Peck described three other manuscripts in Fleming’s collection that were similarly themed: “De Mode triumphandi inter Romanos”; “De Imperatoris Mauritii Interitu. Anno Christi DCII”, which is surely related to the many victories of the Byzantine Emperor Maurice (582–602); and, “De tribus Causis, inter alias, praecipuis Discordiae sive Divisionis inter Romanos”.

Knowing when Fleming was working on his translation of Aelian and focusing on Roman military history might help to give an approximate date for his acquisition of these manuscripts. His interest in Aelian and Pliny might also help to explain why these four otherwise out-of-place manuscripts were in his collection: Fleming’s others papers were about contemporary English matters.

In addition, in 1576 Fleming translated and compiled Certaine Select Epistles of Cicero. This is now lost and survives only as a catalogue entry in Bibliotheca Britannico-Hibernica, which was compiled by the eighteenth-century bibliophile Thomas Tanner. Fleming included Cicero in Panoplie of Epistles (1576), and it is likely that the letters he chose to translate in Select Epistles were at least partly the same as those printed in Panoplie. Fleming is known to have ‘recycled’ his writing, for example Diamond of Devotion borrowed heavily from Footepath of Faith (as discussed on pp. 72-3 and pp. 77-8). Cicero (106–43 B.C.), the Roman orator was famous for his political speeches and in particular his “defence orations”, so the theme of war was also present in this book. It is apparent from Fleming’s other texts that he was often inspired by or reacting to current affairs. His interest in Roman military matters might have been inspired by the French Wars of Religion, which had been raging since 1562; the Fifth War had flared up following the death of Charles IX in May 1574. His brother Henri duke of Anjou, who had been crowned king of Poland in 1574, secretly entered France and was crowned Henri III later that year. The years from early-1574 to early-1576, by which time the Sixth War had started, were not only troubled but were also

265 Resolving conflict became a theme in Fleming’s translations. See pp. 141-3.
exactly the years when *Registre*, with its military theme, and *Select Epistles of Cicero* were being compiled and printed. As the French Wars of Religion began to draw in Spain and England (by the Eighth War the conflicts were considered by contemporaries to be an extension of the hostilities between Philip of Spain and Elizabeth) there must have been not little concern on the streets of London. Thousands of Huguenot refugees emigrated to England, a great many of whom settled in the capital, and their presence probably reminded Londoners of the Wars. During 1576-7 a tentative peace developed in France following the Edict of Beaulieu; the outbreak of the Fifth War in 1574 and Henri’s connection to Poland might explain Fleming’s desire to collect manuscripts and write on the subject of classical war in Eastern Europe.

Another possible inspiration, or perhaps a concurrent inspiration, although a little outdated by the time *Registre* was printed, might have been the Turks’ unsuccessful attempt to take Western Europe (their invasion reached as far as Vienna) in 1571, culminating with Pope Pius V’s Holy Roman League defeating the Ottoman invaders in a sea battle at Lepanto. Lepanto took place some five years prior to Fleming’s *Registre* and *Select Epistles of Cicero* being printed but it is likely that he started compiling and writing these books before 1576, since *Registre* was moderate quarto in size and 178 pages long. Fleming could produce small treatises very quickly but *Registre* was a substantial translation and not written overnight.

The wars and European invasions stemming from formerly Byzantine kingdoms provides another example of Fleming reacting to, and capitalising on, the events going on around him as opposed to writing about the past for the sake of antiquarianism.

Fleming’s interest in classical literature inspired him to translate another collection of letters that was also printed in 1576. This was a compilation of translations from several different Roman and Greek writers and one Elizabethan scholar, which Fleming titled *A Panoplie of Epistles. Or a looking glass for the vnlearned. From Tully, Isocrates, Pliny, Roger Ascham etc. used of the best and the eloquentest Rhetoricians that have lived in all ages* (hereafter *Panoplie*). Like *Registre*, *Panoplie* was printed by Middleton (although *Panoplie* was sold by...
Newberie) and dedicated to another of Lord Burghley’s circle of intimates, Sir William Cordell. Two further books were dedicated to Cordell: Blasing Starrs in 1577 and Bright Burning Beacon in 1580.

It is not possible to say why Fleming chose to translate this selection of works beyond the reason that he gave in the title of this book: they were considered the best, most eloquent rhetoricians. It is also likely that the choice was based largely on what Latin texts were available to him at Peterhouse. However, Fleming most likely included Pliny because of his topical interest in Trajan’s war in Eastern Europe. Pliny had also written a great deal about public waterworks and conduits, and such benefaction was of interest to Fleming. It is likely that Fleming was born and lived in Holborn so he would have been familiar with the conduit that William Lambe had financed, which was completed in 1577. This kindly act and the provision of clean water to his neighbourhood seem to have moved Fleming, who went on to write three tributes commemorating Lambe and his good deeds.266

Panoplie also included letters by the Athenian orator Isocrates (436–338 B.C.). The reason for this is surely that Isocrates’ philosophical works were popular among scholars and had become standards for teaching rhetoric and morality to schoolboys. However, Isocrates also wrote of war and his belief in a pan-Hellenic peace in which the enlightened political states were unified by their intellect and education, led by Athens. Perhaps the war by proxy between Spain and England, which was taking place as Fleming compiled Panoplie, encouraged him to include Isocrates’ letters. Possibly Fleming hoped that Isocrates would provide a model for a lasting pan-European settlement, led by England.

Fleming chose to include some of Cicero’s letters in Panoplie, calling him by the fashionable Renaissance diminutive Tully, derived from Marcus Tullius Cicero. Fleming’s decision to refer to Cicero as Tully is revealing, for Tully was the name popularized by the Italian Renaissance poet Dante, who, like Fleming, had been particularly drawn to Virgil. It is

266 The Lambe texts are discussed on pp. 147-55.
Virgil who leads Dante through the first cantos of his *Inferno* where, in the First Circle of Hell (canto IV), they encounter Tully among other virtuous but pagan characters. Fleming’s knowledge of and translations of Virgil and Tully suggest far more than a familiarity with Dante’s *Divine Comedy*. It is probable that Fleming was aware of the humanist movement, and would have encountered English humanists or humanicians when at Cambridge. The humanists were particularly interested in Cicero because Petrarch, often referred to as the father of Renaissance humanism, modelled his writing on Cicero, as well as Virgil, whose written Latin was considered to be almost perfect. Fleming was certainly interested in reading and translating both Virgil, whose works he translated four times in total, and Cicero, whose letters he published twice, making Virgil and Cicero unique among Fleming’s printed books since he never revisited any other authors.

The term “humanist” had been defined by John Florio in his Italian/English Dictionary of 1598: “umanista, a humanist or professor of humanity”. Fleming used the term almost a decade ahead of Florio when in 1589 that his *Georgiks* was suitable for “weak grammatists” rather than “courtly humanists”. For this reason Fleming is among the earliest English writers known to have used the word “humanist”. Fleming’s *Georgiks* was suitable for aspiring scholars and would-be humanists without Latin. What Fleming meant was that, although they were in English language, *Georgiks* and the earlier classical translations he had made were still scholarly, humanist texts. A humanist in 1589 was an intellectual who studied classical Latin texts at first hand or *ad fontes* as opposed to vulgar Medieval Latin editions of earlier works; the definition did not say one could not translate primary texts into English *verbatim*. Fleming’s translating is literal and accurate, in no way is his writing “vulgar”, therefore he provided readers without Latin the next best thing to an *ad fontes* text.

*Panoplie of Epistles* included letters by Roger Ascham (c.1515–68), who had tutored the queen in Latin and Greek and for whom she had great affection. Fleming surely intended to put Ascham on the same lofty pedestal as Tully and the great Roman orators, and, since Ascham had taught the queen, this would also flatter Elizabeth. The queen enjoyed reading
Cicero in Latin and could recall almost all of his writing, a fact that would have made her an intimidating reader of any translation. As Fleming dedicated this book to one of Lord Burghley’s circle it is possible that this book circulated at court. It is not known if the queen ever read Fleming’s Panoplie herself but the inclusion of both Cicero and Ascham would presumably have piqued her curiosity. Fleming was well known in the mid-1570s when his name was included in the first edition of Holinshed’s Chronicles as one of the “writers of our nation”. His confidence in his own abilities and his translating skills must have been high. Fleming was surely aware that there was a good chance that Elizabeth, a respected classicist, would hear of his book, either from Burghley’s circle or perhaps from her godson Harington, who was probably encouraged to read Panoplie by his tutor, Fleming’s brother.

Panoplie was printed in 1576 and it is more than coincidence that Fleming included Ascham at this time. Earlier in 1576 Edward Grant, a close friend of Ascham, published the schoolmaster’s collected letters in a book with the preface ‘Oratio de Vita et Obitu Rogeri Aschami’. Fleming took advantage of the interest in the schoolmaster instigated by Grant and almost simultaneously produced a book that also included Ascham’s letters. However, Fleming’s book also included the writing of Isocrates, ideal for using as a school book at the same time his brother was tutoring John Harington. This probably represents Fleming’s attempts to be noticed in court circles. Further commissions were most likely given to Fleming as a result of his writing Panoplie, although these were from peripheral members of the queen’s extended circle. Panoplie was dedicated to Cordell and when Cordell’s good friend Lambe died in 1580, Fleming was commissioned by Lambe’s executors including Cordell to produced two memorial publications. Also in 1580 Fleming was given a dictionary or Alvearie to update and enlarge. Alvearie had previously been edited by the same Edward Grant that had been Ascham’s friend and author of Graecae Linguae Spicilegium, which contained poetry by Fleming’s brother (as mentioned on p. 20).

---

268 Fleming Alvearie or quadruple dictionary, containing foure sundrie tongues: namelie English, Latine, Greeke and French (1580). The original Alvearie had been compiled by Peterhouse alumnus John Baret (d. 1578). The 1580 edition by Fleming is recognized as a distinct book with its own STC number: 1411.
The last text to belong to this group of translations is *A paradoxe proving, by reason and example, that baldnesse is much better than bushie haire, &c.* Written by that excellent philosopher Synesius, Bishop of Thebes or (as some say) Cyren. A prettie pamphlet, to perverse, and replenished with recreation. Englished by Abraham Fleming. Herevnto is annexed the pleasant tale of Hemetes the Hermite, pronounced before the Queenes Maiestie. Newly recognised in bothe Latine and englishe by the said A. E. (hereafter Bushie Haire).

This was the first of Fleming’s books to be printed by Denham. The evidence in this thesis demonstrates that Fleming produced this book for children.

*Bushie Haire* was a translation of the light-hearted riposte *Encomium Calvitii* (“in praise of baldness”) written by Synesius (373–414) in response to Dio Chrysostom’s *encomium In Praise of Hair*. Fleming’s title page carried the humorous motto “The badge of wisdome is baldnesse”. In his ‘Epistle Apologeticall to the lettered Reader’ Fleming explained to his surely intrigued audience that

> It might be demed dotage in the Deuiser, and madnesse in the Translator, that they both by consent, would publish and disperse a toie so ridiculous as this appeareth to be, penned in the praise of Baldnesse. But the Deuisers settled iudgment dischargeth him of dotage, the Translators aduisement cleereth him of madness, & the worke it selfe consideratiuelie perused, doeth answer for them both.

There followed descriptions of other “toys” with sound, classical foundations that were surely included in this ‘Epistle’ by Fleming because they would have appealed specifically to children. He mentioned “*Virgil of a Gnat, Ovid of a nut*” and others who he said were not “brainsicke” but rather very skilled. For example, Mymecides

> made foure horses drawing a cart, & their driuer with his whip, in such curious compasse, that they were hidden vnder the wings of a flie: and Callicrates a shippe, the whole bodie where of a littl e bird couerd with his feathers.\(^{269}\)

---

\(^{269}\) Fleming, *Bushie Haire*, p. 3-4. The “Deuiser” is surely Denham.
Fleming closed the epistle with a sustained burst of alliteration, again this was surely written to capture the interest of children and possibly to make them laugh:

> With which sentence I conclude, in the behalfe of mine Authors, submitting his trauell to the censure of the sage, among whome, as all wise heades deserue inrollment, so I wish them wiselie to weigh his words who hath written this worke vpon the warrant of wisedome.

> Thine for thy pleasure and profite,

> Abraham Fleming. ²⁷⁰

“Annexed” within Bushie Haire was A Pleasant Tale of Hemetes the Hermit, which had been presented to the queen at Woodstock by George Gascoigne in 1575 and proved very popular. ²⁷¹ There are two versions of Hemetes in Fleming’s book, one in Latin and the other in English. Fleming surely did this so that the pleasant story could serve as an educational text. The reader could make a double translation and compare their results to Fleming’s versions of Hemetes. This was a recognized way of teaching young children Latin and therefore this thesis maintains that Bushie Haire was designed to be a fun and intriguing introduction to classical works and Latin for children.

**The William Lambe texts**

Between 1579 and 1580 Fleming wrote three original publications in English. These were a godly treatise The Conduit of Comfort conteining sundrie comfortable prayers to the strengthening faith of a weak Christian (1579); a broadside called An epitaph or funeral inscription upon the godlie life and death of the right worshipfull Maister William Lambe esq. founder of the new conduit in Holborn, &c. Deceased this one and twentieth of April, and intumbed in S. Faiths Church under Powles the sixt of Maie next and immediately following Anno 1580. Deuised by Abraham Fleming (1580); and, a godly biographical book titled A memoriale of the famous monuments and charitable almesdeedes of Maister W. Lambe, esquire. Deceased the 21 April. an. 1580 (1580).

²⁷⁰ Fleming, Bushie Haire, pp. 3-4.
²⁷¹ Gascoigne was one of the writers associated with Holborn, which this thesis argues was Fleming’s birthplace. Gascoigne was a student at Middle Temple and two of his plays were performed at Gray’s Inn; he died in 1577. He was certainly a friend of Whetston, who was strongly associated with Fleming. Gascoigne was likely to have known Fleming personally. See pp. 162-3.
Conduit) provides evidence of the ongoing popularity of Fleming’s writing, although little else is known about this book. It was first registered with the Stationers’ Company in June 1579 when it was assigned to Denham by Seres. After Fleming’s death the book was registered again in March 1613 by W. White and again in September 1623 by J. White to the printer Augustine Matthewes; this edition was sold by Francis Grove in the following year. There were at least five editions although no complete first editions of this once popular and affordable book (it was valued at 1 shilling in 1588) have survived.\textsuperscript{272} Little else can be said about Fleming’s Conduit except that it was likely to have been connected to Lambe.

It seems likely that the 1579 edition of Conduit was known as “Lambe’s Conduit of Comfort”. However this alternative title has caused confusion by suggesting that there were two different texts by Fleming with “Conduit” in their titles. Since the only surviving copy of the 1579 Conduit is lacking its title page it is impossible to know what the first edition was actually called. This thesis demonstrates that there was only one book and it was called Conduit of Comfort, since this is the title by which Fleming referred to the book.\textsuperscript{273} This thesis also demonstrates that it was popularly called “Lambe’s Conduit of Comfort” because the book had been dedicated to Lambe. The unique copy from 1579 is incomplete, the first two pages of the dedication are lost and the name of its addressee is missing. However, the remaining text included this passage:

\begin{quote}
Beseeching God, that your temporall Conduit sweete and hoalsome water conueied into the vessels of a great multitude, for their sundrie services: so from this spirituall Conduit, comfort may flowe.\textsuperscript{274}
\end{quote}

Since Lambe built a conduit and furnished it with a large number of buckets or vessels, this dedication must have been to Lambe. The fifth imprint of 1624, which was published 40 years after Lambe’s death, did not include a dedication, most likely because Lambe was no

\textsuperscript{272} There are two incomplete copies of the first edition at the British Library, both missing their title pages and most of their dedications. There is a microfilm copy of a 1624 edition in the Folger Shakespeare Library, which I have been unable to see at the time of writing.

\textsuperscript{273} BL Harl.5927(260-262). In the dedication of this microfilm copy Fleming wrote that he was “Meditating this Manuell intituled Conduit of Comfort, and deliberating with myselfe (according to common custome,) under whose sheeld it might be safely shadowed”.

\textsuperscript{274} Abraham Fleming, Conduit of Comfort (1579), p. iiiii.
longer remembered with the popular affection he had enjoyed during his lifetime. For this reason the later edition was known simply as Conduit of Comfort and given its own STC number, suggesting that it was a different book, which it is not.275

Just like Fleming’s other godly treatises, Diamond and Footepath, Conduit remained popular long after his death and one reference to this book demonstrates the relevance of Fleming’s godly lessons into the seventeenth century. Katherine Paston quoted and referred to Conduit in an instructive letter to her son, Will, who was at university in the 1620s.276 This thesis argued that Fleming’s small, pocket sized and decorated godly treatises were intended for women to enjoy and also read to their children in order to impart moral lessons.277 The Paston letters confirm that Fleming’s Conduit was used for this purpose, and it is likely that his other godly pocket books were too.

When Lambe died on 21 April 1580, Fleming was commissioned to write two new publications, the Epitaph and Memoriall, which celebrated the life of this well-respected figure. It is largely due to Fleming that we know so much about Lambe, and Memoriall was the source for the DNB entry for Lambe.278 Lambe was born in 1495 in Sutton Valence, Kent. The Lambe family were described by Fleming as being “of mean estate” but William Lambe rose to be a gentleman of the Chapel Royal to Henry VIII. Once in London Lambe made his fortune as a clothworker, later holding notable positions within the Company and after the dissolution in 1542 he was able to buy from King Henry the Chapel of St James next to his own house in London Wall. Although he married three times, Lambe remained childless and by 1576 he had started giving away his worldly goods. His house and chapel were bequeathed together with £30 per year to the Company of Clothworkers so that the

275 The confusion caused by giving different editions of the same book their own STC numbers might explain why previous studies of Fleming attributed different numbers of books to him.
277 See pp. 82-3.
Company could provide money and clothing for 24 poor people every year, and for a minister to say thrice-weekly prayers. In addition Lambe left £6 13s 4d per year to the Stationers’ Company so that they could give money to the poor, and he made other smaller donations to churches, hospitals and prisons in London. 279 Not all his charitable deeds took the form of bequests. Despite his commitments in London, Lambe never forgot Sutton Valence, his Kentish birthplace. In 1576 he founded a free grammar school in the village and provided £30 a year for the master, Robert Sharpe (whom Lambe also endowed with a house) and an usher. 280 He made other gifts and annuities in Sutton Valence including an almshouse for cloth workers and he endowed nearby Maidstone Grammar School. Fleming carefully catalogued and recorded all of Lambe’s good deeds within Memoriall to Master William Lambe in 1580, which was interspersed with Fleming’s trademark godly moralising.

Perhaps Lambe’s best-known and biggest altruistic act (one that “disbursed thereabouts of his own costs and charges to the summe of fifteen hundred poundes” 281) was financing the building of

the Conduite which of his owne costs, not requiring either collection or contribution, founded of late in Holborne, not sparing expenses so it might bee substantiall, not pinching for charges so it might be durable and plentifulfull, as they can testifie which saw the seeking of the springs, the maner of sinking the trenches, the ordering of the pipes, lieng in length from the head, to the saide conduit, more than two thousand yards: and finally the framing of euerie necessarie appurtenance therefore unto belonging. 282

Fleming also explained that Lambe purchased “a hundred and twentie pales, wherewith to carrie and serue water” so that the poor women of Holborn could collect and sell clean water in order to earn an honest wage. Today there are prominent reminders of Lambe’s good

279 Lambe’s bequest to the Clothworkers would be approximately £4,500 per year today and his bequest to the Stationers is roughly equal to £995, according to TNA online currency converter [http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/currency, accessed 20 April 2011].
280 The school founded by Lambe is still a well respected secondary school, as is Maidstone Grammar School.
281 Abraham Fleming, Memoriall of the Famouse monuments and charitable almesdeedes of Maister W. Lambe, esquire. Deceased the 21 April. an. 1580 (1580), p. 18. Lambe’s outlay of £1,500 in 1577 was extremely generous, almost a quarter of a million pounds today according to TNA online currency converter [http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/currency, accessed 20 April 2011].
282 Fleming, Memoriall, p. 17.
deeds in Holborn. A street has been named after Lambe’s watercourse; there is a modern monument to his conduit on the junction of Lambe’s Conduit Street and Guilford Street (opposite Coram’s Fields) and a pub near the site was called The Lamb. In Long Yard, a side street off Lambe’s Conduit Street, there is a less prominent white stone plaque marking the site of the actual wellhead. Written on this plaque in a seventeenth-century script is: “Lambe’s Conduit the property of the City of London, this Pump is Erected for the Benefit of the Publick”.

Both Memoriall and Epitaph are interesting and important because they demonstrate the speed at which Fleming could work. As the title of Memoriall indicates, Lambe died on 21 April 1580. The full title of Epitaph gives the date of his funeral, which was to be held on “the sixt of Maie next”. This title indicates that a great deal happened within a fortnight. Firstly Fleming was found, commissioned, and he devised and wrote Epitaph. He then took his draft to the printer Denham who typeset the text, printed it and edited a proof copy. Next, Denham produced the final print run and Epitaph went on sale. Since the broadside advertised Lambe’s forthcoming funeral, this broadside must have been circulating a week or more before Lambe’s interment on the “sixt of Maie next”. Epitaph was a lengthy folio-sized broadside comprising two columns of small text and written in rhyming couplets, as this section about Lambe’s humanity demonstrates:

So this religious Gentleman, a Patron to the poore,
In allies and in lanes abrode, at home in th’entrie doore,
In open streete, in holie Church, in many a corner crooke,
(Where, for the poore and impotent, whom kith and kin forlooke,
With charitable zeale inflamde this lowlie Lambe did looke,)
His almes he hath distributed, and giuen as he sawe neede,
Cloth for the backe, meate for the mouth, the hungrie soule to feede.
As lousing as a Lambe he liud, and verified his name,
He was an eie unto the blind, a legge to the lame,
A comfort to the comfortles, a succour to the sicke,
A father to the fatherles, whome nipping neede did pricke,
A husband to the desolate, and widowe left alone,
A fauourer and a freend to all, an animie to none.
Now such as had his wooll to weare lament of him the lacke,
His flesh did fill their bellies full, his fleese kept warme their backe,
His pence and pound preserved them, from many a wringing wracke.
No misse of mercie was in him, for jointly hart and hand,
Were pliant to supplie th' wantes, of many in this land.\textsuperscript{283}

The sheer length of the poem and the lack of a proposed popular tune at the start of the text make it unlikely that \textit{Epitaph} was intended to be sung. It was to be recited.

\textit{Epitaph} has all the hallmarks of a book by Fleming. As with many of his other printed texts, alliteration and metaphor were employed throughout the \textit{Epitaph}. The most obvious and appropriately religious metaphors were the lamb and the shepherd, as demonstrated in the excerpt below. Also in common with most of Fleming’s published books, he managed to get his own name into the body of the text as well as the title. In this case he resisted putting his trademark acrostic signatures into it. Possibly Fleming did not have time to devise verses that started with the letters of his own name, but it seems more likely this was done as a mark of respect: the focus of this poem was Lambe, not Fleming. Instead he merely alluded to himself by mentioning his Old Testament namesake:

\begin{quote}
The fruites of faith which he hath left behind him being ded,  
Are signs that Christ our Shepherd hath, unto his sheepfold led,  
This louing Lambe, who like a Lambe dide maekely in his bed:  
His bodie buried in Abrahams bosome restes in quietnesse I trust:  
A place allotted vnto Lambe, there to possesse in peace,  
Such blessings as this Lambe enioyes, whose like the Lord increase,  
For Iesus sake the spotlesse Lambe, And here my penne shall cease.\textsuperscript{284}
\end{quote}

Lambe was a well-known and much-loved figure yet no other pamphlets or books about him survive, except for those written by Fleming. When other terrible or popular events took place, such as the earthquake on 6 April 1580, the Stationers’ register recorded that a dozen different authors and printers had produced books and pamphlets about the tremors, and there were likely more that were not registered. Lambe’s death must have been felt keenly, especially among the poor, and there must have been a genuine need for comforting penny pamphlets and cheap commemorative broadsides about London’s great benefactor, as well as more substantial books for the wealthier contacts such as Clothworkers that Lambe had made.

\textsuperscript{283} Fleming, \textit{Epitaph}.  
\textsuperscript{284} Ibid.
during his long life. Lambe’s will confirmed that he had been popular. He certainly anticipated large numbers of mourners at his funeral and asked for a “sermon my desire shalbe at Paules Crosse for that the foresaid church of St Faith is very litell”. Paul’s Cross yard could accommodate hundreds or even thousands of people.

It is possible that the only tributes to Lambe were by Fleming because Lambe’s executors exercised some control over what was published. Why this was so might be explained by this request in Lambe’s last will and testament, in which he specifically asks for a learned man to create a sermon:

\[
\text{that my executors and overseers hereafter named at theire discrecones shall appoint a learned man to make a sermon at my burial.}\]

Lambe was a regular visitor to Paul’s Cross and wanted his funeral service to be held there. Throughout his long life he almost always attended the sermons at this open air pulpit, arriving early in the morning and being among the last to leave at night, so it is not surprising that he wanted to be remembered in this way. However, there is nothing in MacLure’s standard reference text Paul’s Cross Sermons to suggest that Lambe was allowed the Paul’s Cross sermon he wanted. Although there are gaps in MacLure’s study, the pulpit was tightly controlled and sermons were planned weeks in advance. The Stationers’ register also fails to mention any printed versions of a sermon about Lambe, which one might have been expected given Lambe’s popularity (although not all publications were registered). It is therefore unlikely that that Lambe’s wish was fulfilled, but his executors did the next best thing and “at theire discrecones” commissioned Fleming, who was certainly a “learned man”, to devise a more enduring memorial. One of Lambe’s executors was Cordell, whom Lambe described in his will as “my very dere frend”. Prior to 1580 Fleming had dedicated two books to Cordell, Panoplie (1576) and Blasing Starrs (1577), and the evidence from

---

285 TNA MS prob/11/62.
286 Ibid.
288 See pp. 211-3.
these dedications suggests that Cordell had been generous to Fleming in the past. Fleming wrote to Cordell in 1580 that he was “under your [Cordell’s] protection” and that he “doth not craue choice of a new patron”.289

This thesis argues that Cordell commissioned the godly and learned Fleming to write Epitaph and Memoriall in approximate accordance with Lambe’s wishes and to the exclusion of all other writers. Although Bright Burning Beacon was inspired by the earthquake that happened on 6 April, a fortnight before Lambe’s death, it was not registered with the Stationers’ Company until 27 June 1580. Epitaph was certainly produced before Bright Burning Beacon, and Memorial, which was registered with the Stationers’ on 28 April, was most likely to have been printed before Bright Burning Beacon as well. Therefore, the dedication in Bright Burning Beacon, which thanks Cordell for his “protection” almost certainly refers to Cordell protecting Fleming’s rights to produce books about Lambe. Cordell’s protection is important early evidence of a writer being given the copyright to his own writing, as opposed to the printer and/or seller owning the rights to a book, which was more usual at this time. Had Denham or Turner held the rights then he would have been at liberty to print memorials to Lambe by other writers. The evidence points to Fleming being the only writer to have commemorated Lambe’s life and death. The evidence also suggests that Fleming’s contemporaries apparently liked his style and it is likely that he won this commission on the strength of it.

Further evidence suggests that Cordell not only secured the rights to produce Lambe’s memorials on Fleming’s behalf but that he also paid Fleming generously for his texts. The payment may not have been made in money since in his last will and testament Lambe asked that “the preacher for his pains taking” be given “a blacke gowne of xiii” iii’d the yard”.290 Whether Fleming, whose two texts were written in lieu of the sermon, was given such a costly gown or given money instead is not known. However, he was happy to be under 289 From Fleming’s dedication to Cordell in Bright Burning Beacon.
290 TNA MS prob/11/62. A black gown made of material costing this much would have been a generous bequest.
Cordell’s patronage. It is likely that, had Cordell not died in 1581, Fleming would have dedicated further books to him.

Epitaph was written and printed quickly as a means of advertising Lambe’s funeral. Epitaph was intended to be very cheap so that the poorer people whom Lambe had helped could afford a memento of this generous public benefactor. At 40 pages Memoriall was a lengthier, considered biographical tribute to Lambe. It is not clear exactly when Memoriall was written, but this book was registered with the Stationers’ Company by Thomas Turner (who was to sell the book, and had also sold Epitaph) on 28 April 1580, seven days after Lambe died and a week before his funeral. Like Epitaph, Memoriall was printed by Denham, who appears to have produced two editions: one octavo in size and another even smaller edition.

Further “occasional” texts

Fleming wrote three books that were inspired by natural phenomena during the first part of his literary career. The earliest of these was Of all blasing starrs in general as well supernaturall as natural, to what countrie or people so ever they appeare in the world universall (hereafter Blasing Starrs). The first edition was printed in 1577 by Middleton to be sold by Woodcocke at The Black Bear in Paul’s Churchyard, most likely within a few weeks of the sighting of the comet in November. The book was registered with the Stationers’ Company roughly six months later on 1 July 1578, which suggests that one of the people involved in producing Blasing Starrs, most likely Middleton, wanted to protect his rights to this book. Possibly Middleton initially underestimated the popularity of Blasing Starrs and only later decided to protect his interest. Certainly no other printer or seller produced further editions of this book until 1618.

Like Wunder (which was printed approximately three months earlier), Blasing Starrs was written to commemorate an unusual natural event. On 10 November 1577 a comet was seen over London and Fleming used the occasion to make this English translation of Frederic
Nausea’s Quolibet alio cometa explorato (1531). Nausea (also called Nawse, c. 1480-1552) had been Bishop of Vienna from 1541 until his death. His treatise on comets was one of his earliest books and he devoted the rest of his life to trying to reconcile the Lutherans of his diocese with the catholics.

Fleming’s Blasing Starrs was the second of three books that Fleming dedicated to Sir William Cordell. In the dedication Fleming thanked Cordell for his patronage, which was surely given as a result of initial dedication in Panoplie the year before.

Remembrance of vndeserued fauour (Right Worshipfull) is a present spurre vnto me to continue deserued dutie: in consideration whereof, not knowing otherwise to seale an assurance of my thankful seruice, I haue (after my maner) employed my pen in translating a pamphlet.

Fleming described Blasing Starrs as a “breefe and compendious” book, and in this respect it was similar to Englishe Dogges. Both can be considered early scientific works. Within Englishe Dogges different breeds of dogs were grouped together into types and then each breed’s characteristics were described in turn. Similarly comets were grouped according to where they had been seen and what they foretold and then described in Blasing Starrs. The first five chapters of this book form an early astrological study that explains when comets can be expected to appear, what they are made of and how they are classified according to their different types.

Fleming did not make a word-for-word translation of Nausea’s original text, as this excerpt (which explains how comets got their name) illustrates:

\[\text{291 The comet of 1531 is now known to have been Halley’s Comet. The unusually bright Great Comet that Fleming saw in 1577 (now called “C/1577 V1”) was closely observed by astronomer Tycho Brahe and is now thought to be non-periodic, meaning that it has not been seen since and is “lost”. This is also true of the 1618 comet that inspired the second edition of Blazing Starres.}\]

\[\text{292 Abraham Fleming. Of all blasing starrs in general as well supernaturall as natural, to what countrie or people so ever they appeare in the world universall (1577), p. 5.}\]
The starre which the Grecians call Cometa, the latines Stella crinita, we Englishmen a Blazing starre... because this kind of starre seemeth (in our opinion and judgement) to shoote out long strakes of fire in the Element, of bright and lightsom sparckles continued in length unto the hayre, which the Grecians call Coma, and thereupon Cometa.\textsuperscript{293}

As Nausea was from Bavaria it is unlikely that he would have used the phrase “we Englishmen” in his original Latin text. That Fleming altered the text indicates that this book was aimed at a different market to his other translations. Bucoliks, Eclogues and Panoplie were primarily produced as educational books that enabled the reader to learn Latin by checking their interpretation of Virgil’s, Cicero’s or Isocrates’ works against Fleming’s precise English translations. Blasing Starrs was produced as a popular book that would appeal to and inform those interested in the recent comet that had passed over London.

