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FOR students of the interaction between oral and written forms of communication the early modern period provides an important case study. England in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries was far from being an oral society; and yet it was not a completely literate one either. On the one hand, old vernacular traditions had long been infused and supplemented, or corrupted and destroyed, by the written word; on the other hand, only a certain part of the population could read and write or ever relied on the products of literacy. Indeed, as Keith Thomas has suggested, 'it is the interaction between contrasting forms of culture, literate and illiterate, oral and written, which gives this period its particular fascination'.

Long before the early modern period, records, documents and literary productions of all kinds were structuring the mental world of English people at all social levels. Written texts were commonplace in recording economic transactions, in providing witness and proof at law and in conveying the fruits of artistic and imaginative achievement. If the spoken word remained the principal mode of communication and cultural transmission, it was inextricably and increasingly intertwined with the written. And yet oral exchange and tradition, however derivative from textual sources, remained a vital and innovative force throughout these centuries and beyond. For that majority of men and women who could not read, and for all people in certain contexts, information was learned by listening and stored in memory.

In this paper I want to focus on the relationship between oral and written tradition in the formation of memories and perceptions of the past in early modern England. In this sphere, too, the mutual infusion of the oral and the written was thorough and of long standing. Whatever the provenance of historical tales or traditions, however, there is no doubt that the majority of people received their knowledge of the past

---

knowledge from which people derived a sense of identity and pride based upon place. They provided an imagined heritage which helped to underscore the emotional solidarity of the community and they were expressed in the ‘common voice’, ‘common fame’ or ‘common report’ of the inhabitants which antiquaries and travellers frequently encountered as they toured the country.\(^5\)

The fanciful fables which some small towns or villages liked to cherish about their former greatness, for example, were often sustained by local memory and by the physical evidence all around rather than by any written documents. In the 1530s the ‘commune voyce’ at Billericay in Essex informed the passing John Leland that the town had once been much greater, and they could show had a fine ceremonial horn and mace to prove it. The Elizabethan inhabitants of Overburrow in Lancashire were equally keen to tell visitors that their ‘small country village’ had been ‘formerly a great city’, as they knew ‘by a tradition handed down from their ancestors’ and a variety of Roman remains confirmed. By the same token, large foundations uncovered in the village of Coggs, Oxfordshire, made the ‘vulgar people that live here think that in old time here was a castle’, but there was seemingly no documentary evidence to support this idea.\(^6\)

Just as the survival of such physical evidence could be crucial in the preservation of local tradition, so it was likely to die out if the landmarks or monuments which kept it in mind once faded. ‘Notwithstanding the eagerness of the vulgar in harkening to stories relating to parochial churches to which themselves particularly belong’, observed the Oxford antiquary Thomas Hearne, ‘when such churches fall or are destroyed, they soon forget what they had been, or even what benefactions had been made to them.’\(^7\) A good example of this is provided by the case of the statue of Our Lady of Gillingham and the Rood of Chatham which stood in the churchyard of this Kentish village. They were described in the 1570s by the local antiquary, William Lambarde, who also recorded the legendary miracle associated with them ‘as I have often heard (and that constantly reported)’, and he thought it ‘not amisse to commit faithfully to writing, what I have received credibly by hearing’. But when John Weever came to the same monuments

---


\(^{7}\) The History and Antiquities of Glastonbury, ed. Thomas Hearne (Oxford, 1722), xiv.
over half a century later he found the images ‘now many yeares sithe
ence defaced’ and thus the legend, although ‘received by tradition ... from
the elders’, and ‘long since both comonly reported and faithfully
credited by the vulgar sort’, was now not to be ‘learne[d] at man’s
mouth’. Yet, Weever conceded, ‘many of the aged number remember
it well’.8