Today the first edition of Blasing Starrs is very rare and only one known copy exists. Only one copy was recorded on a contemporary library inventory and that belonged to the bibliophile Lord John Lumley (d. 1609), which suggests that this edition was not produced in great numbers. By contrast twelve copies of the second edition from 1618 have survived and this implies that the second edition was undoubtedly a popular book, which, like its predecessor, coincided with a comet sighting.\textsuperscript{294} By this time Fleming had died but the printer and seller of this later edition did not feel the need to have the book changed or updated so the text is the same. They did, however, change the format. The first edition was octavo in size with approximately 80 pages. The second edition was larger and slimmer being quarto with 36 pages. The title page was embellished with a large woodcut of a comet with its head pointing south-east, presumably to indicate that it was seen clearly over London and the south-east of England. The title itself was altered slightly to A treatise of all blazing starres in generall. As well supernaturall as naturall: To what Countries or people soever they appeare in the spacious world (hereafter Blazing Starres, as opposed to Blasing Starrs).

\textsuperscript{293} Fleming, Blazing Starres (1618 edn), p. 5. The only surviving copy of the first edition of Blasing Starrs was too rare and fragile to consult frequently, I therefore refer to the second edition.\textsuperscript{294} Eleven copies are in academic libraries both in England and the United States, and I own one copy. My copy is a print variant by Alsop for Bell, STC 18413.7.
The first edition of Fleming’s *Blasing Starrs* was initially given the STC number 11051 and the second edition became 11051a. However, it became clear that there were at least two or possibly three print variants made in 1618, and each has now been allocated its own STC number. The text remains the same in all the books from 1618 but the colophons are different. One print variant says “LONDON, Imprinted by Bernard Alsop, and are to be sold by Henry Bell at his shoppe without Bishops-gate, 1618.” This is now STC 18413.7. A variant colophon states that the imprints were made by Alsop for Edward Wright; this is STC 18413.3.295

The STC numbers allocated to Fleming’s books have caused scholars to make disordered and inaccurate lists of the books associated with him. *Blasing Starrs* (1577) currently has the STC number 18413 but so does another of Fleming’s publications, *A generall doctrine of Earthquakes in England from the time of William the Conqueror to a recent earthquake on 6th April 1580* (1580; hereafter ‘Generall Doctrine’). This shared STC number was born of confusion and has led to further muddling of the records.

‘Generall Doctrine’ is not a book in its own right, despite having been given an STC number. Rather, ‘Generall Doctrine’ is a section within a larger book called *A Bright Burning Beacon*, forewarning all wise Virgins to trim their lampes against the comming of the Bridegroome. Containing a general doctrine of sundrie signes and wonders, specially Earthquakes. A discourse of the end of this world; A commemoration of our late Earthquake the 6. of April, about 6. of the clocke in the euening 1580. And a praier for the appeasing of Gods wrath and indignation. Newly translated and collected by Abraham Fleming. The summe of the whole booke followeth in fit place orderly diuided into chapters (hereafter simply *Bright Burning Beacon*). This larger book has been ascribed to Nausea and Fleming has been described as its translator, or not credited with writing this book at all. Fleming

295 There is probably a third print variant as STC lists another version with the number 18413.2, but I have only seen two different imprints in the U.K.
most certainly compiled and wrote **Bright Burning Beacon**, but within this book he included
text copied from **Blasing Starrs**, which was originally by Nausea, hence this subsequent
confusion.\textsuperscript{296} This thesis makes it clear that **Blasing Starrs**, **Blazing Starres** and **Bright
Burning Beacon** are different books that were all written by Fleming; ‘Generall Doctrine’
was not a book, it was a section within Fleming’s **Bright Burning Beacon** so ‘Generall
Doctrine’ should *not* have the same STC number as **Blasing Starrs** (18413). However,
because **Blasing Starrs** and **Bright Burning Beacon** were thought to be the same book,
‘Generall Doctrine’ shares 18413 with **Blasing Starrs**, even though ‘Generall Doctrine’ was
simultaneously considered by scholars other than Pollard and Redgrave to be a book in its
own right (and should as such have been given a completely separate STC number at that
time).\textsuperscript{297}

**Bright Burning Beacon** was another occasional text that was compiled and printed following
a powerful earth tremor that shook London on 6 April 1580 at about 6 o’clock in the
evening. Evidence suggests that Fleming’s **Wunder** was unique in commemorating the
tempest of 1577 and similarly **Blasing Starrs** is the only known English publication that
coincided with the comet of 1577.\textsuperscript{298} This thesis argues that Fleming was in the vanguard
when it came to producing popular books about strange phenomena. It was not until 1580

\textsuperscript{296} ‘Generall Doctrine’ has also been wrongly attributed to Nausea despite the full title including the
words “of Earthquakes in England” and “to the recent earthquake [of] 1580”. Nausea was a Bavarian who
lived in Vienna and he died in 1552. Nausea could not therefore have written this text about English
earthquakes to 1580.

\textsuperscript{297} These problems seem to stem from the antiquarian bibliophile Tanner, who catalogued ‘Generall
Doctrine’ as a book and also catalogued **Blasing Starrs**, but did not list **Bright Burning Beacon**; Lowndes,
on the other hand, listed **Bright Burning Beacon** but omitted the other texts. It seems to have been Cooper
who compounded the problem as he tried to make sense of the three titles in the entries he wrote for
Fleming in DNB and Athenae Cantabrigienses, which do not list the same titles or cite the same sources
despite both having been written by Cooper.

\textsuperscript{298} Of the British Library’s 803 books that were printed in 1577, Fleming’s was the only English text
about this Great Comet. Eight were produced in Europe, including Francois Liberati Discours de la
comete commencaes à apparoir sur Paris le XI jour de Novembre (Paris); Joannes Huernius De Historie
[... der erschrickelckie Comete die geopenbraert is int jaer 1577 (Koln); David Chytraeus’ De Stella
musitata et noua [... ] Et de comato sidere quod mense Nouemabi (Rostochi); and, Jacob Heerbrand’s
Ein predig, von dem erschrockenlichen Wunderzeichen am Himmel, dem neuen Cometen, oder
Pfawenschwantz (Tubingen). Three other books featured astronomy generally: John Bishop’s **Beautiful
Blossoms gathered by John Byshop from the best trees of all kyndes Divine, Philosophical,
Astronomicall, Cosmographical, etc**. (London); Jean Gosselin **Historia imaginum caelestium** (Paris); and
a reworking of Catullus’ *Poematium Coma Berenices* by Marc Antoine Muret (**Coma Berenices or
Berenice’s Hair is a constellation**).
that the Stationers’ Company registers saw a sudden increase in phenomena-related pamphlets produced during years concurrent with national crises when the population was worried and looking for messages or guidance from God. Pamphlets relating tales of strange phenomena (at least those that were registered with the Stationers, as not all publications were) appeared in batches to coincide with or react to some disconcerting event. The Stationers’ entries for the year 1580 provided many examples, since it was a very troubled year full of portents, signs and doom warnings from on high. Greatest among these was an earthquake on 6 April that shook London and made church bells ring for some minutes. Within a week numerous pamphlets and books about the earthquake were logged in the Stationers’ Register.

Fleming was among those who responded to this earthquake with Bright Burning Beacon. Chapter 12 of this book, subtitled “A contemplation of wonderful accidents and principally of Earthquakes”, described the tremors of 1580. The chapter is at the back of the book and this suggests that Fleming had already started compiling the text, which also includes different kinds of phenomena and doom warnings, before the earthquake happened. This is most likely because 1580 had seen a great many signs and wonders (see below). When the tremors happened, Fleming quickly added the twelfth chapter to bring the book up to date and take advantage of public interest in the earthquake.

The natural phenomena that caused concern during 1580 might have seemed more significant because during that year the Spanish invaded and conquered Portugal. This caused alarm all over Europe. The widespread concern that followed could explain why Fleming produced on average a book a month during 1580; all except Bright Burning Beacon were ‘comfortable’ and reassuring godly texts, and even this book contained strong religious and moral undercurrents. The evidence from the Stationers’ registers suggests that

---

299 Bright Burning Beacon was registered with the Stationers’ Company in June 1580 and seems to have been produced primarily because of the earthquake. A “beacon” or comet was seen in Europe during October 1580 but the “beacon” referred to in the title of Fleming’s book was the comet of 1577. Certainly Bright Burning Beacon was in circulation before news of the 1580 comet reached England.
there was a great deal of unrest during 1580 and a resultant market for comfortable and
occasional texts of all kinds. On 22 April, Master Barker entered *An order of praier for*
turning away God’s wrathe threatened by the *Earthquake* into the Stationers’ register; a
description of *A Monster* was entered to Gosson; Bynneman entered *Admonycion*
concerning the *Earthquake* and Denham’s entry for *A Thing concerning the Earthquake* was
recorded a week later. Later that year Bynneman made another entry, *The description of a*
Monstrous Childe born at Fenny Stanton. Edward White recorded the title *The description of*
great wonders seene the xiii January 1580 and fearful wyndes and earthquakes at Roome.
The significance of Rome, heart of the catholic church, being shaken by God in this last
entry cannot be overlooked. Kirkham entered another title *A blasing star or burning beacon*
seene 10\textsuperscript{th} October 1580 at vii o clock at night and Watkins entered into the register *Treatise of the crinital starre which appeareth this present month* (this comet was seen most clearly
from Nuremberg). Meanwhile Robert Whalley printed *A true report of the strange commyng and breedinge of myse in the marches of Dengie in Essex*; mice might not seem
as immediately threatening as an earthquake but during that year of heightened sensitivity
the plague of rodents was considered unsettling and “wonderful”.

**Fleming’s recommendatory and celebratory poems**

It is not possible to list Fleming’s works in date order according to when they were written
because so few of them can be precisely dated. The exceptions would be publications like
*Wunder* or the Lambe books, which were quickly produced in response to precisely dated
events. The Stationers’ Company registers reveal when a title was entered into their records
but not when it was actually written or printed; some titles were registered long before
publication while other books were registered after they were printed. Many titles were never
registered at all. During the year 1576 for example seven books were printed to which
Fleming had either contributed or translated. It is likely that the translations were published
first and that these confirmed the reputation that Fleming had made for himself when he
translated Virgil’s *Bucoliks* and *Eclogues* the previous year. The evidence indicates that
Fleming’s early translations were written first and established him as a writer. Then other
writers and printers approached Fleming to endorse or “commend” their own books with poems and recommendations.

The first authors to ask Fleming to ‘augment’ their work did so in 1576. They were Barnabe Googe (1540-92) and George Whetston or Whetstone (c. 1544-87). Googe produced a translation of The Zodiake of Life written by the excellent and Christian poet Marcellus Paligenius Stellatus, wherein are conteained twelve several labours. Newly translated into English verse by B. Googe (hereafter Zodiake). This was printed and sold by Newberie. Fleming provided Googe with a short poem in English titled “Solerta non Socordia” that was inserted at the end of the book and signed “Qd Abraham Fleming”. This poem likened Googe to a dormant talent “O poet… that long hath lyen in Leth lake, Thie Theseus wills thie sonnet awake”. Googe’s talent had indeed lain dormant for over a decade (his previous book Eglogs, epytaphs, and sonnettes was printed in 1563). Had “Solerta non Socordia” been a purely commendatory poem it is likely that the verses would have been at the front of the text, as was the case with Fleming’s celebratory poems in the reports of Frobisher’s voyages. The fact the Fleming’s poem closed or “signed off” Zodiake strongly suggests that Fleming had a hand in producing the entire text. It is likely that he corrected the book for Googe, and he certainly produced its eleven page index. Zodiake was a success and a second edition was produced in 1588 followed by 46 subsequent editions, the most recent, remarkably, in 1992.

Whetston’s Rocke of Regard, diuided into foure parts. The first the Castle of delight. The second the Garden of Unthriftiness. The third the Arbour of Vertue. The fourth the Ortchard of Repentence: wherein are discoursed the miseries that followe dicing, the mischiefs of quarrelling, the fall of prodigalitie etc. contained an English poem by Fleming. Whetston was an earthy character reputed to have “haunted gambling houses and brothels, and

---

300 Solerta non Socordia literally means “clever and skilled, not foolish nor negligent”.
301 The voyages and Fleming’s text are discussed on pp. 165-8.
dissipated his patrimony by reckless living”. He later renounced this way of life, became interested in puritanism and fought in the Low Countries. The full title of Rocke of Regard demonstrates his adherence to clean living, a way of life that he advised “all the young gentlemen of England” to follow. At the time Rocke of Regard was written, Whetston was living at Furnivall’s Inn and he dated this book “Holborn 15 October 1576”. He and Fleming were likely to have been friends and they both went on to write commendatory poems for Timothie Kendall’s Flowers of Epigrammes (see below).

Fleming was one of five writers who contributed to Whetston’s book. The others were the now unknown Humphrey Turner, John Wytton, Nicholas Bowyer and an unidentified “R. C.” It is likely that these men were students of the Inns of Chancery and that Whetston and Fleming became acquainted with them as they too were based in Holborn. Certainly the other poets were not attached to Oxford or Cambridge. Fleming’s poem was called “Abraham Fleming vppon G. Whetstons worke” and was divided into four verses, each corresponding to one of the four sections within the book.

Whetston and Fleming together with W. Seymour of Gray’s Inn, “E.G.”, “A.W.” and “G.L.” contributed poetry to Timothie Kendall’s Flowers of Epigrammes out of sundrie the moste singular authors selected, as well auncient as late writers, etc. (1577). These men were most probably from the Inns of Chancery too. Kendall was a student at Staple Inn, which was attached to Gray’s Inn, to which Seymour belonged. Whetston was purported to be residing at Furnivall’s Inn at this time, which was attached to Lincoln’s Inn. Little can be said about the poems in Flowers of Epigrammes except that the relationships between the men who wrote them strongly suggest that when Fleming left Cambridge in 1575 he went back to his home in Holborn and stayed there for some years.

---

303 Nicholas Bowyer did provide a poem for Gascoigne’s satire The Steele Glas & The Complainte of Philomene (1576). Nothing else is known about these four poets.
304 Miller suggested Whetston was residing in this Inn of Chancery in his unpublished thesis ‘Abraham Fleming, Elizabethan Man of Letters’ (1957), p. 46-7. Whetston was undoubtedly in Holborn.
The Martin Frobisher poems

Sir Martin Frobisher (c. 1535–94) was one of the great explorers of his age and the subject of dozens of books and pamphlets during his lifetime. Two books about Frobisher’s voyages are of particular interest because they both contained poetical contributions from Fleming. Now largely overshadowed by Drake and Raleigh, Frobisher was famous for his three voyages to the New World in search of gold and the fabled Northwest Passage. He was Drake’s vice-admiral in the West Indies in 1585 and on his return Frobisher played a part in England’s victory over the Armada. He was considered by his contemporaries as a hero and spent the last nine years of his life patrolling the Channel and protecting the realm from Spanish invasion. Frobisher died of wounds received whilst defending Brest in November 1594 and passed into legend, appearing in countless Latin, English, French, German and Dutch books from 1576 onwards, some of which are still in print today.

Frobisher was undoubtedly brave but his expeditions enjoyed little success. His first expedition set off from Blackwall in 1576 in three tiny ships (one of only 20 tons) carrying a combined crew of just 35 men. Two ships sank in the Atlantic but Frobisher’s barque, the Gabriel, reached Labrador and found a natural harbour christened Frobisher Bay. One of the crew collected what he thought was gold. After a hostile encounter with some Inuit and losing some more men, Frobisher left Labrador for London where he was hailed as a hero. However, the gold was identified as iron pyrites, many of his crew died and he had not found the fabled Northwest Passage. At least two celebratory accounts of Frobisher’s first voyage were printed. The most notable report was Captain George Best’s three-part “discourse” and another description was later written by Christopher Hall, but greater adventures and propaganda were yet to come.305

305 The full title of Best’s book was A True Discourse of the late voyages of discouerie, for the finding of a passage to Cathaya, by the Northweast, vnder the conduct of Martin Frobisher Generall: deuided into three booke. In the first wherof is shewed, his first voyage. Wherein also by the way is sette out a geographicall description of the Worlde, and what partes thereof haue bin discouered by the nauigations of the Englishmen. Also, there are annexed certayne reasons, to proue all partes of the worlde habitable, with a generall Mappe adioyned. In the second, is set out his second voyage, with the adventures and accidents thereof. In the thirde, is declared the strange fortunes which hapned in the third voyage, with a seuerall description of the countrey and the people there inhabiting. With a particular card (cont.)
Following the perceived success of the 1576 voyage the queen herself lent Frobisher a ship called The Aid and gave him £1,000 towards a second expedition. Frobisher set off in May 1577, arrived in Frobisher Bay in July and returned in the autumn claiming that he had expanded England’s territories. However, this voyage saw little success. Frobisher decided to take 200 tons of an unidentified ore that he hoped was gold back to England. This led to disputes among the miners, refiners and crew, while the ore turned out to be worthless. Neither did Frobisher find the Northwest Passage.

Despite these problems the queen was seen to be very pleased with Frobisher’s efforts and she christened the newly discovered land Meta Incognita. The Privy Council wanted to ‘spin’ accounts of the expedition and stress only the achievements of England’s foremost explorer. Unauthorized accounts were collected in October 1577 and in January 1578 further unauthorized accounts were “committed unto their Lordships the speciall care to order all matters appertayning to the voiages”. The Privy Council appointed Sir William Winter, Thomas Randolphe, Edmund Hogan and Matthew Fielde to write an official account of Frobisher’s achievements. However, other versions have survived. One first-hand account by crew member Dionysis Settle called A true report of the laste voyage into the West and Northwest regions, &c. worthily atchieved by Capteine Frobisher (hereafter Settle’s Reporte) opened with a flatteringly vague poem by Fleming. Settle’s Report was popular and there were at least two editions of this book (both printed by Middleton), one with a subtly variant text that suggests the first run initially sold out and a second run was quickly produced.

Fleming’s contribution was a poem likening Frobisher’s voyage to those made by the classical heroes such as Jason (“The golden fleece […] hath he got and rich returned,”) and Ulysses. While the voyages of these fabled heroes bore no resemblance to Frobisher’s, Fleming’s decision to parallel the naval hero with Ulysses (“That ventrous knight of Ithac’ thereunto adiouned of Meta Incognita, so farre forth as the secrets of the voyage may permit (1578; BL C.13.a.9.(1.) and G.6527.)

soyle”) reveals a great deal about the almost mythical status Frobisher had attained, as well as displaying Fleming’s own classical learning. Furthermore, by writing about well known heroes, Fleming was also spared the awkwardness of trying to fabricate celebratory verses based on Frobisher’s actual voyage, which, in truth, enjoyed only very limited success. Unlike Jason, Frobisher certainly had not found any gold nor returned richer.

The next year, 1578, Frobisher embarked on his third and last voyage to Meta Incognita. This time he was instructed to take everything needed to set up a colony and the queen herself put a gold chain around his neck. Frobisher and crew left Harwich in May with a fleet of 15 ships (some weighing as much as one hundred tons, four times the size of the “Gabriel” he used for his first voyage). Unfortunately storms and ice floes wrecked one ship and drove the others off course, forcing Frobisher up the Hudson Strait (a course that he initially seemed quite happy to have found). It was some time before he conceded that the strait was not the Northwest Passage and he returned to Frobisher Bay. Efforts were made to establish a settlement but these were not successful, and the crew’s efforts to find gold were equally disappointing: what they did bring back to England was said to be unworthy of smelting.

When Frobisher returned from his third expedition in 1578 another first hand account was published, this time written by Thomas Ellis, a sailor: A true report of the third and last voyage into Meta Incognita: achieved by the worthie Capteine M. Frobisher Esquire. Anno 1578 (hereafter Ellis’ Report). This book was embellished with celebratory poems written by Fleming and two other writers. Only one copy survives today, in the Huntington Library, California. It was printed by Thomas Dawson, a printer with whom Fleming was familiar, but without other copies to compare, it is impossible to see if there were any of the print variants indicative of reprints and extra runs which one might expect from a popular and topical book. Two other contributors supplied verses for this book: John Kirkham, whose poem was written in praise of Frobisher, and John Stanley who knew Ellis and dedicated his
poem to his sailor friend. Fleming on the other hand is not known to have been an associate of Ellis so it seems more likely that he was asked to write his poem by Dawson the printer.

The last two poems in the book were both written by Ellis: one was dedicated to Frobisher and the other to the reader apologising for his inadequacies as a poet.

The poem Fleming wrote for Ellis’s *True Report* in 1578 drew on classical inspiration. Likening Frobisher to Ulysses, on this occasion Fleming used the Roman name for the Greek “Odysseus’”), Fleming’s “rhyme decasyllabical, comparative and congratulatory” recounted Ulysses’ return home, grey haired and hoary, after 20 years’ adventuring. Fleming (apparently keen to write about dogs whenever possible) devoted an entire verse to Ulysses’ “toothlessse curre, all ruggie and unshorne”, who had been a pup when his master departed and had waited for his return, making Ellis’s *True Report* the third piece of text Fleming had written in as many years that focused on a dog or dogs.

The poem Fleming wrote for Ellis’ *Report* does not allude to the sea, empire building, seeking riches or any of the specifics of Frobisher’s voyage. The third expedition to *Meta Incognita* is conspicuous by its absence from the poem. Instead Fleming described an old, grey and unrecognisably hoary Ulysses coming home to his queen Penelope after a 20 year absence. The picture Fleming painted of Ulysses with a “Gray beard old” and having “a wart which grew upon his toe” was not a flattering one. Ulysses’ elderly dog, “toothlesse […] all ruggie and unshorne […] A mumping nourse, farre spent, all skinne and bone”, was made the hero of this poem. This is the most unlikely of all Fleming’s celebratory rhymes because not only does it avoid describing the actual event it celebrated, it also portrays the hero(es) in such an unflattering light. Possibly Fleming was aware that whilst Frobisher was undoubtedly brave and pioneering, the captain’s mission had not been successful, and he had therefore found it difficult to write truly celebratory lines.
The Martin Frobisher poems were included in books that were carefully monitored by the Privy Council. Ellis’ and Settles’ Reports were not recalled (they are not recorded in Acts of the Privy Council), and this suggests that they were considered to be good pieces of propaganda. Since Fleming was asked to contribute poetry to the books it is strongly suggestive that early in his career he was considered a dependable writer. Whilst the poem in Ellis’ Report is not the most flattering (it does at least tell of the safe return of a hero), both the Martin Frobisher poems draw parallels between Frobisher and the classical heroes Jason and Ulysses.

* * * * *

The translations that Fleming produced, the occasional books that he wrote and the poetry that he wrote to commend other authors’ books between 1575 and 1580 all demonstrate that he had rapidly established himself as a successful and innovative writer. Having left Cambridge he returned to Holborn and quickly gained a good reputation as an author. From as early as 1576 Fleming was called upon to embellish and produce books for other people. From 1580 onwards the kinds of books to which Fleming was asked to contribute changed in character and, as he gained greater experience of book production, the nature of the work he carried out changed too, and this will be discussed in the next chapter.
Chapter Six:

Fleming’s Devotional Books, A Discoverie of Witchcraft, Dictionaries and Indexed Works, c. 1580-89

The bulk of Fleming’s earlier printed writing demonstrated his concern with marking popular occasions and events, and also producing scholarly translations of classical works with a view to helping students to learn. The second half of his career was characterized by three kinds of writing: dictionaries, indexes and devotional texts. Fleming maintained his zeal for producing educational books in the second half of his career, but turned his attention to Latin-English dictionaries and quadrilingual dictionaries. He also created a number of substantial indexes within devotional works, which enabled ordinary people to study religious texts and cross-reference these writings with the Bible, without the need for a cleric. That Fleming was a godly protestant throughout his life is not in question, but it was during the middle part of his literary career, 1578-81, that he wrote, edited or endorsed the majority of the godly books associated with him.

Contributions to godly works

Fleming wrote three original godly devotional texts: Footepath, Diamond, and Conduit of Comfort. He also ‘augmented’ and contributed text to seven or possibly eight existing godly works. The earliest was A pithie exposition of the 51st Psalme intituled Misere mei Deus, &c. Also a godly meditation upon the .31. Psalme intituled In te Domine speraui. Written by Hierome of Ferrarie: And now newly augmented and amended by Abraham Fleming, which was printed by Dawson in 1578. One copy worth 6d was recorded on the inventory of “Anonymous 22”, the Cambridge scholar who died c.1588. This was a very small book, sextodecimo in size, with 256 unnumbered pages.

Footpath and Diamond are discussed throughout Chapter Three; for Conduit see pp. 147-9.
This edition, hereafter Pithie Exposition, was a translation of a popular book by the early protestant writer Savonarola, also known as Jerome of Ferrara (executed in 1498). Pithie Exposition was a Biblical commentary in which the psalms were broken down into verses. Following each verse was advice on the meaning of that particular section. Fleming had not written the text itself but he had edited it. In his dedication to Dr Gabriel Goodman Fleming described the existing English editions of Pithie Exposition as being “rugged… lame and maymed” and went on

The booke was yll englishe, and worse printed (the more pitie) considering the goodnesse of the matter, and the learning of [Savonarola].

Fleming explained that he tooke the paines (though not artificially) to polishe and trimme… and restoring that to perfection and soundnesse… I haue amended what was amisse and scoured away the rust from this excellent peece of metal: whiche glistering with a newe grace, I present vnto your Worship.

Fleming may or may not have written the closing section of Pithie Exposition, ‘A Prayer vnto the Trinitie, that the seeded of the holie Scripture may fructifie in our heartes, and that we may be founde faithfull bearers of the worde preached, and followe the same in life and conversacion’. However, he certainly wrote the signed letter ‘To the Christian Reader’ at the front of this book.

Fleming worked on a number of devotional books printed in 1580. He compiled and indexed Certayne sermons in Defense of the Gospell, and he also translated and indexed The Epistle of the Blessed Apostle Saint Paule. The zealous prefix letter in this book made Fleming’s

---

308 Tanner included a book with a similar title in his list of Fleming’s works: Meditations on the 31st and 51st Psalms (1581). Possibly this was a separate volume. However, since nothing more is known about this book and Tanner was the only bibliographer to record it, he was most likely referring to a later edition of Pithie Exposition of the 51st Psalm, Also a godly meditation upon the 31 Psalm.

309 Goodman was dean of Westminster and a chaplain to Lord Burghley. This is one of many texts dedicated to Burghley’s circle. See p. 134, p. 142 and fn 328 on p. 185.

310 This book was a translation and commentary on the first of St Paul’s “Prison Epistles”, which was to the Ephesians. Its full title is given on p. 182 and it is discussed on p. 185.
godly faith clear. In the letter he described the original author, Niels Hemmingsen, as “able to withstand all seditious Scismatikes” and “impudent papists”. The Epistle was laid out in a distinct style that Fleming called a “double translation of the text” but he did not mean it was a double translation in the traditional sense of the phrase. Fleming provided two alternate English translations of the verses in St. Paul’s epistle to the Ephesians as opposed to a true double translation of the text (from Latin into English and back into Latin) that schoolmasters like Ascham would have recognized. It is not clear why Fleming did this, although it is likely that the first English translation was an outmoded one by the previous editor and that Fleming provided a newer, clearer version in English to demonstrate his own skill.

The letter in The Epistle of the Blessed Apostle Saint Paule was not the only prefatory material that Fleming was invited to write in at that time. He also penned the recommendatory epistle in Certaine comfortable expositions of the constant martyr of Christ, M. John Hooper Bishop of Gloucester and Worcester, written in the time of his tribulation and imprisonment, vpon the XXIII. LXII. LXXIII. and LXXVII. Psalmes of the prophet Dauid. Newlie recognised, and never before published (1580), (hereafter Comfortable Expositions). Fleming also wrote the counsel to the reader in A fort for the afflicted wherin are ministered many notable & excellent remedies against the stormes of tribulation. Written chiefly for the comfort of Christes little flocke, which is the final number of the faithfull, by John Knox (1580), (hereafter Fort for the Afflicted).

Comfortable Expositions was printed by Middleton, with whom Fleming had already established a working relationship. Almost certainly Middleton commissioned Fleming to

---

311 The Danish author Hemmingsen (1513-1600) was a Lutheran and a pupil of Melanchthon at the University of Wittenberg (now called the University of Martin Luther at Halle-Wittenberg). He is sometimes known as Nicholaus Hemmingius or Nicholas Hemmings. When he wrote The Epistle of the Blessed Apostle Saint Paule, Hemmingsen was Professor of Divinity at the University of Copenhagen.

312 Middleton had printed A Registre of Hystories (1576), Panoplie of Epsiltes (1576), Settle’s True Report (1577) and Blasing Starrs (1577), all of which are discussed in Chapter Five. After Comfortable Epistles (above), Middleton printed Footepath (1580) and Calvin on Deuteronome (1583). (Cont.)
write the letter in *Comfortable Expositions* as the original author, Henry Bull, had died in 1575 and the printer wanted the text updated. This edition was first registered with the Stationers’ Company on 16 January 1579. *Comfortable Expositions* was quarto-sized and 129 pages long. This smaller size would have made it relatively cheap to buy but unfortunately gave the book little durability; only two surviving copies are known. Fleming’s letter was titled “To all the faithfull flocke of Christ, grace and peace from God the Creatour, Christ the Redeemer, and the holy Ghost and comforter.” Within this letter Fleming wrote a few biographical lines about Bishop Hooper. The “learned, godlie, faithfull, zealous, constant and in all points praise worthie Protestant” was, explained Fleming, imprisoned in “the Fleeete, the tossing of him from the Fleeete to the Counter in Southwarke, from the Counter in Southwarke to the Clinke, from the Clinke to Newgate”. Hooper’s “lamentable execution”, as a protestant martyr, took place on 9 February 1555.

Unfortunately the scarcity of *Comfortable Exhortations* today means that little more can be said about it, except that it further cements Fleming’s reputation as a godly protestant. So too did Fleming’s other prefatory letter from 1580. The original title of Knox’s *Fort for the Afflicted* was *A percel of the vi. Pslame expounded. Followed by A consolation for the persecuted in England. By J. Knox. Followed by A copies of the letter that d. Ridley sent for the answer to d. Burne &c*. This book had much in common with *Comfortable Expositions*. Firstly, it contained material by Nicholas Ridley, Bishop of London, who had consecrated Hooper and who, like Hooper, been martyred during the Marian persecutions. Secondly, *Fort for the Afflicted* was another of Fleming’s smaller, cheaper books. It was printed on quarto-sized paper and was 129 pages in length. Cambridge scholar Richard Mote, a fellow of Queen’s College, had a copy of this book in his own library, which was valued at 2d when Mote died in 1592. Fleming provided the letter ‘To the Religious Reader’. It is likely that he

---

313 This was surely Dr Henry Bull, who had attended Magdalen College, Oxford with John Foxe and later helped Foxe to gather material for his “Book of Martyrs”.
314 There are no known copies in the United Kingdom but there is a copy in the Folger Shakespeare Library and another at the Huntington Library, California.
edited the main text as well, since the title is so different from Knox’s earlier edition. This suggests that the printer, Dawson, asked Fleming to refresh the entire book. This edition was entered into the Stationers’ Company register to Richard Field on 5 November 1580, although it was sold by Newberie. It was entered again on 29 October 1589; this is suggestive of a later edition.

In 1581 Fleming gathered or collated and edited *Manuall of Christian Praiers made by diuers deuot & Godlie men such as Calvin, Luther, Melangton &c.* Very little can be said about this book because no copies have survived. *Manuall of Christian Praiers* was first recorded in the Stationers’ register for 18 October 1580. The title was next recorded by Andrew Maunsell in *The First Part of the Catalogue of English Printed Bookes* (1595) and later in Tanner. Subsequently *Manuall of Christian Praiers* was included by Cooper in his entries for Fleming in *DNB* and *Athenae Cantabrigienses*. There is almost nothing more that can be said about this godly protestant text except that it was printed by Denham in 1581. *Athenae Cantabrigienses* mentioned a second edition in 1585 and a possible third edition might have been produced in 1594.

*David’s Sling against great Goliah, conteining diuers notable treatises, the names whereof follow next after the epistle to the reader by E. H.* was another text from 1581, but about which more is known. The author of the main text was Edward Hutchins but Fleming composed a lengthy prayer, which was inserted at the end of the book. 315 Since this prayer closed the main text, it is likely that Fleming also edited the book. *David’s Sling against great Goliah* was printed by Denham, which also suggests that Fleming did far more to the text than just add the prayer. Denham and Fleming had a long working relationship and typically Fleming edited and corrected the texts that bear both their names. Fleming’s

315 Fleming was not named as the prayer’s author in the first edition of *David’s Sling*, however the 1593 edition gives the prayer’s title as ‘A Paraier vnto almightie God, wherein we beseech his diuine maiestie, so to blesse vs with his grace, that the vse of the praiers in this booke, and the whole some lessons comprised in the same may take Christian effect in vs, to our great comfort euen at all assaies, and especially in time of necessitie. Made by A.F.’ (Hutchins, *David’s Sling*, pp. 329-36).
'Paraier vnto almightie God’ was a characteristically godly one in which he beseeched God to

kindle our zeale to guide all our affections, and to gouerne the whole course of our life: that exercising our selues in this, or anye other godlye volume, published for the edification of thy church, wee may use it and them with integritie & uprightnes of iudgement, with deuotion voyd of hypocrisie.”

In 1581 or 1582 an English translation of Jacob Wittewronghelus’ De vera Christiani hominis fide was printed by Purfoote, who also printed Fleming’s Shorte Dictionarie in 1584. Two versions of this text were in circulation at the same time (one in Latin, the other in English) and this has led to confusion about the title of the edition to which Fleming contributed. He did in fact make contributions to both texts as the books’ full titles demonstrate. The Latin edition was called: De vera Christiani hominis fide, Dialogue elegantissimus & utilissimus Jacobe Wittewronghelo authore. Huc accessit, praetor annotations marginales praecipuas doctrinas indicantes oratio pia & luculenta, quae ipsam totius operis hypothesin breviusculis quibusdam petitionibus complectitur per Abrahamum Flemingum Londigenum.

Fleming was undoubtedly responsible for the notes, ‘A Godly and fruteful prayer’ and the dedication that were included in the English-language version: Concerning the true beleefe of a Christian Man, a most excellent a profitable dialogue by S.C. Herevnto besides the marginal notes, declaring the chiefe points of doctrines, there is added a godlye and lightsome prayer, which in certaine breve petitions, comprehendeth written in Lat. by Abraham Fleming, a Londoner borne. To the right Reuerend Father in Christ, John Bishop of London. Translated out of Latine by Arthur Golding (hereafter True Beleefe). This edition was not dated by the printer but was supposed to have been printed in 1582 according to STC. Another edition was printed in 1615 and, unlike the earlier English edition, this was

---

316 Fleming, ‘A Paraier vnto almightie God’ in Hutchins, David’s Sling, p. 335.
317 In 1584 Fleming wrote in Shorte Dictionarie that Purfoote was known to him (see pp. 194-7), so it is likely that they first met during the production of this edition of De vera Christiani hominis fide.
entered into the Stationers’ register. The entry, which was made on 6 November 1615, shows that it was printed and sold by Purfoote’s son, “his father deceased”. The Latin and English editions are now very rare and are perhaps unique.\(^{318}\)

**True Beleefe** was numbered 4301 in *STC* (the Latin version is numbered 25934.5) but the ‘Godly and Fruteful Prayer’ that Fleming wrote has been given its own STC number, 11046, and this has caused problems with defining the books on which Fleming worked. This godly prayer was not a separate book; it was intended to be part of **True Beleefe** and there was a corresponding Latin godly prayer by Fleming within *De vera Christiani hominis fide* (although the Latin prayer does not have its own *STC* number). In his prefatory letter to Bishop Aylmer, Fleming described **True Beleefe** as a small volume with an appropriately small price tag, which implied that the book had been produced with the general market for affordable devotional works; Fleming added that he hoped **True Beleefe** “shall turne to the great benefite of many, and besides that”. Evidently he hoped that the book would be bought and read by as many people as possible.

Another translated text from this period was **Monomachie of Motives in the Mind of Man or a battell betweene vertues and vices of contrairie qualitie. Wherein the imperfections and weaknesses of nature appeare so naked than anie reasonable soule may soone see by what spirit he is lead: herevnto also besides sundrie deuout praiers necessarily interlaced, diuers golden sentences of s. Barnard are annexed and also a briefe conclusion of his vpon this theame, that victorie is obtained by resisting temptation. Newlie englishe by A. Fleming.** Hereafter **Monomachie**, this was a small duodecimo-sized book, 339 pages in length. it was registered with the Stationers’ Company on 30 June 1581 and, as the colophon reads, printed in 1582 by Denham “dwelling at Pater noster Rowe” for the seller Williams Seres. Fleming’s English version of **Monomachie** was a first edition. However, it was taken from a translation of a much older Latin work by St Augustine called **De conflict vitiorum et virtutum**, which

\(^{318}\) Certainly the copy of the 1581/2 **True Beleefe** at Hatfield House is unique.
was copied by Ambrosius Autpertus (d. 784). As the title of Fleming’s book suggests it also included devotional texts from St Bernard of Clairvaux.

Fleming dedicated *Monomachie* to Sir George and Lady Elizabeth Carey, as he had done with *Diamond* the previous year. *Monomachie of Motives* was the last in a group of original, palm-sized yet substantial, alliteratively-titled ‘comfortable’ works by Fleming that also included *Conduit of Comfort, Footpath of Faith* and *Diamond of Devotion*. The text was organized in a similar way to these earlier books. For example, just as *Diamond* had been “cut and squared into six severall points” or sections, so *Monomachie* was divided into 25 “severall combates or conflicts” each between a particular vice and virtue. Each of these battles was further divided into six sub-sections: an argument in favour of a sin; an argument in favour of its corresponding virtue; a prayer against that sin; St Bernard’s commentary on that virtue; an allegorical speech by that virtue in which it argued with the corresponding sin; and a prayer in favour of that particular virtue.

Another very small devotional handbook associated with Fleming but not written by him was *The Alphabet of Praiers verie fruitfull to be exercised and vsed of euerie Christian. Newlie drawne, into no less direct an order than aptlie agreeth with name by A. Fleming*. The earliest surviving copy bearing Fleming’s name is from 1591. Since he had been ordained in 1588 and had become chaplain to Lord Howard of Effingham, it is unlikely that this edition had been “newlie drawne” by Fleming as the title suggests.\(^{319}\) When he initially edited and updated this book, Fleming left the original dedication to the Earl of Leicester in place but took the trouble to update the spelling.\(^{320}\) This suggests that this book was printed before September 1588, when Leicester died. A more likely year of production would be 1580 because the 1591 edition was printed by Rychard Yardley and Peter Short. Yardley and Short had inherited Denham’s business and this inheritance most likely included the rights to *Alphabet of Praiers*. Denham’s association with Fleming began in 1579 and ended in 1587.

---

\(^{319}\) Three editions of *Shorte Dictionarie* carried the title “newlie done by Abraham Fleming”, yet the evidence suggests that Fleming was not involved with these later reprints.

\(^{320}\) Instead of Roba rt Dvdley, Fleming wrote Robert Dvdley. See p. 177
However, the two were at their most productive in 1580/1581. At that time Fleming wrote Diamond, which was also printed by Denham and was similar to Alphabet of Praiers. This thesis argues that the earlier edition of Fleming’s Alphabet of Praiers was therefore printed in 1580 or 1581, and is likely to predate Diamond.321

Unlike Conduit of Comfort, Footepath, Diamond, the Alphabet of Praiers was not an original text written by Fleming. This little book had been written by James Cancellor and was printed in 1565 with subsequent editions dated 1570, 1573 and 1576. Fleming’s principal work was modernising the text, which he did by updating the spelling. An example of this came from the dedication. Originally this was to “ROBART DVDLEY”:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R</th>
<th>Remember thy calling.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Obey thy prince.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Beware of ambition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Aduenge not thy cause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>Regard thine estate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Take counsel of the wise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Deserue no euill report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Vse iustice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Defend the right.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Let wisedome rule thee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Embrace honour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Yeeld to truth.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fleming changed the spelling to “ROBERT DVDLEY” and reworked the dedication’s fourth line accordingly:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R</th>
<th>Remember thy calling.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Obey thy prince.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Beware of ambition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Eschew i lenes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>Regard thine estate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Take counsel of the wise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Deserue no euill report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Vse iustice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Defend the right.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Let wisedome rule thee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Embrace honour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Yeeld to truth.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

321 See p. 178.
The earliest existing edition associated with Fleming from 1591 is markedly different from Cancellor’s 1565 text. Fleming retained the alphabetical format that gave the book its title but expanded the text. ‘The first psalme’ by Cancellor carried the subheading ‘wherein the penitent requireth of God to walk in his commaundments’. Fleming’s ‘The first psalme alphabeticall’ had the different subheading: ‘Wherein the penitent sinner requireth of God to walk in his commandments & other spirituall graces’. These additions went on throughout the 224 pages of text. Cancellor’s ‘first psalme’ starts with the letter B and each line begins with next letter of the alphabet, as this excerpt demonstrates:

Blessed are all those that are undefiled in the waies of [th]e Lord, and blessed are they [tha]t keepe his testimonies, and seeke him with their whole heart.

Cause mee thy Creature and handiwork therefore (O Lord) diligentlye to keepe thy commaundements, and so direct my wayes that I may keepe thy statutes.

Doe so vnto thy seruaunt (O Lorde) that I may lieu and keepe thy most holye Worde.

Cancellor used the letters B through to H, then used O instead of I, a second G and another A to start the nine sections of his ‘first psalm’. Fleming by contrast made use of the letters A to I (which started the word “In” but meant he sacrificed the letter J), then resumed with H and used each sequential letter up to W. Not only did Fleming make his version of the “first psalme” thirteen sections longer, he also made more effective use of the alphabet than Cancellor. This evidence suggests that Fleming wanted to better Cancellor and this desire to prove that his book was better than the previous one might have been the reason why he wrote Diamond, which is full of clever wordplay and acrostic verses. This thesis therefore argues that Fleming’s earlier Alphabet of Praiers was written before Diamond, most likely in 1580.
Scot’s *Discoverie of Witchcraft*

One text that Fleming was associated with, but which does not seem to fit into any group is Reginald Scot’s *Discoverie of Witchcraft* (1584), printed in London by William Brome. Although *Discoverie of Witchcraft* is unlike any of the other texts that Fleming worked on, the book has much in common with a number of his texts. The printer, Brome, was part of the syndicate that including Denham which had financed Peter Martyr the previous year, 1583. Denham and Middleton, both of whom had established relationships with Fleming, printed Peter Martyr. Therefore it seems highly likely that Fleming was introduced to Brome through Denham at the time Peter Martyr was being compiled.

It is unlikely that Fleming was commissioned to work on *Discoverie of Witchcraft* by Scot. This book was surely written in Smeeth, Kent, where Scot spent almost all of his life; he was not present in London when Brome printed *Discoverie of Witchcraft*. However, Scot’s marginal notes demonstrate that he read very widely when researching *Discoverie of Witchcraft*. He referred to over 200 classical, Latin and English sources. These included “Hemingius”, surely Niels Hemmingsen whose *Epistle of the Blessed Apostle Saint Paule* Fleming had indexed. Scot was also acquainted with Googe’s writing and Fleming had been instrumental in publishing Googe’s *Zodiake*. Chapter IX of *Discoverie of Witchcraft* opens with a long passage taken from *Beehiue of the Romish Church*, which Fleming had indexed. The marginal note next to this passage said “Englished by Abraham Fleming” and referred the reader to *Beehiue*. Lastly, Scot included numerous passages in Latin and English from Virgil’s *Eclogues*, which Fleming had “Englished”. Certainly Scot was using this English translation of *Eclogues* because the marginal note of Chapter X of Booke XVI states:

---

322 The full title was *Discoverie of Witchcraft wherein the lewde dealing of witches and witchmongers is notablie detected, the knauerie of conjurors, the impietie of enchantors, the follie of soothsaiers, the impudent falshood of couseners, the infidelitie of atheists, the pestilent practises of Pythonists, the curiositie of figurecasters, the vanitie of dreamers, the beggarlie art of Alcumystrie, the virtue and power of naturall magike, and all the conveinances of Legierdemaine and juggling are deciphe red. Hereunto is added a treatise upon the nature and substance of spirits and divils, &c.*

323 Scot (c. 1538–99) attended Hart Hall, Oxford (now Hertford College) when he was seventeen and Miller thought that Scot might have transferred to one of the Inns of Court since he became a magistrate. However, I would argue that Scot had returned to Smeeth by the time Fleming moved back to Holborn and it is unlikely that they knew each other personally.
Nescio quis oculus teneros mihi fascinate agnos, saith Virgil: and Englished by Abraham Fleming. I wrote not I What witching eie Doth use to hant my tender lams sucking their dams And them enchant.

Fleming had therefore been a source for Discoverie of Witchcraft.

Fleming also translated nineteen small Latin poems into English and the marginal notes next to the translated poems state that they were “Englished by Abraham Fleming”. Had he contributed anything more to Discoverie of Witchcraft it is likely that his contribution would have been acknowledged somewhere in text or title. It is possible that Fleming had a hand in editing the text. The editor took care to ensure that every poem by Fleming was credited to him. Also in the list of English authors that Scot used as sources which was appended to Discoverie of Witchcraft, Abraham Fleming’s name was written backwards: Gnimelf Mahabra. No other author’s name was marked out by this special treatment, which indicates that Fleming might have played with his own name during the editing process. While the evidence is only circumstantial, it strongly suggests that Fleming edited this book.

Why Fleming reversed his name in this way is not known. It may have been an attempt to disguise it because where sensitive issues such as reform or denouncing the existence of witchcraft were concerned many authors sought a degree of anonymity to avoid reprisals. Writing one’s name backwards was also quite a clever thing to do; Fleming may simply have been demonstrating his ability to play with language or giving himself an ironic air of mystery in keeping with the nature of Discoverie.

The rhyming translations that Fleming made for Discoverie of Witchcraft are witty and at times indicate exasperation at the foolishness of those who believed in charms and spells, as the first poem demonstrates:

Good Lord! How light the credit is
the waivering mind of man!
How unto tales and lies his eares
attentive all they can?

The original poems were not by Fleming so the opinions within the Latin verses (presumably those of Scot) cannot be said to be Fleming’s. However, his ‘pithie’ translations suggest that Fleming was of the same opinion as the Latin author. Fleming, like Scot, had developed a no-nonsense, pragmatic attitude towards the strange happenings that others attributed to witches.

If any thinke that evill herbs
in Haemon land which be,
or witchcraft able is to helpe,
let him make proof and see.

Discoverie of Witchcraft provides some evidence that Fleming had moved on from his earlier, sensational works such as Wunder. In this respect his translations for Discoverie of Witchcraft are typical of the sober and academic writings that characterized the latter part of his career.

**Fleming’s indexes or tables**

Although Fleming had indexed Googe’s Zodiake in 1576, the majority of his work as an indexer happened between 1579 and 1587. The first of these nine other books that he indexed was The Beehive of the Romish Church. Wherein the Author (Isaac Rabbotenu) a zealous Protestant, under the person of a superstitious Papist doth so driely refell the grosse opinions of Popery, and so divinely defend the articles of Christianie. There is not a book to be found sweeter for thy comforthe (1579). In 1580 three indexes were printed, which were in: Certaine sermons in Defense of the Gospell nowe preached against such Cavils and false accusations, as are objected both against the Doctrine it selfe, and the preachers and professors thereof, by the friends and favourers of the church of Rome Preached of late by

---

324 See p. 162.
325 Later editions of this book had an alternate title: The bee hiue of the Romishe Churche. A worke of al good Catholikes too bee read and most necessary to bee vnderstood: wherin both the Catholike religion is substantially confirmed, and the heretikes finely fetcht ouer coals. Translated out of Dutch into English by George Gilpin the Elder (1580).
Thomas Cooper against the followers of the church of Rome by Thomas Cooper, Bishop of Lincoln (1580); A Godly and Learned Exposition vppon the Proverbes of Solomon: written in French by Michael Cope and translated into English by M.O. by Marcelline Outred (1580); and, The Epistle of the Blessed Apostle Saint Paule which he in the time of his trouble and imprisonment sent in writing from Rome to the Ephesians. Faithfullie expounded both for the benefite of the learned and vnlearned by Nicholas Hemming, Professor of Diuinitie in the Vniuersitie of Coppenhagen in Denmarke. Familiarlie translated out of Latine into English by Abraham Fleming, etc. (1580).

Fleming indexed two books that were printed in 1583. One was The sermons of M. John Calvin upon the fifth book of Moses called Deuteronomie gathered as he preached them in open pulpit together with a preface made by the ministers of the Church of Geneva, and an admonishment made by the deacons there. Also there in are annexed two profitable tables, the one conteining the cheefe matters, the other the places of scripture herein alleged. Translated out of French by Arthur Golding; the other was called The common places of the most famous and renowned diuine Doctor Peter Martyr, diuided into foure principall parts: with a large addition of manie theologicall and necessarie discourses, some neuer extant before. Translated and partlie gathered by Anthonie Marten, one of the sewers of hir Maiesties most honourable chamber. Including an oration by I. Simler. In the end of the booke are annexed two tables of all the notable matters therein conteined. Fleming’s next index was a 14,000 word dictionary-index for John Higgins’ Nomenclator (1585). Two further indexes were compiled and printed in 1587 and these were for John Fox’s Eicasmi, seu meditations in sacrum Apocolypsin. Authore Io. Foxo, Anglo; and, Holinshed’s Chronicles for which Fleming produced two indexes for the ‘History of England’, a table for the ‘History of Scotland’ and the third table for the ‘Chronicles of England’.

In the same way that Fleming strove to make classical texts and Latin books accessible to English speakers, it is likely that he wanted to make large and potentially complicated texts just as easy to access. Fleming’s indexes are clear and well-thought-out. Some of his tables
came with instructions, which indicate that indexes were still a new idea in the 1580s and not familiar. This in turn suggests that, once again, Fleming was in the vanguard of book production. It seems likely that his motivation for putting together tables, some of which formed substantial texts in their own rights and required him painstakingly to read very large and lengthy books, was to improve others’ understanding. Books that might have appeared daunting to those new to encyclopaedic compendiums of sermons or histories were rendered much simpler by the addition of an index. Readers no longer needed a tutor or cleric to show them an improving lesson or interesting passage because they themselves could skim the index and go straight to it. In one case, that of Calvin on Deuteronomie, Fleming provided a standard index to enable readers to look key words up in the main text and a second index so that the reader could cross reference Calvin’s sermons to a Bible.\footnote{326}

The Beehiue of the Romish Church (hereafter Beehiue) was written by Isaac Rabbotenu, better known as Philip von Marnix (c. 1540-98). The altered title given to editions produced from 1580 seems at first to be incompatible with Fleming’s godly protestant faith. It was, though, a satire that “doth so driely refell the grose opinions of popery”, as its original title, made clear. Rabbotenu was a student of Calvin and a zealous protestant, and Beehiue proved a very popular book. It was registered with the Stationers’ Company in June 1577 and entered to the seller John “Hans” Stell. Copies were also sold by Andrew Maunsell at The Parret in Paul’s Churchyard. Beehiue was printed by Dawson in The Three Cranes, Vintry. The Stationers’ registers recorded that a copy of the book was received by the Company on 15 April 1579. Five editions were printed by the Dawson family between 1579 and 1636, all of which included Fleming’s two signed indexes. The first index consisted of an alphabetical finding list of authors cited in Beehiue. The second index was an alphabetical list of keywords that the reader might find useful.

The following year, 1580, Fleming ‘gathered’ or compiled the index for Certaine sermons in Defense of the Gospell by Thomas Cooper, Bishop of Lincoln (1517–94). This book

\footnote{326 See pp. 188-9.}
(hereafter Certaine Sermons) was printed by Newberie, above Conduit in Fleet Street.

Fleming gave his index a title: “The special contentes of this book, reduced into a necessarie Table of Common Places” and closed the index with “Gathered by ABRAHAM FLEMMING”, although a print variant lacks this signature. Fleming composed an alphabetical list of keywords or ‘concepts’ that corresponded with marginal notes throughout the text. For example, the index begins with

**Acknowledge**
The way to acknowledge God in man. 192.
Meanes to make those acknowledge a God, which do not altogether deny him. 191.
Whoso can not acknowledge God in him selfe can not be sayd to be a man. 193.

A Godly and learned Exposition vpon the Prouerbes of Solomon (hereafter Exposition), which was printed in 1580. The Stationers’ register for 27 July 1579 suggest that this large and lengthy book took several months to write.\(^{327}\) The book was printed by Dawson at The Three Cranes for Bishop to sell at The Bell. Exposition was surely a Calvinist text. It was originally written in French by a Marian exile and cleric living in Geneva called Michael Cope (1501-66).\(^{328}\)

The ‘table’ that Fleming created for Exposition was 40 pages in length and he gave it a comprehensive title that included instructions on how to use this index:

An ample and large Index or Table, comprising al the principal points of Doctrines, and circumstances, as wel Moral as Diuine, conteined in this Booke, very necessarie and beneficial for all estates, euen from the highest to the lowest. The number noteth the leafe. A, standeth for the first side, and B, for the second side of the leafe.

\(^{327}\) In the 1592 inventory of Richard Mote’s books, this text was valued at 2 shillings, which was quite costly for an older book. This is suggestive of Exposition being large. Mote was a fellow of Queen’s College, Cambridge.

\(^{328}\) Cope’s book was Exposition familiar des proverbs de Salomon (Geneva, 1556).
Furnishing the reader with instructions for using his indexes became a feature of Fleming’s ‘tables’ and the instructions he wrote for his next index, that of Peter Martyr, and then Calvin on Deuteronomie were more detailed.

Fleming’s next project was translating and indexing The Epistle of the Blessed Apostle Saint Paule (hereafter The Epistle), which was printed in 1580 (although some sources say 1581). First entered into the Stationers’ register on 27 July 1580, it was printed by Thomas East of Bread Street. The Epistle was an affordable, quarto-sized devotional handbook, 237 pages in length. The original text had been written by Niels Hemmingsen (1513–1600), a confirmed protestant who was better known by his Anglicized name Nicholas Hemmings. Fleming’s translation of The Epistle took the reader, verse by verse, through St. Paul’s letter and after each verse was a commentary explaining what the verse meant. Certaine words within the text were underlined and this most likely linked to the index. The index itself had a separate title: ‘The Principall Pointes of this booke alphabetically drawne into a Table whereby the Reader maie soone see what doctrines are heerein handled’.

Not only did Fleming translate The Epistle into English and index the book, he also added a dedication, which is the most significant feature of this edition. The book was dedicated to Anne, Countess of Oxford who was Lord Burghley’s elder daughter and a talented poet. This dedication provides evidence that Fleming was keen to win the patronage of those closest to Burghley and perhaps come to the attention of Burghley himself.329

One of the more comprehensive sets of indexes provided by Fleming can be seen in The common Places of the most famous and renowned diuine Doctor Peter Martyr (1583, hereafter Peter Martyr) by Anthony Marten and J. Simler (1583).330 This was a substantial

---

329 Fleming dedicated three books to Sir William Cordell, who was supportive of Fleming; see p. 142, p. 145 and pp. 153–4. It is likely that Fleming was known to at least some members of the Cecil family as he had in his possession a manuscript by Elizabeth Russell, who was Burghley’s sister-in-law, see p. 134. This suggests that dedications such as this one to the Countess of Oxford were not fruitless.

330 The full title is The common places of the most famous and renowned diuine Doctor Peter Martyr, diuided into foure principall parts: with a large addition of manie theologicaall and necessarie (cont.)
book printed by Denham and Middleton, and sold by a syndicate that included Denham, Thomas Chard, William Brome or Broome, and Maunsell, who between them had financed the book’s production. Denham, Middleton and Maunsell had all worked with Fleming before. Fleming’s tables look like and function as modern indexes do; it takes no time or adaptation to make the transition from using a modern index to using one of Fleming’s even if it is one of his more complicated indexes with directions to columns as well as page numbers. At 63 folio sides long, each side having four columns of text in a font of point six or seven in size, the Peter Martyr indexes are very large and surely took a long time to compile. The indexes have their own lengthy titles that make them more like a supplement than part of the book itself, for example:

The First Table of D.P. Martyrs Common Places amplified and inlarged, comprehending (in as familiar a forme as can be) the summe of all such points of Divinitie, Philosophie and Historie, &c. as are therein comprised: Gathered and laid together in an alphabeticall order as followeth.

In the surviving copies of Peter Martyr the indexes have been bound at the back of the book in the same way that a modern book has its index at the back. However, in giving the indexes their own titles Fleming gave the buyer (who would have bought the books unbound) a choice: their indexes could be bound into back of the text or the index could be left out of the binding as a separate reference tool. Peter Martyr is a very large book and, by treating the indexes as a separate tool, the reader was saved the trouble of flicking back and forth between the index and the main text of this heavy volume if looking up multiple references. The index closes with Fleming’s signature “FINIS propositi, laus Christo nescia FINIS”.

The indexes to Peter Martyr were divided into four sections or volumes, must have taken a long time to compile and check, and were not simple to construct. Yet Fleming ensured that they were simple, elegant and straightforward for the reader to use. He was also working in discourses, some neuer extant before. Translated and partlie gathered by Anthonie Marten, one of the sewers of hir Maiesties most honourable chamber. Including an oration by I. Simler. In the end of the booke are annexed two tables of all the notable matters therein conteined. The copy refered to here is BL 3705f11.
an age when people were becoming increasingly familiar with books and reading, but it is possible that some readers might have become intimidated or confused when confronted with a text as large as this one. Fleming, always keen to make the written word accessible to all, provided these instructions for those unused to indexes or unsure how to use one as detailed as those in Peter Martyr:

For the easier and readier understanding hereof (sith many places carie diverse numbers both in respect of part and page) it shall be necessarie to note, that all such figures as stand thus inclusped or embraced [1] [2] [3] or [4] doe signifie the 1.2.3. or 4. Part, (remembering alwaies that the volume is Quadripartite or consisting of 4. Partes, besides the additions, which may be a supported Part by themselves:) the other figures as they fall more or lesse, doe import the page or side of the leaf. Note further, that (A) informeth the first column (as we commonlie call it) or partition of any page, (B) the second. And thus much briefelie by way of advisement.

The entries in the indexes themselves are comprehensive and words with multiple meanings are given a line to clarify in which context the reader will find the word on any given page, as these typical entries taken from “A” and “P” illustrate:

**Actions.** After what Actions, the actions of vertues do follow [1] 4.b.


The second table or index that Fleming compiled for Peter Martyr is shorter than the first, at ten sides with three columns of text per side. Fleming called this

A breefe Table collected out of the additions: shewing effectuallie such matters as are therein conteined. Where also the Reader for his further resolution may turne backe to the former table.

As with the former table, Fleming signed off with his Latin motto. Again, creating two indexes rather than compiling one goes some way to demonstrating Fleming’s concern with making the reader’s experience as pleasant as possible. One index containing coded references to different ‘Parts’ or volumes and the different ‘Additions’ would be too confusing, so Fleming kept them separate, making extra work for himself but ensuring that,
as with all his writing, his texts were clear, straightforward and accessible. The comfort of
the reader and imparting information quickly and easily were always at the forefront of
Fleming’s mind, particularly where godly learning was concerned.

The tables that Fleming compiled for Golding’s *Sermons of John Calvin on Deuteronomie*
(hereafter *Sermons of Calvin*) were very similar to those that he wrote for *Peter Martyr.*
Both books were printed in 1583 and Fleming was probably working on them at the same
time. Fleming compiled two indexes for *Sermons of Calvin,* both individually titled and
signed with his Latin motto as in *Peter Martyr,* and he included instructions to the reader
explaining how to find a particular word or passage. The first of the tables in *Calvin on
Deuteronomie* is remarkable for its sheer length: 123 folio-sized sides in length with three
columns of small text per side. The main text was set out differently and the instructions
reflect this difference in organisation:

> Touching the use and understanding of this table, this briefe advertisement is to be marked, that the first number directeth thee to the page or side of the leafe. The letter (a) leadeth thee to the first column or partition of the page; the letter (b) to the second. The other number noteth the places, where the matter is conteined within the page, as it is divided by Decads or Tens; for 10. to 60.

Unlike the instructions to using *Peter Martyr*’s index, which were put at the start of the first
table, the instructions for using the index in *Calvin on Deuteronomie* were printed at the end
of the first index. “This I thought not unnecessary to the recorde,” wrote Fleming, “having
forgotten to place it in the title of the table.”

The second index to *Calvin on Deuteronomie* was not an index in the modern sense of the
word in that it was not for finding words, references to people or places. Instead, the second
table was a tool for finding specific lessons from the Bible that Calvin had used in his

---

331 The full title is *The sermons of M. John Calvin upon the fifth book of Moses called Deuteronomie gathered as he preached them in open pulpit together with a preface made by the ministers of the Church of Geneva, and an admonishement made by the deacons there. Also there in are annexed two profitable tables, the one conteining the cheefe matters, the other the places of scripture herein alleged. Translated out of French by Arthur Golding.* The copy used here is BL 1215k14. There is a variant copy (BL 1473dd6) in which the letter ‘To the Reader’ by Fleming was bound in between the two indexes.
sermons. The instructions for use are at the front, and this time Fleming remembered to write the instructions first:

ANOTHER TABLE OF THE PLACES OF THE OLDE AND NEW TESTAMENT alleged, and properly applied and expounded, by Maister John Calvin in his sermons upon Deuteronomie, in which the first number noteth the Chapter, and the second the verses of the Bookes of the Bible, from whence they are taken and the third number noteth the Pages of this Booke. a for first column and b. for the second.

This example from the index itself illustrates Fleming’s method of finding a reference to a specific chapter and verse from Mark’s Gospel passage in the transcription of Calvin’s sermons. This would enable the reader to read a chapter or verse in the Bible and New Testament in full and then look up a particular passage to see how Calvin had used the same verse, perhaps to aid an individual’s understanding or to develop a godly discussion at home:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. marke</th>
<th>V.</th>
<th>P.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>93a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1191a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>50.a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>97.a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>272.b.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVI</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>181.a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The duplicated last page number is not, as one might easily think, a print error for on page 181 in the first column are not one but two references to Mark 16: 15-16, which Calvin made during his sermon on “Fryday the vii of Iune 1555”.

Fleming’s next project as an indexer was providing the tables for Holinshed’s Chronicles, but that was not the only book that Fleming indexed for production in 1587. Foxe’s Eicasmi seu Meditazione in Sacram Apocoypsin, which is now very rare, contained a table 27 pages long arranged in three columns of text per page. Unlike his other indexes, this one was all in Latin (because the main text was also in Latin) and called ‘Index Apocalypticus. Rerum & Verborum in hisce Meditationibus apocalypticus spasorum Index uberrimus, adhitoito ad eundem conficiendum Autoris consilio’. It is a straightforward index akin to one in a modern
book. The colophon states that Eicasmi was printed by George Bishop although this particular index seems to have been printed by different printers since the section beginning with A to H was typeset in a small font, akin to point eight in today’s parlance; the columns for words beginning with H to Z were in a larger font, roughly equivalent to point eleven.

The index is signed “FINIS propositi, laus Christo nescia Finis” leaving no doubt that it was the work of Fleming, but just above his motto is a disclaimer that was also initialled by him:

Errata, que per absentiam collectoris a praelo in hunc indicem irrepsisse animadvertes, gravior aut candide corriges, leviora patienter feras lector benevolentam Ab. Fl.