As this comment suggests, the memories of aged inhabitants could
be crucial in the retention of local tradition. The evidence here confirms
the picture given of other societies with strong oral traditions that older
people are of vital importance in the preservation and transmission of
customary practice and intellectual capital. They provide a direct
human link with the past and are often revered as the repositories of
ancient wisdom and the custodians of communal memory.9 ‘We old
men are old chronicles’, says the ‘countryman’ in a dialogue of 1608,
‘and when our tongues go they are not only clocks to tell only the time
present, but large books unclasped; and our speeches, like leaves turned
over and over, discover wonders long since passed.”10 The importance
of long memories in early modern England was no more evident than
in the many disputes which arose during these centuries over customary
law. For the customs of manors, towns and parishes were very often
unwritten, retained only in the memories of the eldest inhabitants, and
it was thus of crucial importance to the preservation of economic rights
and the maintenance of livelihoods to be able to remember exactly
what had gone on in the community ‘within the memory of those yet
living’ and beyond.”11

Customs were just one of the pieces of local information for which
there was no alternative but to rely upon the recollection of ancients.
Where transmission was relatively shallow, spanning no more than one
or two generations, it might remain a reasonably accurate guide to past
practice. Thus, when the vicar of Radwinter in Essex, William Harrison,
wanted to learn of the changes in domestic comfort which had taken
place during the sixteenth century, it was the ‘old men yet dwelling in
the village’ to whom he turned. In 1630 Thomas Westcote reported the
innovations in agricultural practice in Devon, ‘begun within the memory

8 William Lambarde, A Perambulation of Kent: Containing the Description, Hystorie, and Customes
of that Shyre (1576), 287; John Weever, Ancient Funerall Monuments (1631), 343-4.
9 Jack Goody, The Interface Between the Written and the Oral (Cambridge, 1987), 150, 164;
M. T. Clanchy, From Memory to Written Record: England 1066-1307 (2nd edn, Oxford, 1993),
25-6; Keith Thomas, ‘Age and Authority in Early Modern England’, Proceedings of the
British Academy, lxi (1976), 233-4.
10 The Great Frost (1608), in Social England Illustrated: A Collection of XVIIth-Century Tracts,
ed. Andrew Lang (1903), 166.
11 For recent discussions, see The Experience of Authority in Early Modern England, ed. Paul
Griffiths, Adam Fox and Steve Hindle (Basingstoke, 1996), 96-9, 266-73.
of old men'. As a young boy growing up in Wiltshire before the Civil Wars, John Aubrey ‘did ever love to converse with old men, as living histories’. Among many gleanings from such sources, he picked up local customs and anecdotes from his grandfather Isaac Lite who had heard them, in turn, from his own father; he listened to reminiscences of notable events past from old Mr Jacob, of Wootton Bassett who was eighty years of age in 1648; and he lapped up the stories of other ancients, like his ‘old cosen’ Ambrose Brown of Winterbourne Bassett ‘who lived to 103’, ‘old Jaquez’ of Kington St Michael and old Bartholomew of Malmesbury.

The length of this memory could thus be reliable at least for the period of a long life. In the mid-seventeenth century the Lancashire clergyman Henry Newcome learned of the last great famine to afflict the county from old aunt Key of Bury who told him that it ‘was then sixty years past’. A curious visitor to Skenegrave on the Cleveland coast sometime before had heard ‘ould men, that would be loath to have their credytes crackt by a tale of a stale date, reporte confidently’ an incident said to have taken place ‘sixty years since, or perhaps eighty or more’. Aubrey talked to Goodwife Dew of Broad Chalke in south Wiltshire who died in 1649, also at the age of 103, and remembered Edward VI visiting the county almost a century before. And when more than one generation was involved, inherited memory could reach back with some reliability for far longer. John Smyth of Nibley, estate steward to the earls of Berkeley in Gloucestershire, lived between 1567 and 1640 and during this period he ‘often heard many old men and women’ of the neighbourhood, born in the reign of Henry VII, ‘relate the report of their parents, kinsfolks and neighbours’ who as children themselves had witnessed the great local battle of 1469 between William, marquis of Berkeley, and Thomas Talbot, Viscount Lisle, over land rights. Smyth heard in vivid detail how Lisle had been slain by the arrow of one ‘Black Will’ and carried from the field, together with ‘many other perticularyties ... not possible almost by such plaine country people to be fained’. Old Mr Charles Hiet was able to tell the same story in 1603, as ‘delivered from the relation of his father and grandfather as if the same had been but yesterday’. The inherited