Fleming indexed a total of eleven books during his literary career. The first was for Zodiac in 1576 and the last were printed in 1587 within Holinshed’s Chronicles and Eicasmi. Some of the indexed books were given multiple tables; there were three compiled by Fleming in Holinshed’s Chronicles and two indexes in Peter Martyr. Several of his indexes were substantial works in their own rights, for example the 14,000 word dictionary index in Nomenclator; or the 27 page, three-column table in Eicasmi; and, the 123 page, folio-size sides three column index in Calvin on Deuteronomie. This evidence demonstrates that creating indexes provided Fleming with steady work for over a decade. He was skilled at this painstaking work. Fleming developed a good reputation for producing accurate, user-friendly indexes. He was not merely a writer that could, if needed, make an index. Fleming was an accomplished and respected indexer, and thus in the vanguard of developing the modern printed book for the public sphere.

Dictionaries:

In 1580 Fleming compiled the first of five dictionaries that he had either contributed to or taken over altogether. This first one was an Alvearie or quadruple dictionary, containing foure sundrie tongues: namelie, English, Latine, Greeke, and French. Newlie enriched with a varietie of words, phrases, prouerbs and diuers lightsome obseruations of grammar. By the tables you may contrairiwise finde out the most necessarie words placed after the alphabet.
whatsoeuer are to be found in anie other dictionarie: which tables also serving for lexicons, to lead the learner vnto the English of such hard words as are often read in authors, being faithfullie examined, are truelie numbered. Verie profitable for such as be desireous of anie of those languages. The book included “A Briefe Instruction of Arythmetike”. The original had been finished on “Anno. 1573. Febr. 2.” by John Baret and printed by Denham in 1574. Baret and Fleming had both been students at Peterhouse and part of their time at Cambridge overlapped so it is very likely that Baret and Fleming had known each other. However Baret died in 1579 so it was surely Denham who asked Fleming to update this text, which he did with two hundred new proverbs. Since Baret’s original Alvearie did not contain any Greek, Fleming can be credited with adding this scholarly language to the dictionary, which made the finished edition quadrilingual and over 800 pages in length. The date “Anno. 1580. Ianuarie. 2.” was printed towards the front of this Alvearie and indicates the time that Fleming’s involvement with the text ended; the same year was printed on the colophon.

The commendatory poems in Fleming’s Alvearie came from Baret’s edition and included praise from the schoolmaster Edward Grant, the lexicographer Rudolph Waddington (whose Latin/English dictionary Fleming would edit in 1584), and Fleming’s colleague Arthur Golding. Fleming added his own commendatory poem to his edition, as did Thomas Speght, the scholar of Chaucer. Fleming’s Latin poem, in eight stanzas, played on the title of this dictionary (Alvearie from the Latin alveare meaning beehive) and he heavily employed honey and bee metaphors to illustrate the benefits of being industrious. Bee metaphors were also to play a major part in his Diamond of Devotion the following year.

332 Whilst Fleming did provide indexes for this text, they were as he said “serving as lexicons”. For this reason I have classified Alvearie as a dictionary and not discussed it in the sub-chapter dealing with his indexes.
333 Baret (or Barret) was matriculated sizar at St John’s in 1551 then moved to Trinity where he gained an M.A. in 1558 and became a fellow of Trinity in 1560. He joined Peterhouse sometime after this and went out M.D. in 1577. (Fleming was in residence at Peterhouse from 1570 until 1575 and went out B.A. in 1581.) Venn & Venn Alumni Cantabrigienses vol i, 96.
334 Fleming had contributed to Golding’s True Beleefe, see p. 35, p. 87 and pp. 174-5.
Miller suggested that Fleming referred to a number of existing books when he sought material for inclusion in Alvearie. Among these were a translation of Erasmus’ Adagia; the ‘Dictionarium Historicum et Poeticum’ from Cooper’s Thesaurus; the Huelot-Higgins Dictionarie of 1572; and Lyte’s 1578 translation of Dodoen’s herbal. Of these surely the Huelot-Higgins dictionary is of most interest since Fleming went on to work with Higgins in 1585 when he compiled a 14,000 words dictionary-index for The nomenclator or remembrance of Adrianus Iunius. The botanist Henry Lyte’s Niewe Herball is equally interesting because in 1585 it was still considered a novel publication in England. Fleming used a lot of plant and herb-related metaphor in his later work, most obviously in Diamond in 1581. He also sent Whitgift a letter that he called a gift of fruits and flowers from his garden, and when speaking of himself Fleming wrote that “pleasaunt flowres there in me are”. His frequent use of plants and his knowledge of their metaphorical properties suggest that he had a genuine interest in plants and herb-lore. His likely ownership of this up-to-date and costly herbal, which was folio-sized with over 800 pages and dozens of lavish woodcuts, support this theory. It seems likely that these reference books were owned by Fleming and demonstrate how his own library (described on p. 25) had grown.

Fleming’s edition of Alvearie was so different to Baret’s trilingual dictionary that it was given its own STC number, 1411. Alvearie was surely aimed at schoolboys since it was arranged alphabetically according to the English spelling of each word and its proverbs were enjoyable mnemonics devised to help young students commit foreign words to memory. Fleming provided an index to help readers find proverbs that contained the words they were looking for together with a “briefe note” or instructions for using his ‘Proverbiall Index’. The indexes to the Latin and French words were most likely from Baret’s 1573 Alvearie, although Fleming might have added to these and certainly edited them. It has been suggested that there were two runs of the 1580 edition produced, although no further editions were

336 Lyte’s herbal was a translation of a French book by Charles de l’Ecluse called Histoire des Plantes (1577), which was in turn a translation of Rembert Dodoen’s Cruydeboeke (1564).
337 In this respect Alvearie was very similar to Shorte Dictionarie, see pp. 194-5.
printed. The reason for this was probably that Alvearie was simply too big and expensive to serve effectively as a dictionary for children.\footnote{The 1580 Alvearie was folio sized with at least 852 pages, although the British Library’s copy is lacking its last pages. This is the only copy in the U.K. There are two copies in the Folger Shakespeare Library (the catalogue says that these copies are duo-sized, not folio, I think this is an error).}

Three years later in 1583 Fleming created a second new edition of another existing dictionary, which is now so rare that hardly anything is known about this book.\footnote{Unfortunately the only copy at the British Library, shelfmark 1502/380, has been “mis-shelved” and cannot be seen.} It was titled Verborum Latinorum cum Graecis Anglisque conjunctorum locupletissimi commentarii: ad elaboratum Gulielmi Marelii Regii in Graecis typographi archetypum accuratissime excuse nouaque vocum passim insetarum accessione ad ducti vt stellulae quae singulis lucent paginis indicabunt. Consultis praetor ditissima aliorum dictionaria viuis etiam nonnullorum doctorum vocibus quo Anglica versio perspicua magis sit fructuosiorque ad commune studiosorum vsum eminent. Quid vitalis in his commentariis quaeque conscribendi eos ratio a primo authore inita sit ex ipsius Morelii præfatione studiosi facillime perceipient. As this title suggests the book was a trilingual dictionary. Verborum Latinorum cum Graecis Anglisque was printed by Bynneman, who carried a stock of Greek type, for the seller Richard Hutton in 1583. Bynneman died later that year and his rights to this book passed to Denham and/or Newberie; the Stationers’ register recorded that Verborum Latinorum cum Graecis Anglisque was entered to Denham and Newberie on 30 December 1584. This dictionary, originally by William Morel but renewed in 1558 by John Withals, was so altered by Fleming with new Latin verses that it was considered a new book in its own right and given its own STC number, 18101. Unfortunately its scarcity means that little else can be said about Verborum Latinorum cum Graecis Anglisque.

More is known about Fleming’s next dictionary, which was printed in 1584. It was called simply A dictionarie in Latine and English, heretofore set forth by Master John Veron, and now newlie corrected and enlarged for the uilitie and profit of all yoong students in the
The title is misleading since this book also contained French and this edition (STC 24678) was compiled and expanded by Fleming, not John Veron or “R. W.” (Rudolph Waddington). Fleming altered the existing text almost beyond recognition (hence Dictionarie in Latine and English has its own STC number), but this has caused problems with establishing exactly what the existing text was, although Fleming frequently noted in the text what he had done. For example, where the Latin was “shaky”, Fleming noted that he had repaired it; phrases translated “out of the French idiom” he clarified “in our own” English. It is likely that the precursor to Fleming’s Dictionarie in Latine and English was a trilingual text called Dictionariolum puerorum tribus linguis Latina, Anglica & Gallica conscriptum by Robert Estienne (d. 1559). Estienne’s dictionary was updated by Veron, a French cleric living in London, in 1552. A third version was printed in 1575 and attributed to Veron and Waddington, although Veron had died in 1563. This had been printed by Denham and as with Alvearie, when Denham wanted the Veron/Waddington dictionary updated and refurbished he called on Fleming. Unlike the Alvearie of 1580 that was duo-sized with over a 1,000 pages, this Dictionarie in Latine and English was a more manageable quarto in size with a less daunting 688 pages. Its smaller size suggests that this later book was aimed at pueri (little boys) as was its predecessor.

Fleming’s next dictionary was even smaller: A shorte dictionarie in Latine and English, verie profitable for yong beginners. Compiled at the first by Iohn Withals: afterwards reuised and increased with phrases and necessarie additions by Lewis Euans. And nowe lastlie augmented with more than six hundred rhythmical verses, her eof many be prouerbial some heretofore found in old English: newlie done by Abraham Fleming. What is added in this edition which none of the former at any time had, these markes * may sufficiently shew. Printed in 1584 by Thomas Purfoote, this was a slim volume, quarto size with 232 pages.

---

340 There is only one surviving copy of this dictionary and this is in the Folger Shakespeare Library.
341 Fleming’s name was associated another dictionary with the similar title A shorte dictionarie in Latine and English that was also printed in 1584. The two have been confused in the past. A Shorte Dictionarie (see here, p. 194-7) has the STC numbers 25880 and 25880.5 while the 1584 Dictionarie in Latine and English (discussed here on pp. 193-4) is STC 24678.
specifically for use by children. It is sometimes referred to as *A Shorte dictionarie for yonge begynners* and its running title was “A little dictionarie for children”. *Shorte Dictionarie* was affordable at 1s 6d and popular. More is known about his three editions of *Shorte Dictionarie* than is known about any of Fleming’s other dictionaries because more copies of this text have survived than of his rarer dictionaries. This slightly higher survival rate suggests that larger numbers of the *Shorte Dictionarie* were produced. The number of editions printed and the book’s longevity surely indicate that it was a best seller.

The book that became Fleming’s *Shorte Dictionarie* was originally printed in 1553 and compiled by John Withals (the “J. W.” in its title), the lexicographer who had put together the original *Verborum Latinorum cum Graecis Anglicisque* (see p. 193). There were at least seven or possibly eight editions of this book that were compiled by Withal’s prior to Fleming’s involvement, and subsequent editions were edited by Lewis Evans. This demonstrates the ongoing popularity of this dictionary. Fleming’s name was included in the title of five editions printed in 1584, 1586, 1592, 1599 and 1602 although all the editions had the same title and it is difficult to discern what, if any, additional changes Fleming made to the editions from 1586 onwards. The first of the *Shorte Dictionaries* associated with Fleming is, therefore, the most significant.

As with his previous dictionaries Fleming greatly altered and enhanced the 1584 edition of *Shorte Dictionarie*. He corrected and edited the text, he devised 600 rhyming verses, he added proverbs and new words, and contributed a prefix letter called ‘*Ad Philomusos*’. In this letter Fleming berated the printer Purfoote (who he said was well known to him and who had been responsible for printing several editions since 1565) for allowing so many errors

---

342 This dictionary was given the STC number 25880a, but has more recently been allocated the number 25880.5. However, 25880.5 also refers to one Rudolph Waddington’s dictionaries. The Veron-Waddington dictionary that Fleming edited in 1584 is different again: STC 24678.

343 It has been suggested that Fleming actually added over 1,000 new verses to the text. Miller counted 277 new verses in a quarter of the gatherings, which would total of 1108 new verses. Miller, ‘Abraham Fleming, Elizabethan Man of Letters’, p. 235.
into the book.\cite{344} Despite this Purfoote printed every subsequent edition of this dictionary; he did after all own the rights to print and sell this title (although Fleming’s criticisms would appear to have been removed from the later editions). Fleming also made it clear for whom the book was intended for: *puerilis* or children. When describing in ‘*Ad Philomusos*’ the additional verses he created for the *Shorte Dictionarie*, Fleming wrote that he was “depressed and exhausted by the pressing weight of [his] affairs [because] nobody else translated the Latin, metrical Latin at that; all these verses have been reduced to order and placed in the appropriate places [by him]”.\cite{345}

Fleming specifically described his 600 additional rhythmical verses in *Shorte Dictionarie* as “whetstones” to “sharpen the little memories”, and here is an example about Fleming’s favourite animal, the dog:

\begin{quote}
*Dum canis os rodit\nSocium quem diligit, odit.*\cite{346}
\end{quote}

The other additional material Fleming provided in 1584 were alternative translations of existing Latin phrases that clarified the phrase or word. These were marked with an asterisk.

Despite claiming that he was himself tired and depressed, Fleming remained keen to lay the blame for imperfections in the text on its printer, Thomas Purfoote:

\begin{quote}
Had I just one little short hour of leisure in a day so that I might stand by the press while the book was being printed, this little book would have appeared neat and polished and would not have slipped into publication with an increase in errors, in spite of the care I have taken.\cite{347}
\end{quote}

The 1584 edition, which was quarto sized and between 232 and 240 pages long, was given the *STC* number 25880.5. The edition of 1586, which kept exactly the same title, was a

\begin{footnotes}
\item[345] Ibid. p. 232.
\item[346] Fleming provided a translation of this: “While a dogge gnawes a bone, he hateth his fellow, whom otherwise he loves.”
\end{footnotes}
much slimmer volume with 112 pages and this was given the STC number 25881. It is likely that sometime prior to this edition Fleming had become acquainted with the poet and doctor Thomas Newton (c. 1542–1607). Newton, a prolific writer, furnished the 1586 edition of Shorte Dictionarie with a series of Latin verses that suggested he and Fleming had become good friends.\(^3\) Newton had also provided Fleming with a poem, ‘Carmen Chronologicon’, and other material for Chronicles in 1586.\(^4\)

In 1594 a third edition of Fleming’s Shorte Dictionarie was printed and numbered STC 25882, followed by a fourth in 1599, STC 25883. These were given the same title as the 1584 and 1586 editions, which states that the book was “newlie done” by Fleming although, since by this time Fleming was rector of St Pancras, Soper Lane, it seems unlikely that he played an active role in producing these later editions.\(^5\) One more edition came out within Fleming’s lifetime, but this 1602 edition (STC 25884) was edited by Clark. This edition heralded a change of format, being octavo in size and having 464 pages. Three more editions came out after Fleming’s death, in 1608, 1616 and 1634 and these had slightly different titles. The rights to Shorte Dictionarie were owned by printer and bookseller Purfoote, whose rights passed to his son, also called Thomas Purfoote, who continued to reprint this dictionary until 1634.

The four dictionaries described so far (Alvearie, Verboram Latinorum cum Graecis, Dictionarie in Latine and English and Shorte Dictionarie) were intended as scholarly tools and learning aids. There was one other ‘dictionary-index’ that Fleming compiled and this was printed within John Higin’s The nomenclator or remembrance of Adrianus Iunius physician, divided into two tomes containing proper names and apt terms for all things under their convenient titles, which within a few leaves does follow: written by the said Ad. Iu. In Latine, Greeke, French and other foreign

---

\(^3\) The phrase Newton used in his poem about this dictionary was “Vithalus, Euannus, Flaminiusque meus”, which literally means “Withals, Evans and my friend Fleming”.

\(^4\) See p. 99.

\(^5\) It is also possible that following his earlier criticism of Purfoote in ‘Ad Philomusos’, the printer chose not to work with Fleming on the texts of 1592, 1599 or 1602, since Fleming’s embittered comments were removed from these editions suggesting that one of Purfoote’s employees edited the subsequent proofs.
tongues, and now in English by Iohn Higins: with a full supplie of all such words as the last
inlarged edition afforded and a dictional index conteining aboue fourteen hundred princiall
words with their numbers directly leading to their interpretations of special vse for all scholars
and learners of the same languages. Hereafter Nomenclator, this book was registered with the
Stationers’ Company on 12 October 1583 to Newberie and printed in 1585 by Denham, which
suggests that Nomenclator took approximately eighteen months to compile. Denham apparently
produced three runs of this edition, which suggests that Newberie’s stock kept selling out and he
needed more. Some copies contained an additional section, “Supplementum Vice
Prolegomenon”. There are at least two or possibly three print variants: one contained verses by
Fleming as well as his dictionary-index; another had the verses printed on pages that were blank
in the other variant; and, there was a variant title page that named Fleming as this book’s
indexer, although the other copies said only that the book was “laste inlarged [with] a dictional
index”.

There is no question that Fleming was involved with this text since his signature “FINIS
propositi, laus Christo nesci FINIS” was printed at the end of the main text. The position of this
motto implies that, as well as composing verses and the dictionary-index, Fleming also edited
this book for its author, Higins. Printed on octavo-sized paper, Nomenclator was not large but it
was lengthy and comprised two volumes of 539 pages. At least two surviving variants contained
Latin verses that were dedicated to Fleming titled “Ad studiosos Abrahami Flemingi”.

The poem was eight lines long, which Fleming referred to in Greek as an “octstactich”. His
greatest contribution to this book was the 14,000 word “Index tricolvmnaris omnivm Dictionvm
Qvarvm, interpretationem domestico idiomate Nomenclator iste tradit, exquisita methodo
constructus, per Abrahamum Flemingum Londinigenam”. As well as serving as a ‘table’ this
three-column index functioned in the same way as his earlier Alvearie had, enabling the reader

351 In his dissertation, Miller wrote that this poem was by Fleming and the phrase “Ad studiosos Abrahami
Flemingi” suggests that this verse was addressed “to the students of Abraham Fleming”.
352 These two copies are both in the Folger Shakespeare Library. See Miller ‘Abraham Fleming,
353 Londinigenam meaning “born in London” (see pp. 20-1). The same phrase appeared in relation to
Fleming in Golding’s De vera Christiani hominis fide (1581) and Concerning the True Beleefe of a
Christian Man (1581 or 1582). This provides further evidence that Fleming was born in London.
to not only look up the pages that the required words were on but also to translate each word into Latin, Greek or French. Whilst “Index tricolorum omnium Dictionum” was undoubtedly an index, the fact that it was 14,000 words long and quadrilingual surely meant that its primary function was that of a dictionary.

* * * * *

Fleming’s commitment to learning was strongly apparent in the books he produced between 1581 and 1589. His indexes demonstrate that he wanted to make otherwise large and complex books accessible to readers. His indexes would have enabled readers to access sermons and biblical passages in English without the need for a cleric or other third party familiar with the text to find the desired passages for them. His dictionaries illustrate his desire to help educate young children and schoolboys. Fleming composed the proverbs for his dictionaries with children in mind and this thesis demonstrates that his use of familiar and amusing devices (such as the normally friendly dog defending a bone) made Latin fun, just as the purpose of Bushie Haire had been to capture and engage the imaginations of young classicists. That the dictionaries Fleming embellished ran to several editions over periods of decades prove that his writing was successful. Despite this, Fleming chose to leave the book trade and instead pursued a career in the Church. Although the devotional books that he produced were undoubtedly popular (as evidenced by the longevity of Conduit, Footpath and Diamond, and Diamond entering the English stock), Fleming preferred to preach godly doctrine directly to the people in the parishes that he later ministered to.
Chapter Seven:

Ordination, Paul’s Cross, Lord Howard of Effingham, St Pancras, Soper Lane and the Lost Manuscripts

Abraham Fleming was an asset to and pioneer of the world of printed books. During a literary career spanning fourteen years he made a name for himself working with some of London’s leading printers and booksellers. Fleming contributed to some important groundbreaking texts and he also provided books and written material for people of all abilities and economic groups. Suddenly in 1588 Fleming’s literary outpourings seemed to stop. After such a busy and successful career, not to mention his having built up a network of associates, this seems surprising.

In point of fact Fleming’s literary output had begun to diminish well before 1588. In terms of the number of titles published per year, he peaked in 1580 when his name was put to eleven books. However, in terms of sheer quantity of work produced, Fleming’s magnum opus was in 1587 when Holinshed’s Chronicles was collated, edited, corrected and printed. This may account for Fleming’s apparent cooling towards the literary world: he was still very busy, just busy on one lengthy project instead of numerous smaller ones. As his colleague Francis Thynne observed, Fleming had “sweated mightily” over the production of Holinshed’s Chronicles. At that time he might have believed that he would never again find a project to test his endurance and abilities as much as Holinshed’s Chronicles had (although the evidence suggests that a third edition was proposed, he was likely unaware of this in 1588). Therefore it is possible that Fleming sought a fresh career that would challenge him in new ways. However, it is equally possible that after all the hard work, substitutions for castrated material and other editorial problems generated by Holinshed’s Chronicles, Fleming tired of writing for publication. As has been demonstrated in the previous chapter, he was quick to comment on the failings and inadequacies of his colleagues, and surely found the extra work

354 Thynne’s comment, which was written in Latin, translates as “[Fleming] sweated mightily in the correction and expansion of these chronicles, together with the addition of very useful indexes,” taken from Holinshed’s Chronicles vol. III (1587), 1590.
their carelessness caused debilitating. In addition, Fleming often complained of having to work, from which it can be inferred that he was always short of money. His personal letters and embittered glosses seem to indicate that his wages were indeed meagre in relation to the Herculean efforts he made, and the income that he received from the book trade was poor. Demanding work, imperfect colleagues and interference from the authorities who recalled Holinshed’s Chronicles much to Fleming’s annoyance, plus low income were surely enough to explain why Fleming retired from the literary world and wanted to embark on another career.

It seems there were indeed other career options open to Fleming. He had always displayed an interest in godly matters as his tracts, transcriptions and pamphlets demonstrate. It could be argued that Fleming perhaps acted as a hack writer producing godly books because they were popular and profitable, yet his genuine godly protestant leanings were made crystal clear in Diamond of Devotion (1581). It seems probable that Fleming’s godly protestant tendencies were strong, too strong to remain confined between the covers of printed books.

When Fleming’s manuscript collection was catalogued in the 1730s it was found to contain a number of letters that referred to philosophical and religious matters. However, the exact dates on which these letters were written, that is to say whether they were written while he was still producing books or later when he entered the Church, are hard to establish. Fleming established some significant contacts within the Church of England. His brother Samuel was chaplain successively to four Earls of Rutland and was also a pluralist rector. Fleming had also corresponded indirectly with Archbishop Whitgift during the censorship of Holinshed’s Chronicles and he had written a letter to Bishop Aylmer in Golding’s True Beleefe.355 His manuscript collection also included documents that demonstrated Fleming’s interest in Church matters such as the enthronement of the Archbishops of Canterbury although it seems likely that he had collected these for reference in Holinshed’s Chronicles. However other manuscripts illustrate Fleming’s genuine interest in Calvin and Archbishop Whitgift, as

355 See p. 35 and pp. 174-5.
did his involvement in Golding’s The Sermons of M. John Calvin upon Deuteronomie (1583). Some members of the Church of England were already familiar with Fleming’s work. It is probable that Aylmer, Bishop of London would have encountered Fleming’s Straunge and Terrible Wunder in 1577. The pamphlet was written from a godly perspective shortly after Archbishop Grindal’s fall. It is likely that Aylmer and the Privy Council kept a close eye on the latest printed material, whether licensed or unlicensed, in order to recall “anti-establishment” propaganda as swiftly as possible (as had happened with the pamphlet about the mortalities at Oxford in 1577). A pamphlet like Wunder, Fleming’s translations of Bright Burning Beacon and Generall Doctrine of Earthquakes (both 1580) in which a natural phenomenon was seen as a portent and to which was attributed religious significance would not have escaped their watchful eyes at that time.

Fleming’s manuscripts demonstrate that he reciprocated Aylmer’s interest in controlling such printed material, since a number of his unpublished papers related to the Bishop of London’s actions and policies. Also among Fleming’s papers catalogued by the antiquary Francis Peck in 1732 was “Part of a smart Letter written i. March MDLXXXI. by Elmer [Aylmer] Bishop of London to the then Lord Mayor (Harvey) in Answer to some scurrilous Reflections cast on the Bishop by that Gentleman, as also on Account of his ill using of the Clergy” (James Harvye was Lord Mayor in 1581). Peck also found among Fleming’s manuscripts this account of a sermon from 1584: “Whether a Bishop or any other Churchman may have the Tuition of a Ward [of Court]? affirmed by Bishop Elmer [Aylmer] in a sermon at S. Paul’s Cross, xi. Oct. MDLXXXIV”. At the time of this sermon Fleming had been engaged in producing academic books, particularly Latin-English dictionaries, so his reasons for having a copy of this sermon on the subject of tuition or education seem clear enough. The sermon does specifically discuss the question of churchmen tutoring wards, an occupation that Fleming’s own brother Samuel engaged in when he acted as tutor of Sir John Harington. This could suggest that Fleming too had been torn between his interest in writing or editing educational books and a desire to join the church, and perhaps this was the reason that this sermon particularly interested him.
All in all, it would appear that Fleming had been interested in ecclesiastical matters long before his ordination. Documents such as these (and there were more among his private papers) demonstrate that Fleming took a keen interest in church matters throughout his life, which made his next career move less surprising.\(^{356}\) Francis Peck recorded a letter to Archbishop Whitgift dated 1588 in which Fleming bewailed his circumstances and complained about the poor state of the printing industry. Whitgift’s response is unknown, but on 2 August 1588 Bishop Richard Howland ordained Fleming both deacon and priest in a single ceremony at Peterborough. Superficially and if taken out of context this could be seen as a ‘road to Damascus’ experience during which Fleming suddenly abandoned the world of printed books in order to enter the Church of England. Clearly, as the evidence indicates, this was not the case, particularly as ordination was not something to be rushed into or taken lightly.

Fleming chose to be ordained at Peterborough although there seems to be no obvious connection between Fleming and this remote fenland cathedral. The Elizabethan archive material associated with Peterborough cathedral is very incomplete and offers no clues as to why he wanted to be ordained there, yet with a little understanding Peterborough was not such a strange choice after all. It was close to Cambridge with which Fleming was familiar. Bishop Howland was a Cambridge man and, like Fleming, had attended Peterhouse. In his unpublished and sometimes unreliable dissertation, William Miller implied that an ‘old boys’ network’ was in place and goes so far as to say that Dr Andrew Perne, Master of Peterhouse while Fleming was a student, might have introduced him to Howland.\(^{357}\) However, there might have been other reasons why Fleming chose to be ordained at Peterborough. It was strongly associated with the demise of Mary Queen of Scots about whom Fleming had

---

\(^{356}\) Fleming continued to collect church-related manuscripts; for example towards the end of his career he obtained a letter about Robert Horne, Bishop of Winchester. Fleming also had “Brief Notes about Mr. Anthony Wotton, a worthy Preacher’s being silenced for certain Words scandalously taken,” and “Mr Hugh Broughton’s Censure of Bishop Bilson & Justus Lipsius his Censure of Mr Hugh Broughton”. These papers were dated 1604.

\(^{357}\) Miller, ‘Abraham Fleming, Elizabethan Man of Letters’ (the page numbers are not legible).
shown great interest. He certainly possessed several manuscripts about Mary Stuart and added information about the doomed queen to Holinshed’s Chronicles. Also among his unpublished manuscripts were six papers relating to Scotland, the Berwick peace talks and Mary herself, which had probably been intended for inclusion in Holinshed’s Chronicles in 1587.

Fleming was of course a staunch protestant and an ‘establishment man’, strongly supportive of Elizabeth and her regime, but his papers suggest that he developed a strong fascination with the demise of Mary Queen of Scots. Mary was executed at Fotheringhay in 1587 and was buried in Peterborough Cathedral. It may be significant that Fleming elected to be ordained in Peterborough Cathedral in the year following Mary Queen of Scots’ burial. The dean of Peterborough at this time was Richard Fletcher, who had attended Mary at her execution, and evidence suggests that Fletcher and Fleming were somehow connected. Certainly 13 of Fletcher’s manuscripts about Mary where to be included with Fleming’s papers by Peck in his proposed liber III of Desiderata Curiosa (1732). (Whether the manuscripts were already in the same collection or Peck assembled the papers into one collection is not known.) It is possible that Fleming and Fletcher had been in contact before Fleming’s ordination, since the passages on Mary’s trial and execution that were included in Holinshed’s Chronicles in 1587 must have come from a reliable source, and Fletcher had been an eyewitness.

Mary’s death in 1587 provided yet another propaganda reason for Spain to justify a planned attack on England. Throughout the late spring and summer of 1588 the ships of the Spanish Armada were battered and finally forced northwards by English naval forces. Fleming’s ordination took place early in August, he would have processed down the nave of the cathedral past Mary Stuart’s grave as English ships were winning the battle in the Channel and North Sea. Later that month, news came of the decisive victory, as the Armada fled north, so Fleming began his career in the Church in the midst of national celebrations infused with a deep sense of God’s providence.
There are also practical reasons why Fleming would have seen Peterborough as a good place for his ordination. His brother Samuel was a pluralist rector with livings at both nearby Cottenham and Ely. Fleming would have been assured a place to stay during his visit to Cambridgeshire.

Had he wanted to work within the Church of England but not been ordained, Fleming would have been restricted to teaching and reading, characteristics that would have echoed the educational and moral books that he had written and worked on prior to 1588. As a fully ordained clergyman Fleming was authorized to perform all religious ceremonies, including baptisms, marriages, funerals and the service of Holy Communion. He was also authorized to preach and he rapidly emerged as an effective public speaker. Within a year of his ordination Fleming had delivered his first sermon at Paul’s Cross, the open pulpit in the grounds of old St Paul’s Cathedral. The pulpit was destroyed in the Great Fire of 1666, but a stone plaque in the churchyard of Wren’s cathedral marks where it once stood. The pulpit itself survives only in a handful of illustrations and in this description by John Stow:

> About the midst of this churchyard is a pulpit cross of timber, mounted upon steps of stone, and covered with lead, in which are sermons preached by learned divines every Sunday in the forenoon, the very antiquity of which cross is to me unknown… Thomas Kempe, Bishop of London, new built it in the form as it now standeth.  

The Privy Council controlled the preachers and sermons at Paul’s Cross. Among other examples, there was a letter sent on 20 November 1586 to the Bishop of London requiring him to give order “as well as the preachers appointed to preache at Pawles Crosse as in other places of the cittie”. The Privy Council also suggested themes on which sermons should be based, as can be seen on 13 July 1591 when the Council ordained that the preacher at the

---

next sermon at Paul’s Cross should recommend the cause of those who spent their substance for the redemption of poor Englishmen from Spain.\textsuperscript{360}

When John Whitgift succeeded the troublesome Grindal as Archbishop of Canterbury in 1583, it was from Paul’s Cross, not Canterbury, that Whitgift delivered his inaugural sermon. Laity and clergy alike who wanted to be seen supporting Elizabeth and her church or Government would make a highly visible point of attending specifically themed sermons or listening to particular speakers. Once the queen and her privy council had re-established greater control over the church, after the downfall of Grindal, Paul’s Cross became a more effective propaganda machine. On 15 Feb 1601 the Rector of St Mary Woolchurch, John Hayward, preached a sermon devised by privy counsellors Robert Cecil, the queen’s trusted advisor, and Richard Bancroft, Bishop of London. Bancroft, pleased with the sermon, responded: “The traitor [Essex] is laid out well in colours to every man’s satisfaction that heard the sermon”.\textsuperscript{361} A week later on 22 February an unnamed preacher “spoke from written instructions supplied by Bancroft, which the bishop had first submitted to Cecil for approval” again about the earl of Essex. Essex was executed three days later and there was no further unrest in London.\textsuperscript{362}

Sermons were not the only orations to be heard at Paul’s Cross. The pulpit was also used for making important announcements, for example during outbreaks of plague, when it might be ordered from Paul’s Churchyard that the theatres were to be closed, a significant step to take at a time when theatre was a very popular form of entertainment. An unnamed preacher, who may have been Fleming as the date of one of his sermons corresponds with the date of the announcement, made a very similar proclamation. This suggests that the preachers themselves read necessary news and notices before the main sermon.\textsuperscript{363} Order had to be

\textsuperscript{360} Dasent, \textit{Acts of the Privy Council}, vol. XXI, 281.
\textsuperscript{361} MacLure, \textit{Paul’s Cross}, p. 221 (MacLure cited \textit{Salisbury Papers} XI, 55-6).
\textsuperscript{362} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{363} Ibid. p. 218
maintained in troubled times, public information had to be broadcast and Paul’s Cross assisted Elizabeth and her government in so doing.

Fleming had been ordained for less than a year when he delivered his first sermon. It is likely that he was already known and trusted by the Privy Council, or he must have quickly become an approved preacher. Furthermore the speed with which Fleming was invited to Paul’s Cross suggests that he was well-known, that he was seen as speaking with conviction and authority, and that he was trusted by the general public. He must have had a reliable reputation, probably a prerequisite for a Paul’s Cross preacher. Fleming was a strong character as his forewords and prefaces show. Given the fastidious nature of his books and the quickness with which he is known to have worked, Fleming’s sermons were likely to have been well-researched and supported by his stock of literary examples and stories. He did at times show humour and used colourful metaphors in his writing, which suggests he would have made an effective public speaker.

Fleming was promptly granted his licence to preach by Aylmer, who like Fleming was a Cambridge man. Fleming’s longstanding patron Charles Lord Howard of Effingham, the Lord High Admiral of England and later earl of Nottingham, was a privy counsellor. There is no record of when he began serving the Howard family but Fleming was ordained in 1588. He was not attached to any parish until 1592, but despite this lack of attachment he was able to start preaching at Paul’s Cross as early as 1589. He must have held an official position somewhere, but Miller’s suggestion that Fleming may have been attached to Cambridge University as a college chaplain is unlikely. He had graduated seven years earlier and there is no evidence to suggest he ever went back to Cambridge; certainly Fleming was working in London from 1575, and firmly identified himself as a Londoner from 1581. As Fleming seems to have been taken into the lord admiral’s household around the time of the defeat of the Armada, it seems more likely that Howard of Effingham employed him immediately
after his ordination, and as a privy councillor he facilitated Fleming’s speedy emergence as a Paul’s Cross preacher.

As a chaplain to a senior privy councillor and naval hero, Fleming can be seen as a part of the Elizabethan establishment, trusted to keep to the government line and support the queen and her church. Unfortunately the texts of Fleming’s eight known Paul’s Cross sermons do not survive. No sermons corresponding with these dates were registered with the Stationers’ Company, so it is unlikely that they were printed (although the Stationers’ Register is not an infallible source). This is a pity as other sermons that were registered with the Stationers’ Company were described in some detail. Fleming’s eight sermons have survived merely as a list of dates in Peck’s catalogue of Fleming’s manuscripts. Peck did not give the titles of the sermons nor allude to their content. Instead he promised to publish them fully at a later date, but did not do so. MacLure does not mention Fleming at all in his widely-used study of the Paul’s Cross sermons. Despite this it is possible to deduce likely topics for Fleming’s sermons. Paul’s Cross was an elite pulpit reserved for sermons marking major events or bringing order at times of crisis. By examining the dates on which Fleming was allowed to preach in relation to events happening at around those dates, it may be possible to establish the context or at least suggest the general themes of his sermons.

The first two sermons were both delivered in 1589, the only year in which Fleming preached at Paul’s Cross twice. Peck did not attribute exact dates to these sermons, so perhaps precise dates were not written on the manuscripts. One of the sermons may have been prompted by events in France as in August 1589 King Henry III, a protestant sympathizer and older brother of Elizabeth’s suitor the Duke of Anjou, was murdered during a rebellion by the Catholic League. In view of Fleming’s attention to current affairs and his ability to bring comfortable words to the masses, this seems as good an inspiration as any.
Other sermons of 1589, such as that given by Bancroft on 9 February, focused on putting down the Martin Marprelate controversy. “Martin Marprelate” was the *nom de plume* of an anonymous writer who, during 1588 and 1589, produced illegal tracts berating the Elizabethan religious settlement. The Privy Council commissioned counter-tracts and sermons, so possibly Fleming’s sermon was the one given by an unnamed preacher given in 1589 and described by MacLure.\(^{364}\) The inspiration of this sermon was indeed the Marprelate controversy and its evocative title “Woe to the printer, woe to the seller, woe to the buyer and woe to the author” may well recall Fleming’s former literary career. It was noted that the anonymous preacher who gave this sermon “lay in the same house in Wood-streete” as Gabriel Harvey. Harvey was another Cambridge man and a writer, close to Edmund Spenser, and about the same age as Fleming. Through marriage, Spenser was a kinsman of Fleming’s patron Lord Howard. Wood Street was located off Cheapside not far from St Paul’s, Paul’s Cross and the bookshops with which Fleming was so familiar. Wood Street was also very close to St Pancras, Soper Lane where Fleming lived from 1593; assuming that Fleming always lived around the same area he might well have been this Wood Street preacher. However, Harvey supported Martin Marprelate, whom this Wood Street preacher denounced; their difference in opinion (which presumably made living together awkward for Harvey and the unnamed preacher) might explain why their cohabiting was considered noteworthy. This issue aside, the evidence for Fleming living in Wood Street between 1588 and 1593 is suggestive.

Peck noted that the “third time of Mr. Fleming’s preaching at S. Pauls Cross” was in 1592, and this sermon included a plague notice, as described above. As with the first two sermons no other details were offered. A possible event on which Fleming could have commented was the succession of Pope Clement VIII, who was elected pope in January 1591/2 after the death of Innocent IX. There had also been an upsurge of interest, or rather fear, of a catholic plot at about this time. Fleming delivered his fourth sermon on 17 March 1593, St Patrick’s

Day. Perhaps this sermon countered any sympathy for catholic superstition and saints’ imagery, particularly apt given the association of the patron saint of Ireland and the date of this sermon. It may be that this sermon was related to the so-called ‘Hesketh Affair’, which formed around Ferdinando Stanley, Lord Strange who became the focus of catholics wanting to use him in order to usurp the throne from his distant cousin Queen Elizabeth or at least proclaim him as her heir. The Privy Council found it necessary to arrest two of Strange’s associates, the playwrights Thomas Kyd and Christopher Marlowe. It may be relevant that another sermon given at that time happened to included denunciations of atheism, of which Marlowe was suspected. Fleming was also working as a curate in Deptford at this time, and coincidentally Deptford parish was where Marlowe was murdered and buried in May of that same year. Reverend Thomas Macander buried the allegedly atheist playwright and suspected spy in the grounds of St Nicholas’ church, Deptford. Fleming was most likely present at the graveside in his capacity as curate, and might have performed some of the burial service himself. As his occasional publications have already shown, Fleming was always in tune with what was happening and quick to act. It therefore makes sense to suggest that his 1593 sermon, whilst no doubt overseen by the Privy Council, was indeed about atheism and Fleming may well have had an ear to the ground of his parish in Deptford, particularly given the climate surrounding Lord Strange and Marlowe.

The date of the 1593 sermon also coincided with the trials of the puritan extremists Henry Barrowe and John Greenwood. The latter had been at Cambridge at the same time as Fleming and was awarded his bachelor’s degree a year before Fleming graduated. For having played a prominent role within a separatist church, Greenwood was hanged on 6 April 1593.365 Dissent involving two popular playwrights and Lord Strange would have coincided with agitation over the puritan separatist movement. No doubt the Privy Council wanted to re-enforce order via Paul’s Cross and it seems very likely that Fleming’s sermon dealt with some of these topical themes.

By the time of Fleming’s fifth sermon he had established himself as rector of St Pancras, Soper Lane, a small parish near St Paul’s and bordering Cheapside. The sermon was dated 5 December 1596. That summer, the English expeditionary force led by Essex and Howard of Effingham had taken the town, if not the citadel, of Cadiz. Elizabeth lamented that Cadiz had not been the lucrative campaign she had hoped for, but it proved a military and psychological success over the Spanish and their catholic supporters in England. It left Philip of Spain embarrassed and so deeply in debt that he subsequently declared bankruptcy, while Fleming’s patron Lord Howard was elevated to Earl of Nottingham in recognition of his services. Since Howard was the original proponent of the Cadiz expedition, it seems probable that this was an event to be remembered and to give thanks for in the days preceding Christmas, particularly as tension was building between the expedition’s two leaders, Howard and Essex, over their share of the glory. Essex had to be appeased with the title of earl marshal in 1597.366

A gap in the evidence of roughly five years implies that Fleming did not preach at Paul’s Cross for some time, he may instead have concentrated on work within his parish. On 9 August 1601 Fleming preached his sixth sermon in St Paul’s Churchyard. This was some months after the Essex Revolt, which had begun on February 8 and ended with Essex’s execution a fortnight later. Four of the five known preachers at Paul’s Cross in 1601 spoke of Essex and hoped to settle the discord in London caused by the uprising. It is likely that Fleming also sought to divert the audience from unsettling thoughts and a rare find confirms this. On his death Peck’s antiquarian collections were purchased by Mr Cave of Stanford Hall near Leicester, which was close to Peck’s hometown of Grantham. The papers stayed within the Cave family, later called Braye, and many of Peck’s manuscript collections (namely his drafts of local histories) have been carefully bound and are still in Stanford Hall library. Despite an extensive search of the library it appears that Fleming’s papers have been lost. However, there is a reference to a sermon delivered on exactly the same day as

Fleming’s. The reference is in the form of a rather brusque letter from Bancroft that was transcribed in 1885:

June 30th, 1601. London. Richard, Bishop of London to ____ You are appointed to preach at Paul’s Cross on the 9th August next by the discreet performance of which duty you shall do good service to God, her Majesty, and the state, and receive thankful commendation. These are therefore to require you in her Majesty’s name to keep the day appointed, all excuses set apart. Whereas the malice of our Romish adversaries doth still increase, I desire that you avoid all domestic controversies, and discover to the auditory the absurdities and falsehood of Popery. Hereof fail not to send your direct answer in writing, and fail not to be ready at the time and place appointed, as you will answer the contrary at your peril. 367

At the end of this letter was added “Endorsed: _______ The fourth time of my preaching at St Paul’s Cross. 9 August, 1601.” While the name of the preacher is not known from the transcription, the date is exactly the same as that of Fleming’s sermon. It is very unlikely that there were two sermons on the same day. However, one problem does arise. The preacher describes this as his fourth time preaching at Paul’s Cross. Peck numbered the 1601 sermon as Fleming’s sixth. It seems unlikely that the preacher would not know how many sermons he had delivered at such an important location, but Peck does seem to have been careful in noting the dates and numbering the sermons he attributes to Fleming and differentiating between those by Fleming and those by other preachers among Fleming’s papers. Without the name of the preacher to confirm that it was definitely Fleming, this discrepancy remains unsolved. However, the circumstantial evidence strongly suggests that Fleming delivered the sermon described in this letter.

The letter itself, its tone and its content clearly demonstrate that Bishop Bancroft kept a tight rein on what was said at Paul’s Cross. The pulpit was indeed a carefully controlled propaganda machine. The preacher is directed to avoid “all domestic controversies” and this surely referred to the recent rebellion by Essex and his followers. Bancroft is very clear

367 Unfortunately the original letter has been lost. The records at Stanford Hall show that in 1885 Bancroft’s letter was bound into a Historical Commission folio volume entitled ‘Letters and State Papers 1573-1636’, but this folio volume is no longer in Stanford Hall, nor at Leicester Records Office where many of the papers from Stanford Hall were later taken. The letter from Bancroft survives only as a transcribed copy in the library at Stanford Hall.
about what the content of the sermon should be: “Whereas the malice of our Romish adversaries doth still increase… discover to the auditory the absurdities and falsehood of Popery”. This was exactly the sort of material that Fleming was well practised in, denouncing the Pope and papists just as he had done countless times in his printed books. It was, said the letter, the preacher’s duty to God, the queen and the state to be there on the appointed day or risk punishment. The preacher clearly had no room to manoeuvre but Fleming was by now used to following such stringent instructions from the Privy Council.

This sermon of 9 August 1601 was the last to be delivered by Fleming during Elizabeth’s reign. She died on 24 March 1603, and almost a year later “the seventh time of Mr Fleming’s preaching at S. Paul’s Cross iv. March 1603/4”, took place. The month of March 1604 saw the first anniversary of King James’ accession. Incidentally the date corresponds with the first anniversary of the death of Catherine, Countess of Nottingham although it seems unlikely that a sermon would be given specifically in her honour even if the preacher had been a chaplain within her household.

Fleming’s last sermon was presented to his audience on 29 December 1606 when he was approaching 60 years of age. Examples of handwriting from his parish records which are very likely to be Fleming’s suggest that he was starting to feel his age and that his eyesight was beginning to fail him. It was given as the first anniversary of Guy Fawkes’ execution approached. The earl of Nottingham had been a commissioner during Fawkes’ trial, and as Nottingham’s chaplain Fleming would have had a reliable source of material for a sermon. Significantly, the 1606 sermon took place between the first anniversaries of the Plot’s failure and Fawkes’ execution, but equally it may have been related to something of political interest such as the parliamentary session of 1606. Without his manuscripts and papers it is almost impossible to do more than speculate on much of the content of Fleming’s sermons.
The Howard Family

Fleming’s exact position in the Howard household has been disputed. It is possible that Fleming started his employment as tutor to the Howard children, Frances, Charles, William, Margaret and Elizabeth. Historians from Cooper in the 1880s through to Clegg’s 2004 ODNB entry have all asserted that Fleming was chaplain to the “old countess of Nottingham”, Howard’s wife. The origin of this is most likely Peck who attributed this role to Fleming in 1732. However, there are two key pieces of contemporary evidence that indicate that Fleming was in fact a chaplain to Lord Howard. The first is a deposition written in 1592 in which Fleming described himself as “Clerk and preacher Chapleyn to the right honourable Lorde howard of Effyngham lord Admyrall of Englande”. Curiously, Miller attributes this to a scribal error and argued that it should have read just “Lady Howard”, but there seems no reason why the deposition should be inaccurate. The suffix “lord Admyrall of England” would have been unnecessary had the scribe accidentally written Lord instead of Lady so the scribe’s writing of Lord Howard was deliberate and not an error. It must be remembered that while a clerk of the court was responsible for taking dictation, Fleming had to check what had been written and put his signature to the deposition to verify that his account was accurate. It is hard to imagine a learned corrector as fastidious as Fleming allowing a scribal error like that to go unnoticed. In addition there is a second piece of evidence pinning Fleming down to the admiral’s service. Among the unpublished papers listed by Peck was “A brief Note concerning the Lord Admiral Haward, MDXCV. MS. Manu. Flemingi”. The evidence is surely conclusive.

Fleming was not the earl’s only chaplain; Howard was initially entitled to three and, from October 1597, when he was promoted to the earldom of Nottingham, Howard would have been entitled to keep five chaplains, one in each of his residencies and possibly another to...
travel with him. At the time Fleming was his chaplain, Lord Howard kept houses and servants in Chelsea, Greenwich and Deptford. From his house on Deptford Green (later the Gun Tavern and then a private shipbuilder’s yard) Howard, who was Lord High Admiral of England, could keep an eye on the bustling dockyard and it is very likely that Fleming was the chaplain attached to this house. This would also help to explain how Fleming could be both Howard’s chaplain and curate at St Nicholas’ Deptford, a busy church serving both the parishioners and seamen just along the road from the docks. The Howards’ London residence was in Chelsea where they leased a great house formerly belonging to the Duchess of Somerset; Fleming might have divided his time between Chelsea and Deptford or, more conveniently, Fleming may have been based in Deptford all the time. Fleming’s name has yet to be found among accounts of Howard’s activities although another of his chaplains, Richard Webster, is mentioned and despite being one of several clergy, it was still an illustrious post for Fleming. There was probably a chapel attached to the house in Deptford where Fleming was based in or at least a room in which he would lead divine service for the family. Fleming would have been expected to attend the table at meal times to say grace before dining and to give thanks when the meal was over. He was a learned man able to discuss services as well as educate the younger members of the household.

There is evidence that Fleming attended on the earl and countess and their family. Among his unpublished manuscripts was “The conclusive Prayer said every Night by Mr. Fleming, the old Countess [sic] of Nottingham’s Chaplain (when the Family were together) after Common-Prayer”. A chaplain in a high-profile household would have needed discretion lest his patron disclosed anything to him, spiritual or otherwise, or he witnessed important documents. Fleming would have brought comfort during times of trouble and it is likely that

---

371 Howard’s exact address is not known but may have been Sayes Court. Sayes Court is a mansion in Deptford well known for being John Evelyn’s home in the seventeenth century, although the house was there long before Evelyn. How large or permanent Howard’s Deptford household was is not known. The burial register for St Nicholas’ documents that “humfreye warrine, servaunte to the right honnable Lord Admiralle was buryed the 18 daie of desembre 1587,” which suggests that some staff were in Deptford for long periods of time or lived there.
he played a role in the funeral of the countess in 1603. He might also have been involved in the ceremony surrounding the earl’s remarriage to a 19-year-old Scottish noblewoman in 1604.\(^{372}\)

Becoming chaplain to Howard and his family was a social distinction. Not only was Howard a powerful privy councillor and courtier, he was a cousin of the queen and also related to her through marriage. Howard had married Catherine Carey, the daughter of Mary Carey, sister of Anne Boleyn. The queen and the countess were very close as Elizabeth held dear her few remaining Boleyn relatives. Henry VIII had taken Mary Carey as a mistress and Catherine was rumoured to be the king’s natural daughter, perhaps making Elizabeth and the countess half-sisters. Elizabeth visited the Howards’ Chelsea residence several times, notably in 1597, 1599 and 1600, and was also known to have visited Deptford docks on a number of occasions to view her warships. Fleming may well have been in the presence of the queen several times especially as she is known to have visited St Nicholas’ church (“the Cathedral of the Navy”) entering via the now bricked up “Queen’s Gateway” between the Howards’ home and the churchyard.

**St Nicholas, Deptford**

The Clerical Subsidy Records show that Fleming was a stipendiary curate in the parish of St Nicholas, Deptford from 20 January 1592 until January 1595. The church itself was known as “the Admirals’ Church,” which was particularly apt as the church was close to Lord Howard’s house on Deptford Green. As a stipendiary curate Fleming assisted the vicar, Thomas Macander, in his duties and received a wage in return. The parish is in the county of Kent but not too far removed from the parts of London that Fleming frequented. Deptford was an important area and had never been more popular than during the 1580s and 90s. It was said that for every person that died in Deptford, another ten moved into the dockyards to...

get work or join their families and by 1710 the parish of St Nicholas had a population of over 12,000.373

Among the sailors of the sixteenth century, there were a high proportion of skilled tradesmen: shipwrights (notably the Pett family), sailmakers, armourers and allied trades, as well as a surprisingly high number of farmers who worked the fields surrounding the shipyards. Francis Drake was knighted in Deptford in 1581 when the queen visited his Golden Hind and she had the little vessel put on display in Deptford after Drake’s celebrated circumnavigation. Drake’s last voyage of 1595 also set off from Deptford. Sir John Hawkins lived in the Treasurer’s House at Deptford Dockyard. Lord Howard was seen as a great hero for leading the navy against the Armada, and for “singeing the King of Spain’s beard” at Cadiz in 1596. These docks were vital during in 1588; Deptford provided a base for ships protecting London from any Spanish vessels that might try to penetrate the Thames, and naval ships from the North Sea and eastern Channel could dock at Deptford for supplies, repairs, and to unload their sick or injured crew. In 1588, at about the same time Fleming joined Howard’s household, the parish register recorded that

William Haige [was] buried the xx of September 1588 [who] did belong to ye queens shippe called the Row Buck [Roebuck].

As the admiral’s chaplain in Deptford, Fleming probably saw the little warship come in and would have given thanks for England’s victory over the Spanish. The inclusion of a ship’s name makes this burial entry unique in the registers. The crew of The Roebuck, a privateer owned by Raleigh and commanded by Drake, took a Spanish ship named Rosario and escorted their prize into Dartmouth. Deptford continued to be an important place, as further demands were made on the English Navy. Fleming was certainly there during an event that Deptford would long be remembered for: the death and burial of Christopher Marlowe. Yet, unlike the parish registers of Bottesford and St Pancras, Soper Lane, the registers of St Nicholas’ do not mention Fleming at all and his hand is absent from the entries. Perhaps his

373 A comprehensive history of Deptford at this time is in Jess Steele, Turning the Tide, (Deptford Forum, 1993).
commitments to the Howards took up much of his time, and his role at St Nicholas’ was a comparatively minor one. Fleming had yet to be allotted a living of his own.

St Pancras Soper Lane

Fleming was no longer a poor, perpetual student, nor was he the overworked editor of his earlier career. He had become a Howard chaplain, a curate in Deptford and a preacher at Paul’s Cross. He needed a parish of his own to give him a more secure income. Fleming was already known to Whitgift, who had been involved in the castrations made to Holinshed’s Chronicles as this letter, recorded by Peck, demonstrated:


In 1588, presumably after his ordination, Fleming sent the following hopeful letter to Whitgift, again described by Peck (the letter itself is now lost):


In 1589 Fleming translated Virgil’s Bucoliks and Georgiks, this time into rhyming verse, and dedicated them to Whitgift. Having been reminded of Fleming’s existence, Whitgift probably kept him in mind. As Archbishop of Canterbury, Whitgift presided over the parishes of eastern Kent but that did not necessarily preclude Fleming from gaining a living in a London parish through Whitgift. Some parishes outside east Kent were removed from the jurisdiction of their bishops and governed by the diocese of Canterbury. In London thirteen such parishes, known collectively as the Deanery of the Arches, were “Peculiars of Canterbury”. During September 1593 in a small parish that was united to one of these Peculiars, an outbreak of plague led to a vacancy, as the parish burial register related:

374 Peck, Desiderata Curiosa, p. 52.
375 Ibid. p. 54.
On 19 October 1593 Fleming was collated “concionator” or preacher to this small and one-time wealthy parish of St Pancras, Soper Lane, replacing Turnbull.\textsuperscript{377} The little parish was no stranger to plague and had lost eight members to an outbreak in the summer of 1582. The plague of 1593 was much harder on the parishioners; the burial register shows that seventeen people died in as many weeks. Fleming could have escaped by visiting his brother in rural Cambridgeshire or Leicestershire, but he stayed in London.

Between 24 October and 22 November, his first month in the parish, Fleming lost five of his flock.\textsuperscript{378} The register demonstrates that the burials were performed on the same day as the plague victims died. A partly obscured marginal note, most likely added by Fleming, recorded that “This yeare [1593] the plague was very [?wicked] in London.” Plague heralded Fleming’s entry to the parish, and plague visited the parish again towards the end of his career. In 1603 another seventeen people died in the parish between 11 August and 14 October. The disease visited once more in August 1606, this time taking only one parishioner, a servant girl who was “buried in churchyard by the west wall and toward the parsons house there.”\textsuperscript{379} This entry proves that Fleming did have a house in the parish.

The decade between the two major outbreaks of plague was eventful and more enjoyable for Fleming. In 1594 he ingratiated himself further with the archbishop sending Whitgift a “thank you” poem in French, Latin and English, and what he described as a gift of the first produce from his garden at St Pancras:

\textsuperscript{376} GL MS 5015, St Pancras, Soper Lane Burial Register.
\textsuperscript{377} During the 1550s and 1560s the parish had been very well connected with many prosperous inhabitants as the baptism records show.
\textsuperscript{378} Deaths from plague were indicated in the burial register initially with the word “Plage” and subsequently with a large “P” in the left margin adjacent to the deceased’s entry. The long vertical row of “Ps” makes sobering reading.
\textsuperscript{379} GL MS 5015, St Pancras, Soper Lane Burial Register.
Abrahami Flemingi ad D. Archiepiscopum, cum Oblatione e Primitii Horti sui Pancratiani carmina Latina, Gallica, Anglica, MDXCIV.

MS. Manu Flemingi.

The gift from the garden may be a metaphorical one referring to the poetry; Fleming often used plant and flower metaphors and imagery in his poems, notably in Diamond and Footepath. Despite the inauspicious start to his career in the parish Fleming was grateful to Whitgift for posting him there. That year brought several new parishioners to St Pancras, Soper Lane since the baptism records show that Fleming christened babies born to the Dawnser, Taylor, Asshe and Hodges families.

St Pancras, Soper Lane was a tiny parish in Cheap Ward described by John Stow in his Survey of London:

…in Needlers Lane have yee the parrish church of Saint Pancrate, a proper small church, but divers rich Parishioners therein, and hath had of olde time many liberall benefactors but of late such as (not regarding the order taken by her Maiesty, Justices charged to punish such as sel bels from their churches, Eliz. 14) the least bell in their church being broken, have rather solde the same for halfe the value, then put the parish to charge with new casting: late experience hath proved this to bee true, besides the spoyle of monuments there.380

Soper Lane, Stow wrote, was not so called because of soap manufacture, rather the area was famed for its pepperers, grocers (since moved to Bucklebury) and quality pies. Cheap Ward had been favoured by cordwainers, curriers, the Mercers and haberdashers who had kept their shops in that area but later migrated to London Bridge. Fleming’s parish was congested, like many urban areas.

A house in Soper Lane had a jetty… 20 feet long and more than 3 feet wide which overhung the neighbour’s sawpit in the next property and must have been a confounded nuisance to him… In 1596 a house in Soper Lane was licensed by the City to set up three columns in front of his house… on payment of 1s 4d per annum. Perhaps the columns were propping up a sagging jetty.381

---

Most of the properties had shop fronts:

...in Soper Lane... the shops had narrow frontages. One was 11 feet 3 inches wide by 17 feet deep, another 6 feet wide by 12 feet 9 inches, and a third was just over 1 yard wide.382

As Keene and Harding’s Historical Gazetteer has demonstrated, the properties in St Pancras, Soper Lane were constantly changing. Houses were divided up to provide smaller dwellings, then knocked through into single houses again as was the case with the property known as The Key or Golden Key owned by the Mercers. Upper storeys were added to some houses, presumably with jetties, and later it was ordered that these stories should be taken down again for encroaching on neighbouring plots. Some plots were derelict only to be built on later or absorbed into a neighbouring property. Some properties saw many lodgers pass through their doors while others, such as The Red Lion (also called The Golden Ball) provided a long-term home for the same occupants. Fleming himself lived next door to the church on plot 17B, the Rector’s House, while 17A was the church clockhouse.383

St Pancras, Soper Lane was in a good position both geographically and socially. On the parish’s western border was Queen Street, which was a short walk from St Paul’s Cathedral and Paul’s Cross. The northern boundary was flanked by prosperous Cheapside overlooked by the Mercers Hall. In fact many Mercers and their allied trades (haberdashers, girdlers, drapers and tailors as well as scriveners) still owned property or lodged in St Pancras, Soper Lane. While no longer as wealthy as in former times, the inhabitants remained well connected as the parish registers demonstrate. Stow’s Survey recorded 25 monuments in the parish’s tiny church, including several Mercers. While Fleming was resident in the parish, Sir Stephen Soame, Lord Mayor of London in 1598, and his wife Lady Anne occupied a very large furnished property. On 29 December 1604 Fleming buried one of the Soames’s servants, William Stigall, under the church belfry.384 To the east St Pancras, Soper Lane

383 Derek Keene and Vanessa Harding, Historical Gazetteer of London before the Fire, Pt I, Cheapside (1987).
384 GL MS5015.
shared a boundary with another tiny parish, St Benet Sherehog. Fleming’s private papers and unpublished manuscripts suggest that he took an interest in the business of St Benet’s on at least two occasions, one being when the vestry had been rented out illegally for use as a shop.  

Life for a clergyman often included legal matters. On “the first daye of Februarie in the xxxiii year” of Elizabeth’s reign, 1592, Fleming was called to give evidence in a complicated, lengthy and unpleasant dispute over the redemption of a mortgage. The resultant deposition recorded that William Chapman had purchased some land from Richard Gryffen, since deceased. Fleming explained that “he doth know all the parties plaintiff and defendants” (of whom there were a great number) and that he “doth know & was pryvie” to the agreement between Chapman and Gryffen. The case was convoluted and had become contentious: Fleming swore that “it was very lik” that Chapman “did cause the complainant to be Arrested in london by a Sargeant and laide in the Counter in Wood strete and there detained him untill the complainant did seale unto him an Indenture of Bargaine & sale of the landes and tenantes mencioned”. Fleming swore that Gryffen was telling the truth, but only part of the deposition has survived and the outcome of the case is not known.

Other issues in his parish have survived because of Fleming’s habit of making sure even minor events and details were recorded and written down. On the last day of January 1596, Jone Tampyn, servant of Alexander Danser, passed away after “a long pyning sicknesse” and was buried that same day. The demise of this servant, pining and dying from sadness, may have particularly interested Fleming because he later wrote two epitaphs for Mrs Ratcliffe,

---

385 Peck’s catalogue records the following two manuscripts that were in Fleming’s possession: 1) Bancroft, Bishop of London, his Letter to Mr. Roger Fenton, Rector of S. Benet Sherehog, against the Church-Wardens letting the Vestry of that Church for a shop (without allowing any Right or Profit to the Rector) under a Pretence of applying Rent to the Use of the Poor. MS. Manu Flemingi; 2) De Thoma Griffin, Clerico parochiali Ecclesiae S. Benedicti Sherehog, quem, rogatum a Rogero Fenton [1565-1609] Rectore suo (cui duo Beneficia fuerant concessa, & Sub-Ministro vel Curato, qui Rectoris Locum supplerei, non adhibiti) ut Preces publicas legeret (promissa licet indemniate ipse praestiteret) Ordinarius tamen Diocesani Censura vexavit: cum Antidversionibus Abr. Flemingi, MS. Manu Flemingi.
386 PRO C24/221.
the queen’s lady in waiting who pined to death after the loss of her twin brother in 1602. A page between the baptism and the burial registers had been dated 1598 and was headed “The Registre of such as have been punished in their bodies according to the order of the same made for progress in the 40. yeare of the Queenes reigne Elizabeth by the Grace of God Queen”. Below this were written just two entries, one dated 31 May and the other 2 June 1598. The bodies that were punished belonged to “Yoong Richardson” aged 14 who was corrected by the beadle of Bridewell, and 12 year old John Goodwell from Weston in Bedfordshire. It is likely that they were young apprentices who had flouted the strict rules of their respective companies.

Fleming took to recording the events of his parish with the exacting eye and fastidiousness that characterized his production of detailed indexes and editing of Holinshed’s Chronicles. When he joined St Pancras, Soper Lane in 1593 it would seem the church registers were, in his opinion, disorganized. From the later 1590s until his death the parish registers are written in one fluid and confident hand. The amount of detail included in each entry became greater at this time. The format of the entries also changed to include a marginal note beside each christening, marriage and burial that gave not only the exact date but also the surname of the families concerned so that entries might be found more easily; Fleming created a running index for his registers. Under some of the burial records Latin phrases and notes appeared. For example in the burial register for 7 July 1601 when a stillborn child was buried Fleming noted that “all the funeral ceremonies were carried out except for the ringing of the bells, this slight offence was inconsiderate”. This could only have been the work of Fleming, a man used to applying judgemental glosses and marginalia. After September 1607 when he died, this distinctive handwriting disappeared from the registers and was replaced with a number of different hands, some more accomplished than others, and the detailed format waned. This suggests that rather than entrust the registers to a churchwarden or pay a clerk to do

---

387 This was written in the register as “omnes ritus funebres praestiti fuerunt excepto campanulae sonitu; hinc offendicula inconsiderate”.

---
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paperwork, Fleming preferred to catalogue the events of his parish himself, employing his usual vigour and meticulousness, as this entry demonstrates:

Jone Smith widowe some time the wife of Ambrose Smith died in St Pancras parish the xxiii day of Aprill [1601] being a Friday between the houres of iii and iiii in the morning and was buried in the mercers chapel the xxx daye of the same month in the afternoon.  