memory here, then, spanned at least a century and a half.\textsuperscript{14}

In many of the reminiscences of eldest inhabitants is a nostalgia for the old days which can be characteristic of any age. It had been, after all, a much ‘merrier world’ in the past: hospitality was greater and life was simpler, there were fewer lawyers and all things were cheap.\textsuperscript{15} To this extent there could be something inherently subversive about popular perceptions of the past. What ordinary men and women remembered was not usually the stuff of learned or officially approved versions of the past but instead interpretations of events which attempted to make sense of and justify the world as they saw it. As such their memories could be irreverent and even seditious in the details which they chose to retain, or forget, and the way in which they chose to construe them. Thus at the time of the Civil War the inhabitants of Evesham in Worcestershire were eager to relate the exploits of Simon de Montfort, earl of Leicester, who had fallen there while leading the baronial revolt against Henry III, for such tales sat well with their view of the present monarchy. ‘It is reported the dead body of the earl of Leicester being fouly and barbarously deformed with wounds was there discovered, whom nevertheless the vulgar sort reverence as a martir, because as they said he suffered all this for the Commonwealth, but not for the King, who forbad this the people’s cannonizacion...’\textsuperscript{16}

Just as the versions of manorial custom remembered by the tenants could differ completely from those understood by their landlords, so too other popular traditions might bear little relationship to the significant historical events as recorded by antiquarian scholarship in this period. Take, for example, the disafforestation, drainage and enclosure of Hatfield Chase on the Yorkshire–Lincolnshire border in the reign of Charles I. This was apparently consented to by the ‘better sort’ of the inhabitants of the area at the time and, after initial protests by some of the dispossessed, occasioned no further contention. Sir William Dugdale was to write up this history of ‘improvement’ in 1662 and no other verdict on the issue would be recorded were it not for the enquiries of Abraham de la Pryme who became vicar of Hatfield in November 1696. De la Pryme was a great collector of local traditions and here, as elsewhere, he was always ‘examining and talking with...
my eldest parishioners ... about what was memorable relating thereto'. He found that the 'old men' of Hatfield would often talk nostalgically of the days before the destruction of the chase when 'the poor people got a good liveing out of the same and venison was no greater a rarity then in a poor man's kitchen than mutton is now'. They also related in loving detail the intricacies of their poaching technique, seeming to delight in its skill and craft as well as in its defiance of authority. Moreover, they had a popular hero in Sir Robert Swift, the last Bowbearer to the king in the chase, whose responsibility it was to protect the game but whose loveable incompetence seems to have endeared him to all and occasioned 'many traditional stories'.

Exactly the same kind of discrepancy in interpretations of the past may be detected in the rather different versions of an eventually famous tale collected at Tilney Smeath in Norfolk. In the churchyard there stood a monument commemorating the deeds of one Hikifricke. In 1631 John Weever recorded the tale, 'as it hath gone by tradition from father to son', of how 'upon a time (no man knowes how long since)', Hikifricke had saved the rights of the seven villages in the parish over the large common which they surrounded from the encroachments of the local landlord. When, however, the heralds Elias Ashmole and William Dugdale were touring the fenlands in the early summer of 1657, they both seem to have derived different versions of events from the locals at Tilney. Ashmole understood their hero to have 'killed a gyant and recovered marshland from him', while Dugdale believed that Hikificke himself had been the lord of Tilney and had fought not for but against the inhabitants over the bounds of the common. Such variance provides signal evidence of the way in which interpretations of a tale might depend upon the disposition of both tellers and recipients. In the minds of some Hikifricke was a champion of the common cause of the people, while in the view of others he was invoked as a defender of the rights of property and lordly authority.

Sir William Dugdale, *The History of Imbanking and Drayning* (1662), 145-9; Keith Lindley, *Fenland Riots and the English Revolution* (1982), 13-14, 23-4, 64, 71-2; *The Diary of Abraham de la Pyme, the Yorkshire Antiquary*, ed. Charles Jackson (Surtees Society, iv, Durham, 1869-70), 71; BL Lansdowne MS., 897, fos 50-1, 55r.

Weever, *Ancient Funerall Monuments*, 866; and cf. Sir Henry Spelman, 'Incenia: Sive Norfolciae Descriptio Topographica', in *Relinquiae Spelmannianae* (Oxford, 1698), 138; Francis Blomefield and Charles Parkin, *An Essay towards a Topographical History of the County of Norfolk* (5 vols, Fersfield and Lynn, 1735-75), iv, 691-2. Equally, local tenants might seek to deface or destroy such monuments when there were traditions associated with them which were prejudicial to their land rights and usages: Sampson Erdeswicke, *A Survey of Staffordshire* (1723), 192.

Many communities seem to have cherished hero figures such as Hikfricke who had at some time defended the rights of the common people or flouted authority. Outlaws, in particular, were the epitome of those who spurned the conventions of society and appeared to live a life of freedom outside the bounds and burdens which usually kept people in their place. Theirs were deeds of daring and adventure, romantic and exceptional. To hear of them was to be transported momentarily to a time and a place in which the powerful might be defied and even conquered. Such had been the appeal of Hereward the Wake in the centuries after the Norman Conquest and then of Robin Hood who by the thirteenth century seems to have taken his place in the popular imagination.²⁰

Ubiquitous as Robin was in popular legend, he had plenty of local equivalents who may have been unknown other than in the parochial context and were probably remembered only in oral tradition. Thus, the people living around the Forest of Exmoor in Devon would tell of one Symon, ‘another Robin Hood’, who ‘standing in outlary, kept this forest’. Among the trees was ‘a large deep pool which they name Symon’s Bath . . . and in the moors of Somerset there is a burrow or fort called, by the inhabitants, Symon’s Burrow, which he made his winter strength to retire unto’. Such tales suggest all the swashbuckling elements of the conventional Robin Hood narratives and many seem to have adopted the motif of man of high birth forced to live on the margins of society. At Myddle in Shropshire, for example, they had a local hero in ‘wild Humphry’ Kinaston, a knight-errant turned fugitive of whom ‘the people tell almost as many romantick storyes, as of the great outlawe Robin Whood’. Among these was the tale of how ‘wild Humphry’ had escaped from the ambush of the sheriff and ‘a considerable company of men’ by leaping over the river Severn. He sought shelter in a cave near Nescliffe ‘which, to this day, is called Kinaston’s Cave’. Such also was the history of Poole’s Hole, an underground cave by Buxton in Derbyshire, the refuge of ‘one Pool, of Pool’s Hall in Staffordshire, a man of great valour who, being outlawed, resided here for his own security’, and yet to be seen were his stone table, bed and shelf. Likewise, at Bristol in the years before the Civil War one could still hear tell ‘as fresh as but of yesterday’ of the exploits of ‘black Will’ Herbert, the first earl of Pembroke, ‘a mad fighting young fellow’ who in the reign of Henry VIII had killed one of the sheriffs and escaped through the city gates to France.²¹


²¹Westcote, A View of Devonshire in 1630, ed. Oliver and Jones, 95; Richard Gough, The History of Myddle, ed. David Hey (Harmondsworth, 1961), 56–7; Ralph Thoresby, The Diary of Ralph Thoresby, F.R.S., ed. Joseph Hunter (2 vols, 1830), 1, 91–2; Edward Browne,
Thus, the memories of ancient inhabitants could provide a strong and relatively reliable link with the recent past. Knowledge of events stretching back for a century or more might be passed down the generations with some degree of consistency. The further away from the incidents or individuals in question that oral transmission took an historical tradition, however, the more prone to distortion it might become. Moreover, there was a large gap in the terms of factual accuracy between what was inherited directly at first or second hand from elders and ancestors and what was believed to have taken place in the very distant past. When the short limits of memory were exhausted, myth began.