There may be another reason why Fleming noted Joan Smith’s passing in such detail, as there may have been some trouble between the rector and the widow’s family at her funeral. Under the entry marking her burial Fleming wrote in Italics “Summa injuria oblata rectori circa celebrationem istorum funerorum,” meaning that the rector suffered some insult or injury at the funeral. The baptismal register states that Joan Smith was also godmother to Sir Steven Soame’s son Nicholas, so presumably she must have had some standing in the community and was missed when she died.

The burial record was evidently of great importance to Fleming. This was possibly because his burial ground was very small and space for interment inside the church was at a premium. For this reason Fleming started including the exact location of burials made within the church, as these entries demonstrate:

A female child of Maister Robert Brooke by the bodie of his second wife Marie still borne was [buried] the vii of Julie [1601] in the north isle of the chapel some foot and a halfe as you enter in.

Anna Tomlinson the daughter of Tomlinson was buried the 22. of September 1605 in the churchyard wel nigh the middest, hir feete atmost her head I should say neere the west wall.

Other notes marked “Extract.” suggest that Fleming had copied out the entry concerned, perhaps for legal reasons, to prove someone had been baptized or confirm that a person was dead and buried. From 1605 onwards the confident hand used to detail baptisms, marriages and burials began to grow larger and looser. This suggests that Fleming’s eyesight was failing when he was in his late fifties, perhaps as a result of all those years spent reading and

---

388 GL MS 5015 St Pancras, Soper Lane Burial Register.
389 Ibid.
Fleming’s last known public appearance took place at Paul’s Cross on 29 December 1606 when he delivered what was to be his final sermon. He was still active in his parish during 1607. On 5 February he buried “Sarah Smith a child of two yeares, the daughter of Thomas Smith… in the south ile of S. Pancras church, neere to the entring into the chancel.”390 On Thursday 4 April he married Thomas Morgan and Margarite Barnes, widow, by license.391 Fleming was still in London in the early summer: on 5 May he recorded in the baptism register that a foundling had been “laid in Sir Steven Soames waggon before his stables.” The child was named Thomas after his two godfathers, Mr Venables and Mr Griffen.392 A woman Fleming called simply “Marie the Nurse” was godmother, and the foundling was given the surname “Pancras”.393 On 18 May Fleming baptized Edmund Anderson, son of Sir Francis Anderson. Sir Thomas Nunson, Sir George Booth and “the old lady Magdalen Anderson” were godparents.

The next entries in the baptism register during Fleming’s lifetime were dated 7 July and 9 September 1607, but these were not written in Fleming’s hand, which suggests that sometime after 18 May and certainly by early July he had made the long journey from London to Bottesford in Leicestershire. He visited his brother Samuel’s home, the Rector’s House, near the church of St Mary the Virgin, Bottesford and in this house on 18 September 1607, comforted by his brother Samuel and sister Hester, Fleming passed away.

Fleming seems to have been prepared for death and even welcoming towards his earthly end.

In 1732 Peck catalogued the three of Fleming’s autobiographical manuscripts:

390 GL MS 5015 St Pancras, Soper Lane Burial Register.
391 Ibid.
392 This Mr Griffen is possibly the deponent “Gryffen” for whom Fleming stood witness in 1592 (see p. 222) MS PRO C24/221. This deponent’s deceased brother was named as Richard Gryffen but the deponent’s first name was never given. Incidentally, the defendant in the case was held at Wood Street, where I suggest Fleming lived in 1589.
393 Thomas Pancras was the second foundling discovered while Fleming was rector. On 20 June 1605 a foundling was abandoned in the entrance to Mr Browne the merchant’s house; called simply Browne Pancras, his godfathers were Mr Ned and Mr Venables, but the child died “a while after” his christening.
Abrahami Flemingi de Vita sua succincta & lucida Historia, Anno 1605. a seipso conscripta. MS. Manu Flemingi.

Abrahami Flemingi Operum non solum impressorum verum etiam MS. Catalogus. MS. Manu Flemingi.

Abrahami Flemingi de Laborius suis in sacra sui Ministerii Vocatione Narratiuricula. MS. Manu Flemingi.

These manuscripts, which comprised Fleming’s autobiography, accounts of his life’s work and worldly suffering are now lost. One thing seems to be clear: the man who had written epitaphs of so many prominent Elizabethans was starting to compile a series of epitaph-like pieces about his own life. In the final two documents listed by Peck, Fleming turned away from his earthly life and material achievements: “Abrahami Flemingi de Praeparatione sua ad mortem; in qua cum Deo quaeiritur reconciliari: Orato pathetica. MS. Manu Flemingi.” Had the manuscript survived, it would probably have revealed the spiritual preparations he made for his last hours and his much-anticipated union with God. To ensure that the right things were said after his burial, Fleming, fastidious to the last, wrote his own funeral oration “De Praeparatione sua ad mortem; in quo cum Deo quaeiritur conciliari. Orato pathetica. MS Flemingi.” Finally, as though desirous of a lasting earthly memorial as well as spiritual longevity, he penned the following poem. This was engraved onto a plaque and attached to the floor of the chancel, just in front of the altar, in the church where he lies:

\begin{verbatim}
CORPORI SPIRITV SOLVTO,
QVID APTIVS OPACA FOSSA,
NVMINIS SVPREM1 STATVTO,
NERVVL1 RODVNTVR ET OSSA,
FABRICA TERREENA PVTRECST,
ANIMA DIVINA VIRESCIT:
TV VITA VNIENS O DEV1S,
AETERNATV MIHI MEVS.394
\end{verbatim}

News of Fleming’s death swiftly reached London. On 19 September his passing was entered in the burial register for St Pancras, Soper Lane. However, his body remained in Bottesford: Samuel buried his brother under the chancel of his church amongst the lead coffins of the

394 “Spirit freed from the body, which is apt for a dark grave, the divine majesty’s highest decree, sinews and bones are gnawed, the earthly building will rot, the divine soul will grow green again, you, oh God! Who joins life together join mine forever to me.”
Earls and Countesses of Rutland. Gradually the crypt was filled and sealed. Samuel himself outlived Abraham by thirteen years, dying in 1620, whilst in the middle of delivering a sermon in his pulpit at Cottenham. He was buried not in Bottesford with Abraham and the earls he had served in life, but in the grounds of Cottenham church, in a gravesite that is now unknown. Their sister Hester Davenport died in 1622 after overseeing the building of ‘Fleming’s Hospital’, an almshouse for poor women, funded by Samuel as stipulated in his detailed will. Abraham Fleming by contrast died intestate.

Why Fleming left no will is a puzzle; he had made time to prepare for his death in other ways and had apparently thought about his final end quite carefully, right down to composing his own epitaph. Possibly, having apparently been poor for much of his life, Fleming had little to bequeath to anyone. Alternatively he may not have left a will because, aside from his brother and sister, he had no one to whom to leave his goods. It seems strange that Fleming did not bequeath money for the customary mourning rings, yards of black stuff or for a sermon to be said for him somewhere. However, Fleming’s real legacy was one of spiritual comfort, education and literature. More than 400 years after his death we can read 52 surviving titles that were associated with him; *Of Englishe Dogges* and *Wunder*, are still in print. Fleming created Suffolk’s popular mascot the Black Shuck and he was responsible for *Holinshed’s Chronicles* being in the format that we see it in today.

---

395 In 1901 repairs to the church lead to the opening of the crypt in which Fleming is buried. All of the coffins except one were identified. I presume that the unnamed coffin was Fleming’s. Today the crypt is sealed, filled and Fleming’s resting place is inaccessible.

396 Cooper’s original DNB entry for Fleming alludes to the presence of some administrative papers concerning Fleming’s death that were handled by the Prerogative Court of Canterbury (“PCC Admon.”). A search of the Court’s indexes has yielded nothing, neither is there anything in the indexes for Leicestershire where he died. Clegg’s more recent ODNB entry does not mention the “PCC Admon.” reference; Cooper was apparently mistaken as there was no will.
Chapter Eight:  

Conclusion

This study began with the following statement: it is surprising that so few people today are familiar with the author and cleric Abraham Fleming. Now that Fleming’s works and achievements have been described and explained, the statement has even greater resonance.

Undoubtedly Fleming was a determined character. For example, the Peterhouse buttery books contain evidence that in 1575 he stayed in college during an outbreak of plague (during which the majority of the students at Cambridge had retired to the country) in order to complete the required number of terms for his degree. It has become apparent through this study that Fleming suffered illness and financial hardship whilst at Peterhouse, Cambridge, and it seems likely that late in 1575 he ‘dropped out’ as a result of the need to earn money. This did not stop him from graduating seven years later, but in the interim he commenced his literary career as a writer in a significant way, since Fleming’s two editions of Virgil’s Bucoliks (1575) were the first ever complete English translations. Furthermore, he produced one in rhyme and one word-for-word translation. The latter was most likely produced so that readers unable to attend school or university could use the book alongside a Latin edition in order to teach themselves. What is more, these books were likely to have been affordable, probably costing a few pennies. Fleming began his literary career as he meant to go on, enabling a wider readership to access texts that had previously been available only to academics and scholars.

This thesis argued that Fleming would have been a household name to his contemporaries. Certainly in 1576 he was included by Thynne in Holinshed’s Chronicles as one of the ‘Writers of our Nation’. At the time the list was compiled, Fleming had produced no more than three titles and his name was probably included on the strength of his Bucoliks alone. Later popular texts, such as the Wunder pamphlet (1577) and his broadside Epitaph to philanthropist William Lambe (1580), would have cemented Fleming’s reputation as a well-known writer. Certainly Fleming was an established figure early in his career; he was producing recommendatory poetry
for now better-known writers from 1576 onwards. For example, in 1576 Fleming commended Barnabe Googe’s book *Zodiake of Life* and George Whetston’s *Rock of Regard*, and in 1577 Fleming endorsed Timothie Kendall’s *Flowers of Epigrammes* with a recommendatory poem. The poet Thomas Newton was keen to describe himself as Fleming’s friend (“*Flaminiusque meus*”) in his *Shorte Dictionary* of 1586; even after Fleming’s death the printer Ralph Blower made a point of stating in the prefatory material for *Footepath of Faith* (1619) that he and Fleming had been colleagues. It is clear that his contemporaries wanted to be associated with Fleming, that they respected him and held his writing in high esteem.

Fleming produced a number of groundbreaking books in the same vein as *Bucoliks*. In 1576, very early on in his career, he compiled and translated Aelian’s *Registre*, which had provided light and diverting reading for many centuries; Fleming enabled a new generation of English readers to enjoy Aelian’s anecdotes, observations and early “scientific” accounts. Fleming’s *Panoplie*, like *Bucoliks*, also enabled those without Latin to read classical authors such as Cicero and Pliny. The topics and themes of Fleming’s other printed books, such as *Blasing Starrs*, demonstrated that he was in tune with current affairs and trends. His decision to translate classical texts into English surely indicates that many Londoners were ready to read books such as these. Furthermore, his readers possibly wanted companion texts so that they could check their own translations against Fleming’s version.

As well as translating books into English, Fleming also produced a number of dictionaries throughout the 1580s, such as his *Shorte Dictionarie* (1584) for “yong beginners”. This would have enabled schoolboys and those with “little memory” to learn Latin and translate classical books for themselves. This early phrasebook was principally “A little dictionarie for children”, but there was nothing to stop older readers from using Fleming’s learning aid or his other dictionaries. Fleming’s dictionaries demonstrated that he was in tune with his readers. It seems likely that schoolboys, then as now, found learning Latin difficult and probably quite dull. Fleming judged his audience well and to counter student apathy he devised witty and humorous
proverbs and mnemonics to make learning more enjoyable, such as the vignette depicting the normally friendly dog protecting his bone.

Creating amusing and easy introductions to the classics was most likely the reason (or one reason) why Fleming translated Of English Dogges (1576) and Bushie Haire (1579) into English. John Caius De Canibus was already a very popular book but Fleming’s version of Dogges overshadowed its predecessor and is still in print today. Whilst Bushie Haire did not enjoy such popular longevity, it is likely that this book was widely read when it was first produced. Bushie Haire was most likely intended as a witty introduction to the classical writing for readers with no Latin. It is equally likely that Fleming had children in mind when he translated the lines about marvellous creations like Mymecides’ tiny model of a horse drawn cart complete with driver, which was so small that it could be covered by the wings of a fly. Certainly the purpose of books such as Bushie Haire was to get children enthused about classics and give them a positive introduction to books hitherto only available in Latin so that as schoolboys they would want to learn more.

Furthermore, between 1579 and 1587, Fleming produced a number of indexes for substantial religious texts, for example Peter Martyr, which comprised six lengthy books. Evidently indexes were a comparatively new phenomenon in the later sixteenth century, since Fleming attached instructions on how to use these finding tools to the indexes he wrote. These were ground-breaking because they enabled English readers to access large religious texts, and the inclusion of instructions demonstrates that Fleming intended people to become independent readers who could help themselves to find information. Again, this is suggestive of Fleming creating tools and learning aids that meant ordinary members of the public could use books and teach themselves using sermons or lessons that might otherwise have required a cleric or other learned person to find a passage or lesson. In doing so, Fleming was enabling people to become independent learners and familiarise themselves with large books that might otherwise seem daunting.
Fleming did not limit himself to translating classical Latin texts or indexing since a number of his published books were godly treatises. There is no doubt that Fleming was a godly protestant; his *Diamond of Devotion* (1581) made clear his sympathies to the reformed church. *Diamond* also demonstrated Fleming’s concern with helping people to learn. The “A, B, C” format used throughout the third chapter of *Diamond*, ‘The Schoole of Skill’, was most likely written so that literate women could not only enjoy Fleming’s word-play themselves but also use *Diamond* to start teaching their children the alphabet. Simultaneously the text delivered simple godly lessons wrapped in acrostic wordplay and alphabetized passages. Writing in this witty way indicates that Fleming did not patronize his readers; he understood that the general public were for the most part literate and they would not only recognise conventions such as these but also look for them in his writing.

*Diamond* was one of Fleming’s lengthier books, but he also produced shorter pamphlets on topical events. He had the ability to work very fast and could, if needed, produce text that was ready for printing within days of an event. In this capacity he was acting as an early journalist. In the case of the *Wunder* pamphlet, it seems likely that the story had been a “scoop” exclusive to Fleming since his rival Roland Jenkes had suffered punishment for writing about the same event. Fleming’s “occasional” texts were surely intended to be popular crowd pleasers that appealed to Londoners. Examples of such texts would be the *Wunder* pamphlet and *Memoriall* to William Lambe. It is clear that these affordable little books were written for the wider public. However, there is good evidence that these books transcended class boundaries since educated and wealthy people read them as well. For example, Sir John Harington, who was the pupil of Fleming’s brother, named his dog Bungay after the town that was ravaged by Fleming’s black dog in the *Wunder* pamphlet. Similarly *Memoriall* (like its cheap counterpart *Epitaph*) was no doubt bought and read by higher ranking authority figures, such as Sir William Cordell and Lambe’s other associates. Fleming’s books were by no means elitist and he recognised that the increasingly literate people of London wanted to read the same material as their better educated peers.
Fleming’s peers were also aware of his protestant faith and he won several commissions as a result of the relationships he forged with higher-ranking individuals. Some of Fleming’s dedications appear to be “one-offs”, possibly intended to win new patronage. However, other dedications were certainly to people with whom Fleming already had an established relationship. From these dedications it is clear that Fleming was not seeking patrons connected to Elizabeth’s court, rather he already had the patronage of such people. Not only was Fleming known at court but he was familiar to members of Lord Burghley’s circle. Among Fleming’s papers was an epitaph poem to Burghley’s mother Jane that was written by the peer’s sister-in-law Elizabeth Russell. This suggests that members of Burghley’s circle were familiar with Fleming and gave him at least one known manuscript, the poem by Elizabeth Russell, to publish for them. Fleming’s relationship with another of Burghley’s associates, Sir William Cordell, meant that Fleming received support from Cordell. In addition, this association with Cordell also won him a commission; this resulted in Fleming writing two tributes to Lambe in 1580. Similarly, the dedications to Sir George Carey and his wife Lady Elizabeth in Footepath and Diamond were very probably one contributing factor to Fleming being given a chaplaincy in the household of Carey’s cousin, Lord Howard of Effingham.

Fleming could at times be difficult and pedantic. However, he also forged long-lasting friendships and relationships. In 1619 printer Ralph Blower mentioned in his preface to Footepath that he and Fleming had both worked together, which suggests that Fleming was remembered more than a decade after his death. Fleming’s working relationship with London’s leading printer Henry Denham lasted for over a decade and Denham’s death seems to have marked Fleming’s withdrawal from writing and editing printed books. Although Fleming and his brother lived a considerable distance apart, they appear to have been close throughout their lives and enjoyed a healthier relationship than some of their contemporaries, for example antiquary John Stow and his family. Fleming was demanding but he was also inspired others to work with him and for him, and his demanding nature meant that he was a thorough and hard worker.
Fleming’s skill as a writer meant that some of his books were still relevant and were still being printed a decade or more after his death. *Diamond*, for example, was reprinted until 1624, when it entered the English Stock (indicative of this book being a best seller). *Conduit* was still being used, at least by Katherine Paston, into the 1620s. New editions of *Wunder* and *Dogges* have been recently produced. Conversely there is circumstantial evidence to suggest that Fleming held the copyrights to some of his own books, as these were never reproduced. Some of Fleming’s texts, for example the Lambe books, seem to have belonged to him rather than the printer or seller who produced them. If so, this would be important evidence of a writer owning the rights to his books.

Fleming’s writing and literary skills, both with language and in book production, might have been lost on his recent biographers, but certainly his contemporaries valued him. It is likely that Fleming worked as a corrector or editor with Richard Tottell, who was one of London’s foremost printers. This association surely introduced Fleming’s to another of London’s leading printers and former apprentice of Tottell, Henry Denham. Fleming and Denham were of a like mind in terms of producing quality texts for an increasingly discerning and literate audience.

The culmination of their eleven-year relationship was the second edition of *Holinshed’s Chronicles*, which Fleming undoubtedly edited. His work on this huge book also included compiling new text, rearranging existing sections and he provided *Holinshed’s Chronicles* with its indexes. The second edition of *Holinshed’s Chronicles* would not have been produced, certainly not in the form it has survived in, without Fleming. The evidence taken from Fleming’s manuscript collection strongly suggests that he was invited to oversee a third edition. His efficiency and versatility as the book’s editor made him the ideal candidate for such an onerous role. This thesis has demonstrated how no one was as well placed as Fleming in terms of being part of a literary “communication circuit”; he had established relationships going back as far as 12 years with the *Holinshed’s Chronicles* syndicate and its printer. He also had all the required skills to produce the book and was tried and tested in terms of his literary experience. This thesis has confirmed what Fleming’s colleagues, antiquary Francis Thynne and poet
Thomas Newton, had written at the time: Fleming was responsible for creating the second edition of Holinshed’s Chronicles.

Holinshed’s Chronicles was produced towards the end of Fleming’s literary career and he was ordained in the year after the book was printed. Almost immediately after his ordination Fleming delivered two sermons at Paul’s Cross. This suggests that not only was he a trusted “establishment” preacher, but that he had an official position: Fleming was chaplain to Lord Howard of Effingham. He was also a curate in Deptford, and in this capacity he likely assisted (and possibly carried out) the burial of playwright Christopher Marlowe. As a prominent learned figure, chaplain to a high-ranking courtier and minister to an important naval parish, Fleming was invited to preach at that key pulpit on eight occasions. Documentary evidence suggests that at least one of these sermons was delivered at the direct request of the Bishop of London, John Aylmer, with whom Fleming had previously been in contact. Millar McClure’s study of the Paul’s Cross sermons reveal that few individual preachers repeatedly delivered sermons, which further supports the evidence for Fleming being a trusted, popular and reliable figure.

Fleming was a prominent and established figure with a wide circle of acquaintances. The deposition in which he gave evidence during 1592 demonstrates that he knew all of the deponents (of which there were many), and the protagonists, as well as the defendant, whom Fleming knew well enough to give some indication of his character. In 1593, Fleming was granted his own living in St Pancras, Soper Lane, a position he was given because of his links to Archbishop John Whitgift as well as indicating his experience and godly protestantism. During his 14 years as rector of St Pancras, Fleming carried out his duties with the same care and attention to detail that he employed when editing the books he had produced. Whilst Fleming did not write the parish records for St Nicholas, Deptford, he certainly kept a close eye on the parish registers for St Pancras, Soper Lane. Throughout the years that Fleming was rector of this parish, these registers were all written in the same hand: Fleming’s hand. Marginal notes next to certain events that took place attest to Fleming’s understanding of his flock. It is evident that he
knew his parishioners well and wanted to keep his own records of the incidents in his parish. Furthermore, he made a concerted effort to manage the grounds of his church more effectively, logging where exactly burials took place in order to make the most of St Pancras, Soper Lane’s small churchyard and the spaces in the crypt.

Fleming’s career in the church lasted for nearly twenty years, slightly longer than his career as a published writer and learned corrector (based on his earliest known text). However, it is his legacy of 52 printed works for which he is remembered. In the first chapter of this thesis it was demonstrated that Fleming had been misrepresented in the past by his early biographers. He has been labelled a peripheral antiquarian, a poor poet and a second-rate scholar. The evidence presented here portrays a very different man. Fleming was a driven writer and editor. He produced texts in a variety of themes in a range of sizes and qualities, which enabled anyone, no matter how poor, to be able to buy something he had written. His versatility was remarkable. Fleming’s pervasive desire to produce English books that were accessible to as many people as possible made him a remarkable and sometimes revolutionary figure. He really was a pioneer of the new world of printed books, which could reach an unprecedentedly wide readership.
Appendix A

A biographical timeline of Abraham Fleming’s life

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c. 1544</td>
<td>Fleming’s birth year according to a deposition that he witnessed (PRO C24/221): this stated that he was 47 in the 33rd year of Elizabeth’s reign (i.e. 1591/2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 1548</td>
<td>Possible year of Abraham and Samuel Fleming’s births if they were twins, described as “fratres gemini” by Tanner and “brethren by one bellie” by Thynne.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1552</td>
<td>The accepted year of Fleming’s birth according to the date on his funeral plaque.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1563</td>
<td>Samuel Fleming at Eton; he contributed poetry to a book for Elizabeth I.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 August 1565</td>
<td>Samuel joined Kings College, Cambridge; he received money from a poor students’ fund.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 1570</td>
<td>Abraham matriculated as a sizar at Peterhouse, Cambridge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1570</td>
<td>According to Cooper in Athenae Cantabrigienses, Fleming was involved with George Gilpin’s translation of Marnix’s Beehive of the Romish Church as early as 1570.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1572-3</td>
<td>Samuel completed his Masters Degree.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1575</td>
<td>Fleming most likely withdrew from Peterhouse at the end of Michaelmas term.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1575</td>
<td>Fleming translated Virgil’s Eclogues and Bucoliks into English rhyming verse and plain verse and is the first person to do so. He referred to himself as a student in the text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1576</td>
<td>Fleming translated Aelian’s Registre of Hystories into English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1576</td>
<td>Fleming translated A Panoplie of Epistles […] from Tully, Isocrates, Pliny, Roger Ascham.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1576</td>
<td>Fleming translated into English Certain Select Epistles of Cicero &amp;c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1576</td>
<td>Fleming contributed ‘Solerta non Socordia’ (recommendatory poem) and an index to Barnabe Googe’s translation of Zodiake of Life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1576 (colophon)</td>
<td>Fleming translated Caius’ Of Englishe Dogges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1576 (colophon)</td>
<td>Fleming contributed a poem to George Whetston’s Rocke of Regard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 October 1576</td>
<td>Samuel Fleming was ordained deacon and priest at Lincoln.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?1577</td>
<td>Fleming said he translated Historie of Leander &amp; Hero by Museus (now lost, this text was mentioned by Fleming in the margin of his 1589 Georgiks).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1577 (colophon)</td>
<td>Fleming composed verses for Settle’s True Report of Martin Frobisher’s voyage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1577 (colophon)</td>
<td>Fleming composed a poem of recommendation for Timothy Kendall’s Flowers of Epigrammes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 1577</td>
<td>Fleming wrote A Straunge and Terrible Wunder.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1577</td>
<td>Fleming translated Blasing Starrings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1577</td>
<td>Fleming’s name was published in Thynne’s ‘List of Writers’ in the 1577 ed. of Holinshed’s Chronicles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1578</td>
<td>The Wunder pamphlet is translated into French by Roland Jenkes and published as part of Histoire Mervelleuse in Rouen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1578</td>
<td>Fleming translated Jerome of Ferrara a.k.a. Savonarola’s Pithie exposition of the 51st Psalm... also a godly meditation upon the 31st Psalme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1578</td>
<td>Fleming contributed celebratory poem to Thomas Ellis’ True Report of Martin Frobisher’s third voyage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1578</td>
<td>Likely year of the first edition of Fleming’s Footepath (not survived).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1579</td>
<td>Samuel Fleming became a curate in Ely.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1579-80</td>
<td>Samuel Fleming became a Bachelor of Divinity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1579</td>
<td>Fleming translated Synesius’ A paradoxe prouing by reason that baldnesse is better than bushie haire including a double translation of Hemetes the Hermit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1579</td>
<td>Fleming published (Lambe’s) Conduit of Comfort (dedicated to William Lambe).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1579</td>
<td>Fleming added a table (index) to Rabbotenu’s Beehive of the Romish Church.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1580</td>
<td>Fleming published his broadside Epitaph [...] vpon the godlie life and death of the right worshipfull Maister William Lambe between 21 April and 6 May.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1580</td>
<td>Fleming provided the Epistle to the reader in Henry Bull’s Certaine comfortable expositions of the constant martyr of Christ, M. John Hooper.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1580</td>
<td>Fleming collected and translated A Bright Burning Beacon [including] a general doctrine of sundry signes and wonders, specially earthquakes (including the earthquake of 6 April 1580).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1580</td>
<td>Fleming contributed an address to the reader for John Knox’s Fort for the afflicted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1580</td>
<td>An ‘Epistle to the Reader’ by A. F. was included in the prefix to Certaine comfortable expositions of John Hooper, Bishop of Gloucester.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1580</td>
<td>Fleming compiled text and index for Michael Cope’s Godly and learned Exposition vppon the Prouerbes of Solomon, translated from French into English by Marcelline Outred.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1580</td>
<td>Fleming augmented John Baret’s Alvearie (dictionary); he added Greek and 200 proverbs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1580 or 1581</td>
<td>Fleming translated Epistle of the Blessed Apostle Saint Paule/Hemmingius’s commentary on the Ephesians by Niels Hemmingsen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1580</td>
<td>Fleming compiled the index for Certain sermons in defence of the gospel... by Thomas Cooper, Bishop of Lincoln. There was some dispute between Ames and Herbert in the eighteenth century about Fleming’s role in this publication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1580</td>
<td>Fleming compiled and wrote Bright Burning Beacon, which included text from Blasing Starrings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1581</td>
<td>Samuel Fleming became Rector of Bottesford.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1581 (colophon)</td>
<td>Fleming wrote <em>Diamond</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1581</td>
<td>Fleming graduated from Cambridge, ranked 116th out of an ordo of 216.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1581</td>
<td>Earliest given date for Fleming compiling <em>Manuall of Christian Praiers made by divers devout &amp; Godlie men such as Calvin, Luther, etc.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?1581</td>
<td>Fleming’s <em>Meditations on the 31st and 51st Psalms</em> (lost).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1581 (colophon)</td>
<td>Fleming provided a poem for Edward Hutchins’ <em>David’s Sling against great Goliath</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1581 (colophon)</td>
<td>Fleming wrote dedication letter, prayer and poem to <em>De vera Christiani hominis fide</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1581 or 1582</td>
<td>Fleming wrote dedication letter, prayer and poem for Arthur Golding’s <em>True beleefe of a Christian Man</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?1582</td>
<td>Possible start of Fleming’s employment as a learned corrector with Richard Tottell at “Hand &amp; Star”, 7 Fleet Street. (Ralph Blower started apprenticeship with Tottell in either 1585 or more likely in 1587 and says he and Fleming were ‘servants’ of Tottell’s’.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1582 (colophon)</td>
<td>Fleming reworked and published St Augustine’s <em>Monochamie of motives in the Mind of Man</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1583 (colophon)</td>
<td>Fleming indexed Arthur Golding’s <em>The Sermons of M. John Calvin upon Deuteronomy</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1583 (colophon)</td>
<td>Fleming reworked and composed Latin verses for <em>Verborum Latinorum cum Graecis Anglicisque</em>, a triple dictionary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1583 (colophon)</td>
<td>Fleming indexed Anthonie Marten’s <em>The Common places of Peter Martyr</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1584 (colophon)</td>
<td>Fleming corrected this edition of Veron and Waddington’s <em>Dictionarie in Latine and English</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1584 (colophon)</td>
<td>Fleming added letter ‘Ad Philomusos’, 600 rhythmical verses and proverbs to <em>A shorte dictionarie in Latine and English</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1584 (colophon)</td>
<td>Scot's <em>Discoverie of Witchcraft</em> was published complete with rhyming translations by Fleming and references to Fleming's earlier works.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?1585</td>
<td>Prior to Holinshed’s Chronicles Fleming wrote a short Latin history of the reign of Mary I. It was not published or was lost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. March 1585</td>
<td>Fleming received a “truthful letter” from Rev. George Closse on the occasion of Closse being reprimanded by the Lord Mayor, the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Council for delivering a ‘distasteful’ sermon; this letter gives Closse’s side of the story lest inaccurate info is published.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1586</td>
<td>Samuel Fleming witnessed the signing of Berwick-upon-Tweed agreement, negotiated by his employer the Earl of Rutland. Fleming later documented this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1586</td>
<td>Francis Thynne wrote a short biography of Fleming published in the 1587 edn of Holinshed’s <em>Chronicles</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1586</td>
<td>Fleming “polished” Thomas Newton’s poem ‘<em>Carmen Chronologicon</em>’ and added it to <em>Holinshed’s Chronicles</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1587</td>
<td><em>Holinshed’s Chronicles</em>, which Fleming edited, indexed and contributed to, was completed and published.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 1</td>
<td>The Privy Council wrote to Whitgift regarding the castrations to <em>Chronicle</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 1587</td>
<td>Fleming provided the index to John Foxe’s <em>Eicasmi, Seu Meditationes Sacram Apocolypsin</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 January</td>
<td>Hester Fleming (Fleming’s sister) married Thomas Davenport, a cleric/minister in Bottesford.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 August 1588</td>
<td>Whitgift ordained Fleming as deacon and priest at Peterborough Cathedral.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1588</td>
<td>Start of Fleming’s employment as curate in the parish of St Nicholas, Deptford, assisting Revd Thomas Macander.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1588</td>
<td>Fleming became private Chaplain to the earl of Nottingham (possibly based at the earl’s house in Deptford); Peck had manuscripts of the Common-Prayer and Fleming’s own Concluding Prayer which he said each night whenever the Howard family were together (these papers have been lost).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1589</td>
<td>Fleming delivered his first sermon at Paul’s Cross open air pulpit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1589</td>
<td>Fleming preached at Paul’s Cross for the second time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1589</td>
<td>Fleming dedicated his translation of Virgil’s <em>Bukoliks</em> and <em>Georgiks</em> in English to Whitgift.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1591</td>
<td>Date on the earliest surviving (?)second) edition of <em>Alphabet of Prayers verie fruitfull to be used. Newlie drawn into order by A. Fleming</em> was printed. This version was different to James Cancellor’s original <em>Alphabet of Prayers</em> (1565).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1590-2</td>
<td>Samuel Fleming became Doctor of Divinity although there is no formal record of this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 February 1592</td>
<td>Fleming was called as a deponent in the case of Gryffen v. Mable &amp; Chapman. Fleming gives his age as 47 and states that he is the Lord Admyrall’s chaplain, not the Countess’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1592</td>
<td>Fleming preached at Paul’s Cross for third time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 March 1593</td>
<td>Fleming preached for the fourth time at Paul’s Cross.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 October 1593</td>
<td>Fleming was collated by Whitgift as Rector of St Pancras, Soper Lane and remained there until his death.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1595</td>
<td>Peck catalogued a note from this year in Fleming’s hand concerning Lord Howard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 December 1596</td>
<td>Fleming preached at Paul’s Cross for the fifth time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 August 1601</td>
<td>Fleming preached at Paul’s Cross for the sixth time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 24 March 1602</td>
<td>Fleming wrote two epitaph’s on Mrs Ratcliffe, one of Queen Elizabeth’s maids of honour who died 24 March 1602. This was lost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 1603</td>
<td>Lady Howard died unexpectedly; Lord Howard later remarried.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 March 1603</td>
<td>Queen Elizabeth died.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. November 1604</td>
<td>Fleming wrote an account of the death of Henry Morris in November 1604 and transcribed the “remarkable verses” found in Morris’s pocket. This was lost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 March 1604</td>
<td>Fleming preached at Paul’s Cross for the seventh time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 December 1606</td>
<td>Fleming preached at Paul’s Cross for the eighth and last time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 February 1606</td>
<td>Samuel Fleming was swept from his horse and nearly drowned while crossing river Deven, Leicestershire; he commissioned Fleming’s Bridge in Bottesford to prevent any future accidents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 September 1607</td>
<td>Fleming died while visiting his brother, Samuel Fleming, in Bottesford, Leicestershire aged about 59.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 September 1607</td>
<td>Fleming was buried in the crypt under the chancel of St Mary the Virgin church in Bottesford; a memorial plaque bearing a poem traditionally ascribed to Fleming was placed near High Altar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 September 1607</td>
<td>News of Abraham’s death reached London and was recorded in the St Pancras, Soper Lane burial register.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1618</td>
<td>Hester Fleming was widowed by her first husband Thomas Davenport.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-11 March 1618</td>
<td>Samuel Fleming was involved in examining and condemning Phillipa, Margaret and Joan Flowers, the witches accused of killing Francis Manner’s sons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 or 13 September 1620</td>
<td>Samuel died “in the pulpit” of All Saints Church, Cottenham, Cambs. and was buried there (grave now lost); Hester was executrix of his will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1620</td>
<td>Samuel Fleming’s Hospital was founded to house the poor widows of the parish. The funding of the hospital was organised by Hester and a group of men as specified in Samuel’s Will.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 November 1620</td>
<td>Hester married John Knowles, a clergyman in Bottesford.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 May 1622</td>
<td>Hester was buried in Bottesford (the site of her burial is now lost).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1630s</td>
<td>John Knowles was minister for Bottesford.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1730s</td>
<td>Francis Peck collected all Fleming’s unpublished writing, manuscripts and papers and published a list of their titles in <em>Desiderata Curiosa</em> (1732-5) with a promise to publish them later, but the papers were lost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1740s</td>
<td>Lists of Abraham’s work appear in Tanner’s <em>Bibliotheca Britannica-Hibernica</em> and Ames’ <em>Typographica Antiquaria</em>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B:

Companion to Fleming’s known printed writing


Eclogues
- Title: Virgil’s Eclogues into English verse Rythmical
- Author: English translation by Abraham Fleming
- First edn: 1575
- Dedicated to: Peter Osbourne, Soldier (“Petro Osborne armigero”)
- Sources: Tanner, Ames and DNB
- Comment: Lost. Very little is known about this book.

Bucoliks
- Full title: The Bucoliks of Publius Virgilius Maro, with alphabeticall annotations upon proper names of Gods, Goddesses, med, women, hilles, flouddes, cities, townes, and villages &c. orderly placed. Drawne into plaine and familiar Englishe, verse for verse by Abraham Fleming student.
- STC: 24816
- Author: translated by Abraham Fleming
- First edn: 1575
- Printer: John Charlewood
- Seller: Thomas Woodcocke, The Black Bear, Paul’s Churchyard
- Size: 4o
- Pages: 31?
- Sources: DNB, PBR, BTOP, AthC
- Holdings: Bodleian bookstack CC28(2)Jur.; Harvard

Registre
- Title: Aelian’s A Registre of Hystories conteining Martiall exploites of worthy warriours, politique practices of Civil magistrates, wise sentences of famous philosophers and other matters manifold & memorable.
- STC: 164
- Author: “delivered in to Englishe” from Greek by Abraham Fleming
- First edn: 1576
- Stationers’ reg.: 1576
- Dedicated to: Latin, added in ?1578 to Dr Gabriel Goodman, dean of Westminster (“Doctori Goodmano Westmonasteriensis”)
- Printer: Henry Middleton
- Seller: Thomas Woodcocke
- Size: 4o
- Pages: 178
- Value: 4s 6d in 1586 (William Anderson, Trinity, Cambs); 8d (Richard Collett, Gonville & Caius)
- Sources: Tanner, DNB, PBR, BTOP, AthC, Lowndes.
- Holdings: BL 123b8; BL microfilm; Bodleian bookstack VET.A1.e.7.
- Comments: contains fourteen books or chapters.
Panoplie
- Title: A Panoplie of Epistles. Or a Looking glass for the vnlearned conteining a perfect platforme of indicting letters of all sorts. From Tully, Isocrates, Pliny, Roger Ascham etc. used of the best and the eloquentest Rhetoricians that have lived in all ages. Gathered and translated out of Latine into English by A.F.
- STC: 11049
- Author: compiled and translated by Abraham Fleming
- First edn: 1576
- Stationers’ reg: 13 August 1576
- Dedicated to: William Cordell, Master of the Rolls
- Printer: Henry Middleton
- Seller: Ralph Newberie, above Conduit Street
- Size: 4º
- Pages: 448
- Sources: Tanner, PBR, Ames, DNB, AthC, Lowndes
- Holdings: BL 92.d.25; Bodleian bookstack 40A69Art, F2.50Linc, Tanner738; two copies in Harvard (one of which is variant text); three other copies in US libraries.
- Comments: variant copies contain an extra quire titled “An epitome of precepts whereby the ignorant may learn to indict”.

Title: Certaine Select Epistles of Cicero &c. into English
- STC: ?5284
- Author: compiled and translated by Abraham Fleming
- First edn: 1576
- Sources: Tanner, BTop, AthC.
- Comments: Lost.

Zodiake
- Title: The Zodiake of Life, written by the excellent and Christian poet Marcellus Paligenius Stellatus, wherein are contained twelve severall labours. Newly translated into Englishe verse by B. Googe.
- Author: Barnabe Googe; Fleming contributed a recommendatory poem ‘Solerta: non Socordia’ (signed “Qd Abraham Fleming”) and index; Fleming also corrected the text.
- This edn: 1576
- Printed: Ralph Newberie
- Seller: Ralph Newberie
- Size: 8º
- Sources: DNB
- Holdings: BL 1213.e.44
- Comments: Fleming only worked on 1576 ed.; first edition 1543; other editions in 1561 (slightly different title) and 1565. Later ed. with Fleming’s contributions printed in 1588, 4o size (BL 78.c.30).

Englishe Dogges
- Full Title: Of Englishe Dogges, the diuersities, the names, the natures and the properties. A short treatise written in Latine by Johannes Caius and newly drawne into English by Abraham Fleming.
- STC: 4347
- Author: translated from Latin by Abraham Fleming
Rocke of Regard
- Title: The Rocke of Regard, divided into foure parts. The first the Castle of delight. The second the Garden of Unthriftinesse. The thirde the Arbor of Vertue. The fourth the Ortheard of Repente: wherein are discoursed the miseries that followe dicing, the mischiefs of quarrelling, the fall of prodigalitie etc.
- STC: 25348
- Author: George Whetston (1544–87); Fleming contributed an English poem
- First edn: 1576
- Printer: R. Whaley
- Size: 4°
- Pages: incomplete pagination
- Sources: Tanner
- Holdings: BL 1077.g.7; BL 2326.c.3
- Comments: Whetston, of Furnivall’s Inn, dated the book ‘Holborn, 15 October 1576’; Fleming and Whetston were friends; other contributors were Nicholas Bowyer, Humphrey Turner, John Wytton and “R.C.”

Museus’ Historie of Leander and Hero.
- Author: Translated into English by Abraham Fleming
- First edn: ?1577
- Sources: DNB, AthC
- Comments: Lost. Only reference to this text is in margin of Fleming’s 1589 Bucoliks.

Settle’s True Report
- Title: A True Report of the laste voyage into the West and northwest regions &c. 1577 worthily atchieved by Capteine Frobisher
- STC:22265
- Author: Dionyis Settle, crewmember; Fleming contributed preface and poem
- First edn: 1577
- Printer: Henry Middleton
- Size: 8°
- Sources: Tanner, BTop, DNB
- Holdings: BL G.6479, BL Mic.F.232; Bodleian bookstack Ashm.302(4)
- Comments: a popular text, subsequent editions printed in 1578, 1580, 1675, 1715, 1720, 1731, 1868 and 2001. Translated into many languages. Later editions combined Settle’s account with those of Ellis and Hall.
Flowers of Epigrammes

- Title: Flowers of Epigrammes out of sundrie the moste singular authors selected as well auncient as late writers, etc.
- STC: 14927
- Author: Timothie Kendall, student of Staple Inn; Fleming contributed the recommendatory poem
- First edn: 1577
- Dedicated to: Robert Dudley
- Printer: J. Sheppard
- Size: 8\(^o\)
- Sources: Tanner, BTop
- Holdings: BL C39.b.32
- Comments: also included a poem by George Whetston. 1874 reprint held at Bodleian (H11.2[Flo]).

Wunder: or, the Wunder pamphlet

- Title: A Straunge and Terrible Wunder wrought very late in the parish church of Bongay in ye yeere 1577 with the appearance of an horrible shaped thing.
- STC: 11050
- Author: Abraham Fleming
- First edn: 1577 (August)
- Printer: J. Allde
- Seller: Frauncis Godley
- Size: 8\(^o\)
- Pages: 12
- Sources: Lowndes, DNB, PBR, AthC
- Holdings: BL C27.a.4 (unique copy)

Blasing Starres

- Title: Of all blasing starrs in general as well supernaturall as natural, to what countrie or people so ever they appeare in the world universall.
- STC: 18413 (was 11051)
- Author: translated out on Latin by Abraham Fleming
- First edn: 1577
- Stationers’ reg.: 1 July 1578
- Dedicated to: Sir William Cordell, knight
- Printer: Henry Middleton
- Seller: Thomas Woodcocke, The Back Bear, Paul’s Churchyard
- Size: 8\(^o\)
- Pages: 80 (not numbered)
- Sources: Tanner, DNB, AthC
- Holdings: BL C.143.cc.10 (unique copy)
- Comments: a comet was seen over London on 10 November 1577; a translation of Frederic Nausea’s (d. 1552) Quolibet alio cometa explorato.
Blazing Starres
- Title: A treatise of blazing starres in general: as well supernaturall as natural: to what countries or people.
- STC: 18413.3 and 18413.7 (was 11051a); 18413.2; 18413.5
- Author: Abraham Fleming (posthumously produced)
- First edn: 1618 (1577)
- Printer: Bernard Alsop (produced 3 print variants)
- Seller: (1) Edward Wright; (2) Henry Bell at his shoppe without Bishopsgate
- Size: 4°
- Pages: 36 (not numbered)
- Holdings: BL C143.cc.6 (STC 18413.7, sold by Henry Bell); BL C144.a.8 (STC 18413.3, sold by Edward Wright)
- Comments: a good copy of STC 18413.7 is owned by the author; a comet was seen over London in 1618. Possibly a third print variant STC 18413.2.

Pithie Exposition
- Title: A pithee exposition of the 51st Psalme. Also a godly meditation upon the 31 Psalme. Newly augmented and amended by A. Fleming
- STC: 21797
- Author: Giralamo Savonarola (a.k.a. Jerome of Ferrara, d. 1498); augmented and amended by Abraham Fleming
- First edn: 1578
- Stationers’ reg.: 17 September 1578
- Dedicated to: Dr Gabriel Goodman, dean of Westminster, chaplain to Lord Burghley
- Printer: Thomas Dawson
- Size: 16°
- Pages: 256 (not numbered)
- Value: 6d in 1588 or 1589
- Holdings: BL C.25.a.30.(2.)
- Comments: not to be confused with Fleming’s similarly titled translation Meditations on the 31st and 51st Psalms (1581, see below).

Ellis’ True Report
- Title: A true report of the third and last voyage into Meta Incognita: achieved by the worthie Capteine, M. Frobisher Esquire. Anno 1578.
- STC: 7607
- Author: Thomas Ellis, sailor; Fleming contributed a poem
- First edn: 1578
- Printer: Thomas Dawson, Three Cranes, Vintry
- Size: 8°
- Pages: 40
- Holdings: Huntington Library; (BL 1470.b.19 is a photocopy, as is Bodleian copy)
- Comments: contains a folded woodcut plate.

Bushie Haire
- Title: A paradoxe proving, by reason and example, that baldnesse is much better than bushie haire, &c. Written by that excellent philosopher Synesius, Bishop of Thebes or (as some say) Cyren. A prettie pamphlet, to perverse, and replenished with recreation. Englished by Abraham Fleming. Herevnto is annexed the pleasant tale of Hemetes the Hermite, pronounced before the Queenes Maiestie. Newly recognised in bothe Latine and englishe by the said A. F.
- STC: 23603
- **Author:** translated by Abraham Fleming
- **First edn:** 1579
- **Stationers’ reg.:** 22 September 1579
- **Printer:** Henry Denham
- **Size:** 8°
- **Pages:** 88
- **Sources:** Tanner, BTop, DNB, PBR, AthC
- **Holdings:** BL C.40.a.14; Bodleian bookstack Wood736(1) Folger Shakespeare Library
- **Comments:** the Latin version of Hemetes the Hermite in this book was by George Gascoigne, the English by Fleming.

**Conduit**

- **Title:** The Conduit of Comfort conteining sundrie comfortable prayers to the strengthening faith of a weak Christian by Abr. Fleming.
- **STC:** 11037.3
- **Author:** Abraham Fleming
- **First edn:** 1579
- **Stationer’s reg.:** 29 June 1579, assign of William Seres; later entered to W. White on 2 March 1613; assigned by J. White to A. Matthewes on 6 September 1623
- **Dedicated to:** William Lambe
- **Printer:** Henrie Denham, the signe of the Starre
- **Size:** 16°
- **Pages:** ?368
- **Value:** 1s in 1588
- **Sources:** Lowndes
- **Holdings:** BL C194.a.209 (imperfect), BL Harl.5927(260-262) (imperfect); BL Mic.1958.1(730:03); Folger Shakespeare Library has a 1624 edition on microfilm
- **Comments:** most likely known as Lambe’s Conduit of Comfort. There were at least five editions of this, the fifth being printed in 1624 by Augustine Matthewes and sold by Francis Grove, without Newgate (STC 11037.5, was 11037a).

**Beehive**

- **Title:** The Bee hiue of the Romish Church. Wherein the Authour (Isaac Rabbotenu) a zealous Protestant, under the person of a superstitious Papist doth so drieily refel the grosse opinions of Popery, and so divinely defend the articles of Christianie. There is not a book to be found sweeter for thy conforte.
- **Alternate title (from 1580):** The bee hiue of the Romishe Churche. A worke of al good Catholikes too bee read and most necessary to bee ynderstood: wherein both the Catholike religion is substantially confirmed, and the heretikes finely fecht over coals. Translated out of Dutch into English by George Gilpin the Elder.
- **STC:** 17446 (1598 edn is STC 17447)
- **Author:** George Gilpin’s translation out of Dutch by Isaac Rabbotenu (a.k.a. Philips von Marnix); Fleming indexed the book and signed the indexes, which are included in all later editions
- **This edn:** 1579
- **Stationers’ reg.:** licensed to John Stell 21 June 1577; copy received 15 April 1579
- **Dedicated to:** to Sir Philip Sydney; editors dedication signed by John Stell
- **Printer:** Thomas Dawson, Three Cranes, Vintry printed original 1579, 1580 and 1598 edn; J. Dawson the 1623 edn; M. Dawson the 1636 edn
- **Seller:** (1) John “Hans” Stell; (2) Andrew Maunsell at the signe of the Parret in Paules Churchyarde
- **Size:** 8°
Epitaph

- Title: An epitaph, or funeral inscription, upon the godlie life and death of the right worshipfull Maister William Lambe esq. founder of the new conduit in Holborn, &c. Deceased the one and twentieth of April, and intumbed in S. Faiths Church under Powles the sixth of Maie next and immediately following Anno 1580. Deuised by Abraham Fleming.
- STC: 11038
- Author: Abraham Fleming
- First edn: between 21 April and 6 May 1580
- Printer: Henry Denham
- Seller: Thomas Turner, Guildhall Gate
- Size: folio
- Pages: 1
- Sources: PBR, AthC
- Holdings: BL Mic.A.584(6); Huntington Library has unique copy.
- Comments: in verse.

Memorial

- Title: A memoriall of the Famous monumetts and charitable almesdeedes of Maister W. Lambe, esquire. Deceased the 21 of April. an. 1580.
- STC: 11047
- Author: Abraham Fleming
- First edn: 1580
- Stationers’ reg.: 28 April 1580, at a cost of vi d
- Printer: Henry Denham
- Seller: Thomas Turner
- Size: 8o
- Pages: 40
- Sources: Lowndes, Tanner, AthC, BTop, PBR
- Comments: a reprint was made by C.F. Angell in 1875.

Comfortable Expositions

- Title: Certaine comfortable expositions of the constant martyr of Christ, M. John Hooper Bishop of Gloucester and Worcester, written in the time of his tribulation and imprisonment, vpon the XXIII. LXII. LXXIII. and LXXVII. Psalmes of the prophet Dauid. Newlie recognised, and never before published.
- STC: 13743
- Author: Henry Bull (d. 1575) and Abraham Fleming (“A.F.” signed the epistle to the reader)
- First edn: 1580
- Stationers’ reg.: 16 January 1579
- Printer: Henry Middleton
- Size: 4o
Bright Burning Beacon

- Title: *A Bright Burning Beacon*, forewarning all wise Virgins to trim their lampes against the comming of the Bridgeroome. Containing a general doctrine of sundrie signes and wonders, specially Earthquakes. A discourse of the end of this world: A commemoration of our late Earthquake the 6. of April, about 6. of the clocke in the euening 1580. And a prayer for the appeasing of Gods wrath and indignation. Newly translated and collected by Abraham Fleming. The summe of the whole booke followeth in fit place orderly diuided into chapters.
- **STC**: 11037
- **Author**: Abraham Fleming (including text from Blasing Starrs, his translation of Frederic Nausea’s *Quolio alio Cometa explorato*).
- **First edn**: 1580
- **Stationers’ reg.**: 27 June 1580
- **Dedicated to**: Sir William Cordell
- **Printer**: Henry Denham, The Sign of the Star, Paternostre Row
- **Size**: 8° (and perhaps 12°)
- **Pages**: 128
- **Sources**: Lowndes, AthC, PBR
- **Holdings**: BL 446.a.27 (another copy on microfilm); Bodleian bookstack Tanner 506, Wood 699(4) and Douce F75. Folger Shakespeare Library has two copies.
- **Comments**: Fleming documented the two-minute earthquake of 6 April 1580, but said he had barely noticed it and could not comment on it. This and the next text (below) are the same but have different STC numbers.

Generall Doctrine

- Title: *A generall doctrine of Earthquakes in England from the time of William the Conqueror to a recent earthquake on 6th April 1580.*
- **STC**: 18413 but is part of STC 11037; STC 18413 is also number for 1577 edn of Blasing Starrs (11037 includes text from Blasing Starrs, see above)
- **Author**: Abraham Fleming
- **First edn**: 1580
- **Sources**: Tanner, BTop, DNB
- **Holdings**: BL 446.a.27

Fort for the Afflicted

- Title: *A fort for the afflicted wherein are ministered many notable & excellent remedies against the stormes of tribulation. Written chiefly for the comfort of Christes little flocke, which is the final number of the faithfull, by Iohn Knox*
- **STC**: 15074.8 (was 15072)
- **Author**: John Knox (d. 1572); Fleming edited text and contributed an address to the reader in 1580 edition
- **This edn**: 1580
- **Stationers’ reg.**: entered to R. Field on 5 November 1580; 29 October 1589
- **Printer**: Thomas Dawson, Three Cranes, Vintry
Certaine Sermons

- **Title:** Certaine sermons in Defense of the Gospell nowe preached against such Cavils and false accusations, as are objected both against the Doctrine it selfe, and the preachers and professors thereof, by the friends and favourers of the church of Rome Preached of late by Thomas Cooper against the followers of the church of Rome.
- **STC:** 5685
- **Author:** Thomas Cooper, bishop of Lincoln (1517 – 1594); Fleming gathered or compiled the text and indexed
- **This edn:** 1580
- **Printer:** Ralph Newberie, above Conduit, Fleet Street
- **Size:** 4°
- **Pages:** 241
- **Sources:** Ames, AthC
- **Holdings:** BL 1023.a.10; BL 227.f.28;
- **Comments:** title of Fleming’s index is “The special contentes of this Booke of sermons, reduced into a necessarie Table of Common places”.

Exposition

- **Title:** A Godly and Learned Exposition vppon the Proverbes of Solomon: wriitten in French by Michael Cope and translated into English by M.O.
- **STC:** 5723
- **Author:** translated into English in by Marcelline Outred from Michael Cope’s *Sur les Proverbes da Salomon*; Fleming compiled the text and created the index
- **This edn:** 1580
- **Stationers’ reg.:** 27 November 1579
- **Printer:** Thomas Dawson, Three Cranes, Vintry
- **Seller:** George Bishop, the Bell, St Pauls
- **Size:** 4°
- **Pages:** 639
- **Value:** 2s in 1592 (Richard Mote)
- **Holdings:** BL 3049.e.13

Epistle

- **Title:** Epistle of the Blessed Apostle Saint Paule which he in the time of his trouble and imprisonment sent in writing from Rome to the Ephesians. Faithfullie expounded both for the benefite of the learned and vnlearned by Nicholas Hemming, Professor of Diuinitie in the Vniuersitie of Coppenhagen in Denmarke. Familiarlie translated out of Latine into English by Abraham Fleming, etc.
- **STC:** 13057.8
- **Author:** translated into English by Abraham Fleming
- **First edn:** 1580 or 1581
- **Stationers’ reg.:** 27 July 1580
- **Dedicated to:** Anne, Countess of Oxford (William Cecil’s daughter)


Alvearie

- Title: Alvearie or quadruple dictionary, containing foure sundrie tongues: namelie, English, Latine, Greeke, and French. Newlie enriched with a varietie of words, phrases, proverbs and dierers lightsome observations of grammar. By the tables you may contrariwise finde out the most necessarie words placed after the alphabet, whatsoeuer are to be found in anie other dictionarie: which tables also serving for lexicons, to lead the learner vnto the English of such hard words as are often read in authors, being faithfullie examined, are truelie numbered. Verie profitable for such as be desireous of anie of those languages.
- STC: 1411
- Author: Abraham Fleming
- First edn: 1580
- Stationers’ reg: assigned to William Seres
- Printer: Henry Denham
- Size: 2°
- Pages: 852
- Sources: Tanner
- Holdings: Bodleian DICT.B.1580; FRY.3.J.10 (imperfect); 28.C.9; BT3.76.7
- Comments: based on John Baret’s 1574 Alvearie that lacked Greek; Fleming added the Greek plus 200 proverbs and is acknowledged as author of this greatly altered text. Baret was from Peterhouse and died in 1578.

Footepath (later edn Footpath)

- Title: The Footepath of Faith leading to the Highwaie to Heauen. Wherevnto is annexed The bridge of Blessednes. Compiled and made by Abraham Fleming, and by him newlie altered and augmented.
- Alternate title: from 1619: The footpath of faith, and highway to heaven, With The bridge to Blessednesse. Containing many godly prayers, meditations, and graces. By Abraham Fleming.
- STC: 11039 (1581 ed.); 11040 (1619 and 1624 eds)
- Author: Abraham Fleming, also indexed it
- First edn: ?1578
- Stationers’ reg.: entered to W. Hoskins 23 July 1578; assigned to E. White 25 April 1580
- Dedicated to: Sir George Carey
- Printer: Henry Middleton from 1581; Ralph Blower in 1619; J. Allde in 1624
- Seller: E. White, The Gun, North Door Paules in 1581; John Clarke under St Peters Cornehill in 1619; Widow White & E. White Jnr in 1624
- Size: 16°; from 1619 in 12°
- Pages: 442
- Sources: Lowndes, Ames, DNB, PBR
- Holdings: all surviving copies are imperfect: BL Mic.A.605.(15) (1581 ed.); BL 4400.f.2 (1619 ed.); Bodleian has copy taken from Folger of 1581 edn; Folger Shakespeare Library (1581 copy)
- Comments: first surviving edition is from 1581. Lost 1578 edition possibly dedicated to Dr Roland Hayward.

**Diamond**
- **Title:** The Diamond of Deuotion, cut and squared into sixe seuerall points: namelie, 1. The Footpath to felicitie. 2. A guide to godlines. 3. The schoole of skill. 4. A swarne of bees. 5. A plant of pleasure. 6. A groue of graces. Full of manie fruitfull lessons, available to the leading of a godlie and reformed life: by Abraham Fleming.
- **STC:** 11041 (1581 ed.); 11042 (1586 ed.); 11043 (1598 ed.); 11044 (1602 ed.); 11045 (1608 ed.)
- **Author:** Abraham Fleming
- **First edn:** 1581
- **Stationers’ reg.:** assigned to William Seres on 30 June 1587
- **Dedicated to:** Sir George and Lady Elizabeth Carey
- **Printer:** Henry Denham; in 1602 Peter Short; in 1608 Company of Stationers
- **Size:** 12°
- **Pages:** 320
- **Sources:** Tanner, Ames, Lowndes; DNB, BTop, PBR
- **Holdings:** BL 4412.a.24 and C.107.df.36 (1598 edn); BL C.65.aa.19 (1602 edn); BL 4400.ff.37 (1608 edn); Bodleian bookstack Arch.A.f.63(1) (1581 edn); Folger Shakespeare Library has a copy of each edition
- **Comments:** 9 January 1582 Denham was ordered to make payment to White for including portions of Footepath in Diamond, nothing came of this charge.

**A Manuall of Christian Praiers made by diuerse & Godly men such as Calvin, Luther, &c.**
- **Author:** gathered and edited by Abraham Fleming
- **First edn:** 1581; later editions 1585 and ?1594
- **Sources:** Tanner, BTop, DNB, AthC
- **Comments:** Lost.

**Meditations on the 31st and 51st Psalms.**
- **Author:** Abraham Fleming
- **First edn:** 1581
- **Sources:** Tanner
- **Comments:** Lost; possibly Tanner confused this with Pithie exposition (STC 21797)

**David’s Sling**
- **Title:** Dauids sling against great Goliah, conteining diuers notable treatises, the names whereof follow next after the epistle to the reader by E.H.
- **STC:** 14010 (1581 edn.); 14011 (1589 edn.); 14012 (1593 edn.); 14013 (1598 edn.); 14012.2 (1601 edn.)
- **Author:** Edward Hutchins with dedication by William Baker; Fleming contributed the prayer on pp. 329-36
- **First edn:** 1581
- **Stationers’ reg.:** 1593, assigned to William Seres
- **Dedicated to:** Sir George Calverley of Chester
- **Printer:** Henry Denham; Richard Yardley and Peter Short in 1593
- **Size:** 12°
- **Pages:** 336
Holdings: BL Mic.A780(7) (copy from Huntington Library); BL C.53.a.20 (1593 edn); BL Mic.A.802.(1.) (imperfect 1601 copy); University of Saskatchewan; Huntington Library (1581 edn); Folger Shakespeare Library (1598 and 1601 edns)

Comments: very similar in content and layout to Diamond, with text set out in six sections.

‘A Godly and fruteful prayer’
- STC: 11046
- Author: Abraham Fleming
- First edn: 1581
- Comments: this poem-prayer has its own STC number but is part of STC 4301 (see below)

True Beleefe
- Title: Concerning the true beleefe of a Christian Man, a most excellent a profitable dialogue by S.C. Herevnto besides the marginal notes, declaring the chiefe points of doctrines, there is added a godlye and lightsome prayer, which in certaine briefe petitions, comprehendet written in Lat. by Abraham Fleming, a Londoner borne. To the right Reuerend Father in Christ, John Bishop of London. Translated out of Latine by Arthur Golding.
- Alternate title: De vera Christiani hominis fide
- STC: 4301 (inc. STC 11046)
- Author: unclear; title says “S.C.” but is English translation by Arthur Golding of Jacobus Wittewronghelus de vera christianae hominis fide; Fleming contributed marginal notes and a Latin letter to John Aylmer; Fleming contributed “a godly and fruteful prayer” (STC 11046)
- First edn: 1581 or 1582
- Stationers’ reg: assigned from Purfoote Snr 4 June 1581; 6 November 1615
- Dedicated to: Rev. John Aylmer
- Printer: Thomas Purfoote
- Seller: Thomas Purfoote, at his shop ouer against S. Sepulchers Church; 1615 edn. says at signe of Lucrece
- Size: 8°
- Pages: 56
- Sources: AthC
- Holdings: unique copy of 1581 edn at Hatfield House; Bodelian bookstack has microfilm of 1581 edn and E8(6)Th.Bs. (1615 edn)
- EEBO: yes
- Comments: a Latin version was also in circulation at the same time (STC 25934.5)

Monomachie
- Title: Monomachie of Motives in the Mind of Man or a battell betweene vertues and vices of contrairie qualitie. Wherein the imperfections and weaknesses of nature appeare so naked than anie reasonable soule may soone see by what spirit he is lead: herevnto also besides sundrie deuout praiers necessarily interlaced, diuers golden sentences of s. Barnard are annexed and also a briefe conclusion of his vpon this theame, that victorie is obtained by resisting temptation. Newlie englishe by A. Fleming.
- STC: 11048
- Author: Abraham Fleming translated from Latin and edited
- First edn: 1582
- Stationers’ reg: 30 June 1581, assigned to William Seres
Calvin on Deuteronomie

Title: The sermons of M. John Calvin upon the fifth book of Moses called Deuteronomie gathered as he preached them in open pulpit together with a preface made by the ministers of the Church of Geneva, and an admonishment made by the deacons there. Also there in are annexed two profitable tables, the one containing the cheefe matters, the other the places of scripture herein alleged. Translated out of French by Arthur Golding.

STC: three print variants each has own number: 4442; 4443; 4443.2; ?4443.5

Author: translated from French by Arthur Golding; Fleming contributed two indexes or “profitable tables” signed with his Latin tag

First edn: 1583

Stationers’ reg: 1578 fee not paid; entered to J. Harrison and G. Bishop 4 July 1581

Dedicated to: The Right Honourable Thomas Bromley, knight

Printer: Henry Middleton

Seller: (1) George Bishop (STC 4442); (2) John Harrison (STC 4443); (3) Thomas Woodcocke (STC 4443.2)

Size: 2º

Pages: 1247

Holdings: BL 1473.dd.6 (variant sold by Harrison); BL 1215.k.14 (a variant sold by Bishop); two copies and a microfilm copy in Folger Shakespeare Library

Comments: from French Sermons sur les dix commandemens de la loy by Denys Rageuneau.

Verborum Latinorum

Title: Verborum Latinorum cum Graecis Anglisque conjunctorum locupletissimi commentarii: ad elaboratum Guiliemi Marelii Regii in Graecis typographi archetypum accuratissime excuse nouaque vocum passim insetarum accessione aduerti vt stellulae quae singulis lucent paginis indicabunt. Consultis praetor ditissima aliorum dictionaria viuis etiam nonnullorum doctorum vocibus quo Anglica versio perspicua magis sit fructuosiorque ad commune studiosorum vsum eminent. Quid vitalis in his commentariis quaeque conscribendi eos ratio a primo authore inita sit ex ipsius Morelii praefatione studiosi facillime percepient.