For most people their understanding of long ago was vague and episodic: theirs was a past with little sense of chronology, in which names and places, dates and events could be hopelessly compressed and confused. Certain great historical figures loomed so large as to explain almost any landmark or occurrence of note. There was a tendency to 'telescope', to shorten or omit entire portions of the past, which is familiar in many societies with strong oral traditions. A vivid example of conflation would be uncovered by John Byng in his travels around England in the late eighteenth century. He found that wherever he went the people attributed the destruction of any ruined building to Oliver Cromwell. Moreover, they tended to muddle the Lord Protector with his namesake, Henry VIII’s first minister. Thus at Wingfield manor in Derbyshire his guide ‘spake of the seige it sustain’d in the civil wars; shew’d every rent in the walls as if made by cannon balls; and was puzzled, as all countrymen are, about the two Cromwells; the destroyer of monasteries, and the destroyer of castles’. Such observations indicate the importance of great events such as the Reformation or the Civil

22 On the large gap between what is personally remembered and some imagined mythical past, see Johnson, Folk Memory: or the Continuity of British Archaeology, 13; M. T. Clanchy, ‘Remembering the Past and the Good Old Law’, History, 55 (1970), 167; Thomas, The Perception of the Past in Early Modern England, 8–9; Rosalind Thomas, Oral Tradition and Written Record in Classical Athens (Cambridge, 1989), 283.


War as dating tools in popular perceptions of the past, even if they failed to engender any firm sense of chronology.\(^25\)

This vague sense of date was no less evident among ‘the country people’ of Lincolnshire who were reported to labour under the notion that the Foss road is the oldest in England, and that it was made by William the Conqueror. Ethelbert’s Tower in Canterbury was not in fact built by Ethelbert himself, ‘as vulgar tradition will fabulously tell you it was’, but merely in his honour in about 1047. Castles seemed particularly prone to this kind of fanciful dating. Some were post-dated, like Reigate in Surrey, actually built by the Saxons, ‘tho a vulgar error has generally given credit of it to one of the Warrens, earls of Surrey’. Most, however, were dignified with a more or less bogus antiquity, as was Bamburgh Castle on the Northumbrian coast, built, so the local people affirmed, ‘before our Saviour’s time’.\(^26\)

Julius Caesar seems to have impressed himself on the popular imagination as the natural builder of fortifications, whatever age they may have been. ‘Vulgar chronology will have Norwich Castle as old as Julius Caesar’, it was said, while the castles at Chepstow, Exeter, Canterbury and Dover, where visitors could inspect his ‘old brass trumpet’, were among those similarly attributed.\(^27\) Patrons in an alehouse at Woodstock, Oxfordshire, boasted to one Elizabethan tourist that the Roman conqueror had been responsible for a ‘palace’ there; nor were such notions mere village fancy, for even in the capital city ‘common opinion’ erroneously ascribed the Tower of London to his offices.\(^28\) Small wonder, then, that ‘the vulgar’ were thought to be ‘generally incapable of judging of antiquities’.\(^29\)

\(^{25}\) On great events as dating tools, see Fentress and Wickham, Social Memory, 99, 110–12.

\(^{26}\) William Stukeley, Itinerarium Curiosum (1722), 99; William Somner, The Antiquities of Canterbury (1640), 40; John Aubrey, The Natural History and Antiquities of the County of Surrey (5 vols, 1718), iv, 189; Journeyings through Northumberland and Durham Anno Dom. 1677, in Reprints of Rare Tracts and Imprints of Antient Manuscripts, ed. M.A. Richardson (7 vols, Newcastle, 1843–9), vii, 11.


\(^{29}\) The History and Antiquities of Glastonbury, ed. Hearne, vii.
This confused sense of chronology was not merely the product of popular ignorance or the distortion caused by oral transmission, however, but was in essence the fruit of learned fiction and often derived from written sources. At a time when studious historical scholarship was only just beginning to develop standards of documentary reference and corroboration and to question many of the long-established legends, inherited from the medieval chronicles, which continued to dominate the learned view of the past, ignorance was by no means confined to ‘the vulgar’. Moreover, new and spurious versions of the past were being written in the early modern period which did as much to generate error. It was the arriviste gentry of Tudor England, with the aid of the heralds, who were as responsible as anyone for the creation of bogus versions of history in the fantastic genealogies which they fabricated in an attempt to dignify family lines with spurious longevity.30