STC: 18101

Author: Abraham Fleming

First edn: 1583

Stationers’ reg: entered to Newberie and Denham on 30 December 1584

Printer: Henry Bynneman

Seller: Richard Hutton

Size: 2º

Pages: 1153

Sources: Lowndes, DNB, BTop, PBR, AthC
Holdings: BL copy mis-shelved; Folger Shakespeare Library
Comments: William Morel’s earlier version contained Greek, Latin and French; Fleming took out the French and replaced it with English; this suggests Fleming was at least competent in Greek as well as fluent in Latin.

**Peter Martyr**

- **Title:** The common places of the most famous and renowned divine Doctor Peter Martyr, diuided into foure principall parts: with a large addition of manie theologickall and necessarie discourses, some neuer extant before. Translated and partlie gathered by Anthonie Marten, one of the sewers of hir Maiesties most honourable chamber. Including an oration by I. Simler. In the end of the booke are annexed two tables of all the notable matters therein contenied.
- **STC:** 24669
- **Author:** Anthonie Marten (a.k.a. Marren); Fleming contributed two indexes
- **First edn:** 1583
- **Stationers’ reg:** 3 May 1582 under the hands of both wardens and the Bishop of London
- **Printer:** Henry Denham and Henry Middleton (at the costs of Henry Denham, Thomas Chard, William Broome and Andrew Maunsell “allowed according to hir Maiesties inunctions”
- **Seller:** Denham, Chard, Broome and Maunsell
- **Size:** 2:o
- **Sources:** Tanner
- **Holdings:** BL 13.b.4 (incomplete); BL C.21.e.9; BL 3705.f.11; Folger Shakespeare Library; University of Saskatchewan

**Dictionarie in Latine and English**

- **Title:** A dictionarie in Latine and English, heretofore set forth by Master Iohn Veron, and now newlie corrected and enlarged for the vtilitie and profit of all yoong students in the Latine toong as by further search therein they shall find: by R.W.
- **STC:** 24678
- **Author:** John Veron (d. 1563); Ralph Waddington; edited by Abraham Fleming
- **This edn:** 1584
- **Stationers’ reg:** 30 December 1584
- **Printer:** Ralph Newberie and Henry Denham
- **Size:** 4:o
- **Pages:** 688
- **Sources:** Tanner
- **Holdings:** Folger Shakespeare Library
- **Comments:** an expanded version of Robert Estienne’s (d. 1559) Dictionariolum puerorum, tribus linguis Latina, Anglica & Gallica conscriptum.

**Shorte Dictionarie**

- **Title:** A shorte dictionarie in Latine and English, verie profitable for yong beginners. Compiled at the first by Iohn Withals: afterwards reuised and increased with phrases and necessarie additions by Lewis Euans. And nowe lastlie augmented with more than six hundred rhythmical verses, hereof many be prouerbial some heretofore found in old English: newlie done by Abraham Fleming. What is added in this edition which none of the former at any time had, these markes * may sufficiently shew.
- **Alternate title:** Shorte dictionarie for yonge begynners; running title “A little dictionarie for children”
Discoverie

- Title: The discoverie of witchcraft, wherein the lewde dealing of witches and witchmongers is notable detected, the knauey on coniurors the inietie of inchanters the follie of soothsayers the impudent falsehood of couseners, the infidelitie of atheist the pestilient practises of pythonists the curiositie of figurecasters, the vanitie of dreamers the beggarlie art of alcumystrie the abomination of idolatrie the horrible art of poisoning the vertue and power of naturall magike and all conuieniences of legierdemaine and juggling are deciphered: and many other things nature and substance of spirits and diuels, &c. all latelie written by Reginald Scot Esquire.
- STC: 21864
- Author: Reginald Scot; Fleming contributed nineteen English poems
- First edn: 1584
- Printer: Henry Denham
- Seller: William Brome
- Size: 4º
- Pages: 560
- Sources: Ames, DNB, AthC
- Holdings: BL C.123.c.10; BL G.19129; Bodleian bookstack S53Th. and Douce S 216; three copies in Folger Shakespeare Library.

Nomenclator

- Title: The nomenclator or remembrance of Adrianus Iunius physician, diuided into two tomes conteining proper names and apt termes for all things vnder their convenient titles, which within a few leaues doe follow: written by the said Ad. Iu. In Latine, Greeke, French and other forrein tongues, and now in English by John Higgins: with a full supplie of all such words as the last inlarged edition afforded and a dictional index conteining aboue fourteen hundred princiall words with their numbers directly leading to their interpretations of special vse for all scholars and learners of the same languages.
- STC: 14860
- Author: John Higgins; Fleming compiled the 1,400 word dictionary-index
- First edn: 1585
- Stationers’ reg: entered to Ralph Newberie on 12 October 1583
- Dedicated to:
- Printer: Henrie Denham
- Seller: Ralph Newberie
- Size: 8º
- Pages: 539 in two volumes
- Sources: Ames, Tanner, AthC, BTop
- Holdings: Bodleian bookstack 80P87Jur. and Yc.V11015; Folger Shakespeare Library has eight copies
• Comments: there are three print variants: (1) contains verses to Fleming; (2) variant title that identifies Fleming as indexer; (3) contains verses to Fleming on pages that are blank in other copies. Some copies contained the additional section “Supplementum Vice Prolegomenon”. A reference tool for defining Latin words in Latin, Greek, French and English

Shorte Dictionarie
• Title: *A shorte dictionarie in Latine and English, verie profitable for yong beginners*. Compiled at the first by Iohn Withals; afterwards reuised and encreased with phrases and necessarie additions by Lewis Euans. And nowe lastly augmented with more than six hundred rhythmicall verses whereof many be prouerbiall some heretofore found in old authors and some neuer before this time seene or read in the Latine tongue, as having their originall grace in English by Abr. Fleming: newlie done by Abraham Fleming. What is added in this edition these markes * may sufficiently shew.
• STC: 258881
• Author: Abraham Fleming
• This edn: 1586 (revised version of STC 25880.5)
• Printer: Thomas Purfoote
• Seller: Thomas Purfoote
• Size: 4º
• Pages: 112
• Holdings: BL C.106.d.10 (1586 edn); BL RB.23a.9158 (imperfect 1586 edn); Folger Shakespeare Library

A short Latin history of the reign of Mary I
• Author: Abraham Fleming
• First edn: ?1585
• Sources: Francis Thynne
• Comments: Lost. Mentioned by Thynne in *Holinshed’s Chronicles*.

Title: *Holinshed’s Chronicles*
• Main title: *The first and second volumes of Chronicles comprising 1 The description and historie of England 2 The description and historie of Ireland 3 The description and historie of Scotland: first collected and published by Raphael Holinshed, William Harrison, and others: now newlie augmented and continued (with manifolde matters of singular note and worthie memory) to the yeare 1586. By John Hooker alias Vowell Gent. and others. With conveniente tables at the end of these volumes.*
• Title of ‘Continuation’:* The third volume of Chronicles, beginning at Duke William the Norman first compiled by Raphael Holinshed and by him extended to 1577, nowe newlie continued to 1586*
• STC: 13569
• Author: John Stow, John Hooker, Francis Thynne, Abraham Fleming (inc. material from 1576 edn by Richard Stanyhurst, William Harrison, and others); Fleming was also general editor; Fleming was largely responsible for Volume III “Continuation”; Fleming compiled the following indexes: two tables of particulars to the History of England; a table of principall particulars to the History of Scotland; the third table for the Chronicles of England
• First edn: January 1587
• Stationers’ reg: entered to five stationers on 6 October 1584; entered to Denham and Newberie on 30 December 1584 for an unprecedented fee
Dedicated to: severall: overall to William Cecil; other sections to Lord Brooke; to Robert Dudley; to Sir Henry Lee
Printer: Henry Denham, in Aldersgate Street at the signe of the Starre
Seller: syndicate of Henry Denham, John Harrison, Ralph Newberie, George Bishop and Thomas Woodcocke
Size: 2\textsuperscript{o}
Pages: 1592, in three volumes bound as two volumes
Value: 33s
Holdings: seven copies in BL; six in Folger Shakespeare Library;
Comments: each section has its own title page and date, i.e. Volume II is dated 1586; Scottish title page is dated 1585.

‘Carmen Chronologicon’
Author: Thomas Newton; edited by Abraham Fleming’s “learned file” that polished the poem and added to Holinshed’s Chronicles.
Comments: part of STC 13569

\textbf{Eicasmi}
Title: Eicasmi, seu meditations in sacrum Apocolypsin. Authore Io. Foxo, Anglo.
STC: 11237
Author: John Fox; indexed by Abraham Fleming who initialled the indexes “Ab. Fl.” and also signed off with his Latin tag \textit{FINIS propositi, laus Christo nescia FINIS}
First edn: 1587
Stationers’ reg: 7 March 1586
Printer: Thomas Dawson
Seller: George Bishop
Size: 2\textsuperscript{o}; 1596 edn is 4\textsuperscript{o}
Pages: 396 in 1587 edn
Holdings: BL 3186.k.4 (1587 edn “very rare”); BL 697.c.23 (1596 edn); a copy in Magdalen College, Oxford; Bodleian bookstack; one copy in Folger Shakespeare Library; two copies in US
Comments: 1596 edn has different title: Eicasmi, seu meditations Iohannes Foxi angli in APOCOLYSIN S. IOHANNES APOSTOLI & evangeliste.

\textbf{Bucoliks and Georgiks (if bound together Bucoliks and Georgiks)}
Title: The Bucoliks of Publius Virgilius Maro, prince of all Latine poets; otherwise called his pastorals or shephehrs meetings. Together with his Georgiks or ruralls, otherwise called his husbandrie, conteyning foure books. All newly translated into English verse by A.F.
STC: 24817
Author: Abraham Fleming
First edn: 1589
Stationers’ reg: January 1600
Dedicated to: John Whitgift, Archbishop of Canterbury
Printer: Thomas Orwin
Seller: Thomas Woodcocke
Size: 4\textsuperscript{o}
Pages: 109 (Bucoliks 30 pp.; Georgiks 77 pp.)
Holdings: BL C.122.c.13; Folger Shakespeare Library; Bodleian
Alphabet
- Title: The alphabet of prayers verie frutefull to be exercised and vsed of euerie Christian. Newlie drawne, into no lesse direct an order than aptlie agreeth with the name by A. Fleming.
- STC: 4562
- Author: Abraham Fleming
- This edn: 1591(earlier editions associated with Fleming not survived); another edn in 1610
- Stationers’ reg: assigned to William Seres in 1591
- Dedicated to: Robert Dudley (this was the original dedication from Cancellor’s1565 edn)
- Printer: in 1591 Rychard Yardley and Peter Short, “scene and allowed according to the Queenes inunctions”; likely previous editions were printed by Henry Denham
- Seller: William Seres
- Size: 16°
- Pages: 224
- Holdings: BL C.132.i.12 (1610 edn); Folger Shakespeare Library (1591 edn);
- Comments: Based on an original text by James Cancellor from 1565

Shorte Dictionarie
- Title: A shorte dictionarie in Latine and English, verie profytable for yong beginners. Compiled at the first by Iohn Withals: afterwards reuised and encreased with phrases and necessarie additions by Lewis Euans. And nowe lastly augmented with more than six hundred rhythmical verses whereof many be prouerbiall some heretofore found in old authors and some neuer before this time scene or read in the Latine tongue, as having their originall grace in English by Abr. Fleming: newlie done by Abraham Fleming. What is added in this edition these markes * may sufficiently shew.
- STC: 25883
- Author: Abraham Fleming
- This edn: 1599 (revised version of STC 25880.5)
- Printer: Thomas Purfoote
- Seller: Thomas Purfoote
- Size: 4°
- Pages: 112
- Holdings: Folger Shakespeare Library

Dictionarie in Latine and English
- Title: A dictionarie in English and Latine for children, and yoong beginners: compiled at the first by Iohn Withals, (with the phrases, and rythmicall and prouerbiall verses &c. which have been added to the same, by Lewis Euans and Abr Fleming successiuely) And newlie now augmented with great plenty of latine words, sentences and phrases: with many proper epigrams: descriptions: inscriptions: histories: poeticall fictions besides. Framed all to their yong vnderstandings which be learners in the Latin tongue, to leade them on to riper knowledge, with delight. By William Clark.
- STC: 25884; 25885 (1608 and 1616 edns); 25887 (1634 edn)
- Author: William Clark; this text contained Fleming’s proverbs and verses but does not seem to have been directly involved with this text
- This edn: 1602
- Printer: Thomas Purfoote
- Seller: Thomas Purfoote; 1608 edn sold by Nathaniel Butter
- Size: 8o
• Pages: 464
• Holdings: Folger Shakespeare Library has various copies; the 1634 edn has a slightly different title.
Appendix C

Peck’s list of Fleming’s manuscripts

A transcript from BL 505.ff.8 (Francis Peck’s list as it appears in Desiderata Curiosa Volume the First liber VI (1732-5)).

Now ready for the Prefs; & will be printed on the same Letter & Paper with this BOOK:
Desiderata Curiosa, Vol. II. Or, a farther Collection of divers scarce & curious Pieces (relating chiefly to Matters of English History) in VI. other Books: gathered principally from the MS Remains of the Reverend Mr Abraham Fleming (one of the Compilers of the great English Chronicle, commonly called Holingshed’s Chronicle) & of the Right Reverend Richard Fletcher S.T.P. Dean of Peterborough [n.b. Abraham Fleming was ordained at Peterborough], & successively Bishop of Bristol, Worcester, & London (who attended the Examination & Execution of Mary Queen of Scots) & others; transcribed, many of them from the Originals themselves, & the rest from divers antient MS. copies, or the MS collections of sundry famous Antiquaries & other eminent Persons both of the last & present Age. The whole, as near as possible digested into an Order of Time, & illustrated with ample Notes, additional Discourses, & a compleat Index: by Francis Peck, MA Rector of Godeby near Melton in Leicestershire. Adorned with Cuts.

CONTAINING

Liber I
Abrahami Flemingi de Vita sua succincta & lucida Historia, Anno 1605. a seipso conscripta. MS. Manu Flemingi.
Abrahami Flemingi Operum non solum impressorum verum etiam MS. Catalogus. MS. Manu Flemingi.
Abrahami Flemingi de Laborius suis in sacra sui Ministerii Vocatione Narratiuricula. MS. Manu Flemingi.
Abrahami Flemingi de Praeparatione sua ad mortem; in qua cum Deo quaeritur reconciliari: Orato pathetica. MS. Manu Flemingi.
Abrahami Flemingi Epitaphium a seipso confectum; a Tumulo: Editoris Supplementum.

Liber II
Incipient Abraham Fleming Collectanæae Historica, & imprimis ejusdem Abraham Fleming de hisce Collectaneis Distichon. MS. Manu Flemingi.
De Discrimine inter Triumphum & Tropoeum. MS. Manu Flemingi.
De Mode triumphandi inter Romanos. MS. Manu Flemingi.
De tribus Causis, inter alias, praecipuis Discordiae sive Divisionis inter Romanos. MS. Manu Flemingi.
De Imperatoris Mauritii Interitu. Anno Christi DCII. MS. Manu Flemingi.

Chronici cujusdam irrotulati Fragmentium. E. Rotulo Pergamenico.

Aphorisms of State. MS. Manu Flemingi.


The Names of the Captaines with their Badges in their Standards, who entered France in the Army of King Henry viii. 16. June (5. H. viii) MS. Manu Flemingi.

Articles appointed by King H.viii (6.H.viii) concerning the Orderyng & service of his Chambers. Containing 1. the Roome & servyce of a Page of the King’s Chamber. 2. The Roome & Servyce of the Grome of the King’s Chamber. 3. The Roome & Servyce of a Grome Porter.

4. The Roome & Servyce of a Yeoman of the Crowne, of the Garde, & of the King’s Chamber.

5. The Roome & Servyce of a Sewer of the King’s Chamber. 6. Punycyon for them that bere the Servyce & Meat into the Chambres with the Sewers. 7. The Roome & Servyce belonging to a Yeoman Huisher. 8. The Roome & Servyce belonging to a Gentleman Huisher. 9. The Ordre for the Esquyers & Knightes for the Body. 10. The olde Ordre for making of the Kings Bedde. 11. The Othe of all the Kynges Servaunts. 12. The Othe of the Kinges Apoticaye. 13. The Othe of the Princeis Chamberleyrn; to be geven him by the Kings Chamberleyrn. 14. The Othe of the Kings mooste honorable Counsell. E. Codice MS. penes Leicestrensem.

An Account of the Coming of Emperor Charles V. into England, Anno MDXX. (12. H. viii) more particularly of his Reception & Entertainment at Canterbury. From Hall, Stow, Holingshed, & a MS. Fragment of Mr. Fleming’s own Hand.

De Calvino Machinante confirmare Doctinam suam Miraculo, & praeoccupato justo Dei Judicio, Historia ab Henrico Bolsico, Mediczo Lugdunensi; una cum Abrahami Flemingi ejusdem Fabulae Refutatione. MS. Manu Flemingi.

A Message sent by John Cooke to such as be Enemies to our Sovereign Lord King Edw. vi. & his Realms. MS. Manu Flemingi.

Reasons why a Priest may not practise Physic or Surgery, as offered by Dr John Christopherson, Bishop of Chichester to his Friend Dr Hussy, who desired his License for a Friend to do so. MS. Manu Flemingi.

A brief Note concerning the Charge which Matthew Parker Archbishop of Canterbury was at, in Repairing his Palace there, Annis 1560, 1561. MS. Manu Flemingi.

De Maria Regina Scotica, cum esset apud Fontem S. Annae de Buxton, Pauca. MS. Manu Flemingi.

[XX. A large Account of the unusual Sufferings of Walter Devereux Earl of Essex, xxii. Sept. MDLXXVI. supposed to be poisoned. MS. Manu Flemingi.]

[XXI & XXII do not relate to Fleming]
XXI. The Hymn which the foresaid Earl of Essex sang the Night before he died. MS. Manu Flemingi.

XXII. Wenceslai de Budowitz a Budowa de Morte Mahomet Bassia Epistola, illata per manum Medici. MS. Manu Flemingi.

XXIII. A pleasant Conceit of Vere Earl of Oxford, discontented at the Rising of a mean Gentleman in the English Court, circa MDLXXX. MS. Manu Flemingi.

XXIV. Part of a smart Letter written i. March MDLXXXI. by Elmer Bishop of London, to the then Lord Mayor (Harvey) in Answer to some scurrilous Reflections cast on the Bishop by that Gentleman, as also on Account of his ill using of the Clergy. MS. Manu Flemingi.

XXV. Whether a Bishop or any other Churchman may have the Tuition of a Ward? affirmed by Bishop Elmer in a sermon at S. Paul’s Cross, xi. Oct. MDLXXXIV. MS. Manu Flemingi.

XXVI. Some Account of Bishop Wickham’s sermon at S. Paul’s Cross xiv. Febr. MDLXXXIV. MS. Manu Flemingi.

XXVII. A large Account of an offensive Clause in a Sermon preached at S. Paul’s Cross, vi. March MDLXXXV. by Mr George Closse, a London Preacher; which clause was distasted by the then Lord Mayor, Sir Wolstan Dixey. Together with an Account of a second Sermon there also preached by the said Closse on the xvii. of March the next following. As also of the Proceedings against the said Preacher, first, before the Lord Mayor; afterwards, before the Archbishop of Canterbury; and lastly, before the Lords of the Council. The whole verbatim under the said Preacher’s Hand, as he himself sent it to Mr. Fleming, lest a false Account of those Things should have been published in the then intended New Edition of Holingshed’s Chronicle. MS. Manu ipsius Geo. Closse.

LIBER III

De Tractatu Berwici inter Anglos & Scotos, Anno MDLXXXVI. MS. Manu Flemingi. [Abraham’s brother Samuel had witnessed the Berwick agreement.]

De Statu Scotiae, Anno MDLXXXVI. MS. Manu Flemingi. [Abraham’s brother Samuel had witnessed the Scottish agreement.]

Mary Queen of Scots to Bernardino de Mendoza, xx. May, MDLXXXVI. a Supplement inserted by the Editor [i.e. Peck].

[IV – VIII are Rev. Fletcher’s papers relating to MQS.]

IX. A large Account of Babington’s Plot, as the same was delivered in a Speech at Fotheringhay, at the Examination of Mary Q. of Scots xiii. Oct. MDLXXXVI. by Judge Gawdy. MS. inter MSS. Fleming.

X. The rufful Ryme of Chidioc Tichborn (one of the chief Conspiritors in Babington’s Plot) wrote between the Time of his Condemnation & Execution, which last was on the xx. Sept. MDLXXXVI. MS. Manu Flemingi.

[XI – XIII inserted by the Editor.]
XIV. The Names of so many of the Commissioners & other eminent Persons as were present at
the Examination of Mary Q. of Scots at Fotheringhay, touching certain Articles of Treason
alleged against her. MS. inter MSS. Fleming.
[XV & XVI Fletcher’s.]
The Answer of Mary Q. of Scots to certain Commissioners of the Queen’s Highnes, on
[XVIII – XXII Fletcher’s; XXIII Editor’s.]

LIBER IV
[I. Editor’s]
II. De Castracione Chronicorum quae Raphaelis Holingshedi nuncupantur. Et imprimis de
eorundem Censuris quando Roberto comit Leicestriae, D. Thoma Bromley cancellario & D.
Gul. Cecil Thesaurario oblata; prout ea omnia Camdenus Flemingo retulit. MS. Manu
Flemingi.
Censurae aliae diversorum Hominum malevolentium sed nimium subtilium in eadem Chronica;
cum Responsoribus Abrahami Flemingi. MS. Manu Flemingi.
The Council’s Letter to Whitgift Archbishop of Canterbury, touching the Examinations and
Reformation of the Additions to the new Edition of Holingshed’s Chronicle on Thursday i.
Febr. MDLXXXVI. MS. Manu Flemingi.
Whitgift Archbishop of Canterbury’s letter to Thomas Randolph, Henry Killigrew, Esqrs. & Mr.
Dr. Hammond, touching the Examination & Reformation of the Additions to the new Edition of
Holingshed’s Chronicle on Thursday i. Febr. MDLXXXVIII. MS. Manu Flemingi.
Abrahami Flemingi (qui praerat Typis & Praelo) de Modo Castrati; Reformandiq; Chronica
predicta brevis & vera Relation. MS. Manu Flemingi.
[VII – XVI are Editor’s or Fletcher’s.]
XVII. De Regina nuper Scotorum ejusque Vitae Fine, a viro generoso Edmundo Molineux,
succincta Relatio. MS. Manu Flemingi.
De Regina nuper Scotorum ejusque Vitae Fine, a viro generoso Thomas Milles, Relatio
amplior. MS. Manu Flemingi.
Magistri Thorniae & Magistri Barnardi Gilpin (Domini Gualteri Mildmay Dispensatoris)
aliorumque nonnullorum Relationes breviores ad eandem Reginam & Necem ejus spectantes.
MS. Manu Flemingi
Verses on the Death of Mary Q. of Scots, by the Translator or Orlando Furioso (Sir John
Harington.) MS. Manu Flemingi.

LIBER V.
[I & II Fletcher’s manuscripts about Mary Queen of Scots.]
III. De Davisono Secretario, Pauca. MS. Manu Flemingi.
[IV – VI Peck’s.]


The first time of Mr Fleming’s Preaching at S. Paul’s Cross MDLXXXIX. MS. Manu Flemingi.

The second time of Mr Fleming’s Preaching at S. Paul’s Cross MDLXXXIX. MS. Manu Flemingi.

The third time of Mr Fleming’s Preaching at S. Paul’s Cross MDLXCI. MS. Manu Flemingi.

Brief notes of what passed between one Blabey a Minister & Dr. Cosins in the High Commission, MDLXCI. MS. Manu Flemingi.

The fourth time of Mr Fleming’s Preaching at S. Paul’s Cross xvii. March MDLXCI. With the Order of his so Doing. MS. Manu Flemingi. & MS. inter MSS. Flemingi.

Abrahami Flemingi ad D. Archeepiscopum, cum Oblatione e Primitii Horti sui Pancratiani carmina Latina, Gallica, Anglica, MDLXCVI. MS. Manu Flemingi.


An Epitaph upon the Death of the famous & renowned Knight Sir Thomas Scot of Scots-Hall in Kent, who died xxx. Dec. MDLXCV. & was buried in Braborn Church among his Ancestors; with divers Historical Notes. The whole written by Mr. Reynolde Scot (Author of Discovery of Witchcraft) & sent, as thought, to be inserted in the late new Edition of Holingshed; but not permitted. A curious Thing. MS. Manu Flemingi.

A brief Note concerning the Lord Admiral Haward, MDLXCV. MS. Manu. Flemingi.


Causa superioris Quaestionis. MS. Manu Abr. Flemingi.

The resolute Spirit of Philip Howard Earl of Arundel, who died in the Tower xix Nov. MDLXCV. MS. Manu Flemingi.

Part of Dr. Antony Rudd, Bishop of St David’s Sermon before Queen Elizabeth at Whitehall in Lent, MDLXCVI. admonishing her to think of her latter End. MS. Manu Flemingi.

The Danger of Innovations in a Commonwealth, or the Poison of Sectaries, & how perilous it is to Shake Religion at the Root by licentious Disputes & Doctrines. A copy of Verses presented to Queen Elizabeth, which greatly pleased her. MS. Manu Flemingi.

The fifth Time of Mr Fleming’s Preaching at S. Paul’s Cross v. Dec. MDLXCVI. With the Order of his so Doing. MS. Manu Flemingi. & MS. inter MSS. Flemingi.

The Meditation or Prayer of a rare learned Man of Oxford (reported to Mr. Fleming to have been Dr. Richard Lateware, S.T.P.) when he lay sick of a Consumption & given over by his Physicians, as Mr. Fleming had it of Mr. Thomas Speight, the Editor of Chaucer’s Works. MS. Manu Flemingi.

The sixth Time of Mr Fleming’s Preaching at S. Paul’s Cross ix. August MDCI. With the Order of his so Doing. MS. Manu Flemingi. & MS. inter MSS. Flemingi.

An Epitaph on Mrs Ratcliff, one of Queen Elizabeth’s Maids of Honor; who died xxiii March MDCII. MS. Manu Flemingi.

Another of the same. MS. Manu Flemingi.

The conclusive Prayer said every Night by Mr. Fleming, the old Countess of Nottingham’s Chaplain Mr Fleming (when the Family were together) after Common-Prayer.

LIBER VI

De Henrico IV. Francorum Rege & Gestu sue, cum audivisset Reginam Elizabetham fuisse mortuam & Jacobum Sextum in ejus regalem sedem successisse. MS. Manu Flemingi.

The Archbishop of Canterbury’s Letter to his Suffragens for a Contribution to be gathered by the King’s Order throughout the Realm for the City of Geneva, xxvi. Oct. MDCIII. MS. inter MSS. Manu Flemingi.


Bancroft, Bishop of London, his Letter to Mr. Roger Fenton, Rector of S. Benet Sherehog, against the Church-Wardens letting the Vestry of that Church for a shop (without allowing any Right or Profit to the Rector) under a Pretence of applying Rent to the Use of the Poor. MS. Manu Flemingi.

Some Account of the sudden Death of Mr Henry Morris, in Nov. 1604. with a Copy of the remarkable Verses then found in his Pocket. MS. Manu Flemingi.

Brief Notes about Mr. Anthony Wotton, a worthy Preacher’s being silenced for certain Words scandalously taken, in 1604. MS. Manu Flemingi.

Mr Hugh Broughton’s Censure of Bishop Bilson. & Justus Lipsius his Censure of Mr Hugh Broughton, 1604. MS. Manu Flemingi.

De Thoma Griffin, Clerico parochiali Ecclesiae S. Benedicti Sherehog, quem, rogatum a Rogero Fenton Rectore suo (cui duo Beneficia fuerant concessa, & Sub-Ministro vel Curato, qui Rectoris Locum suppleret, non adhibiti) ut Preces publicas legeret (promissa licet indemnitate
ipse praestiteret) Ordinarius tamen Diocesani Censura vexavit: cum Animadversionibus Abr. Flemingi, MS. Manu Flemingi.


[XI – XX not by or about Fleming.]

Monitio Studentibus, ne Libris nimis incumberent. E. Collect. MS. Abrahami Flemingi.
Appendix D
Illustrations

Above left and right: Fleming’s signatures (shown actual size) from the deposition PRO C24/221 ‘Gryffen versus Mable et al, 34 Eliz. Regnus’.
Centre: a view of Peterhouse, Cambridge that Fleming would have recognized.
Below: Godley’s woodcut of the Black Dog from Fleming’s Straunge and Terrible Wunder (1577).
Above: Peterborough Cathedral, Cambridgeshire, where Fleming was ordained deacon and priest in August 1588. (Photo taken by the author.)

Below: the cups used during ordination services at the time Fleming was ordained. He would have taken communion wine from one of the centre cups. (Photo taken by the author.)
Fleming was a chaplain in Howard’s household from 1588. (Portrait by Daniel Mytens (c. 1590-1647), 1620.)

Below left: the original tower of St Nicholas’ church, Deptford, where Fleming assisted Rev. Thomas Macander as curate. (Photo taken by the author.)

Below right: the area within St Nicholas’ churchyard where Christopher Marlowe was buried. It is likely that Fleming assisted with or performed Marlowe’s funeral. The rectangular plaque (inset) commemorates the playwright. (Photos taken by the author.)
Above left: the modern blue plaque that commemorates the site of St Pancras Soper Lane, Fleming’s parish church from 1593. (Photo taken by the author.)
Above right: a contemporary picture of Fleming’s church showing the Rector’s House on its eastern side. (From Frans Franken’s ‘Copperplate Map’ of London, 1559, now owned by the Museum of London).
Centre: the small graveyard where Fleming buried his parishioners. This is all that remains of his parish today. (Photo taken by the author.)

Below left: a contemporary map showing St Pancras Soper Lane and its proximity to old St Paul’s Cathedral. Fleming’s church is No. 43 directly east of the cathedral. (From a copy of Wenceslaus Hollar’s ‘A Map or Groundplot of the City of London’ made in 1666.)
Three examples of the marginal notes made by Fleming in his parish registers (LG MS 5015, St Pancras Soper Lane.)

*Above left:* the annotation explaining that Fleming was grateful to have been collated by Archbishop Whitgift in 1593.
*Above right:* a note that states its corresponding entry was copied out in 1598, probably to confirm this parishioner's death for legal purposes.
*Below left:* another marginal note in which Fleming noted his collation by Whitgift.
Above: a contemporary picture of old St Paul’s Cathedral showing Paul’s Cross, the open air pulpit in which Fleming preached, just above the eastern end of the cathedral. (From Frans Franken’s ‘Copperplate Map of London’, 1559. Owned by the Museum of London.)

Centre: Another contemporary image of old St Paul’s showing the cathedral from the north, facing south. This is the view with which the printers in Paternostre Row would have been familiar. (‘A Sermon Preached at Paul’s Cross Before King James’, 1614, now owned by the Society of Antiquaries.)

Below: detail from the same painting showing Paul’s Cross pulpit and the gathered crowds listening to a sermon. Note the half-timbered bookshops to the right of the pulpit and the dog whipper in the lower left corner.
Above left and right: two views of St Mary the Virgin, Bottesford, where Fleming was buried under the chancel in September 1607. (Left-hand photo taken by the author; right-hand photo courtesy of Michael Saunders, churchwarden.)

Centre: Samuel Fleming’s house in Bottesford, Leicestershire. This is where Abraham Fleming, his brother, died in September 1607. The house has been greatly changed. (Photo taken by the author.)

Below: the only original feature of Samuel Fleming’s property is the perimeter wall. (Photo taken by the author.)
Above: the entry in the burial register of St Mary the Virgin, Bottesford, which recorded Fleming’s death and burial. (LRO DE829/1.)
Centre: the entry in the burial register of St Pancras Soper Lane, which recorded the death of its priest. (LG MS 5015.)
Below: Fleming’s memorial plaque that is fixed to the floor by the high altar of St Mary the Virgin’s church. This poem was written by Fleming. (Photo taken by the author.)
The title page of the second edition of Fleming’s *Blazing Starres* (1618). This was one of several books by Fleming that continued to be re-printed and sold after his death. This rare copy is owned by the author. (Photo taken by the author.)
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