This can be seen, for example, in the elaborate ‘charter myths’ fabricated and cherished by many towns and institutions in support of their antiquity and venerability. In the late fifteenth century the Warwickshire antiquary John Rous had claimed the foundation of Cambridge, both town and university, for Cantaber, a Spaniard who came to Britain in the time of King Gurguntius, about 375 BC. This was the view endorsed by John Caius in the 1570s, among others, so that the Duke of Wurttemberg, visiting the town in 1592, was rightly told that this was the orthodoxy ‘as affirmed by the principal historians’.31 At Oxford, meanwhile, it was possible for the curious enquirer to choose from a number of contending hypotheses about origins, all of them derived from learned written authorities. Some attributed its provenance to one Mempric ‘who was king of the Britannes in the year of the world 2954 and before Christ 1009’; others gave the plaudits to his son Ebranc; while still others preferred the claims of Olenus Calenus


a Roman, about 70 years before Christ’. But it was equally possible to find support for the view that it had been the creation of ‘certain philosophers out of Graece’, a theory which the existence of ‘Aristotle’s well’ near Walton did much to confirm; ‘that Cassibulan, king of the Britaines about 58 years before Christ, built it; as he did Exeter, Colchester and Norwich’; that it was ‘originally founded by a British king called Avizagus about 70 years after our Saviour’s nativity’; that it had been ‘built or at least restored’ by King Voritgen in 474; or, finally, that it was the work of King Alfred ‘(as some, and these not mean historians, assert) in the year 872’.

Such myths were hardly mere ‘vulgar errors’, therefore, but learned fictions endorsed in the universites and supported by the most respected antiquarian opinion. Many of them derived from Geoffrey of Monmouth’s *Historia Regum Britanniae* or else from the elaborations and imaginings of subsequent monastic writers. Scholarly opinion in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries did little to dispel, and often much to encourage, such legend. It is hardly surprising, therefore, that the majority should have accepted and rehearsed what were no more than long-established commonplaces of historical understanding. Thus, when the ‘old attendant’ at the Angel Inn in Leicester assured three soldiers resting there in 1634 that the town had been ‘built by the British King Leir, neare 1000 yeeres before Christ’, he was doing no more than repeating the testimony of Geoffrey. And his *Historia* was also the source of the tale which these same three travellers found in York, ‘as tradition and story tells’, that the town was founded by King Ebraucus ‘in the reign of K[ing] David’ of Judaea.

This sense of learned fiction feeding into popular lore is evident in much of what can be recovered of generally held versions of the past. In practice few historical narratives which circulated orally were completely ‘pure’, in the sense of owing nothing to the written word. A number of recent studies drawing upon evidence gathered from societies around the world and over time have demonstrated the interaction and reciprocal infusion of written and unwritten sources in the communication of information about the past, whether in story or


song. So, too, in Tudor and Stuart England, much of the historical tradition which circulated among ordinary people had some basis in literary and learned culture even if the embellishment and corruption effected by generations of transmission had taken it far from its origins. By the early modern period, centuries of chronic and hagiographic writing, of chivalric romance, sermon exempla, poetry and drama, had been providing a variety of written sources of knowledge about the past and they provide the key to understanding the genesis of a large part of popular tradition. Time and again, the kind of local anecdote which was increasingly coming to be dismissed as erroneous by antiquarian scholarship in the seventeenth century can be found to derive from some written source, perhaps long forgotten. As Sir Thomas Browne put it in the 1640s with characteristic acuity: 'there is scarce any tradition or popular error but stands also delivered by some good author'.

In addition to initiating much of what subsequently passed into oral circulation, the written word was also responsible for augmenting and enhancing it; for reviving an oral narrative which might otherwise have died out were it not for its preservation, elaboration and dissemination in text. Again, written culture was probably more culpable than oral in the fabrication and perpetuation of distorted, exaggerated and spurious versions of the past. Thomas Westcote commented perceptively in the 1630s that 'some things seem more fabulous, interposed by some augmenting transcribers' than many others 'left unto us as tradition ... from mouth to mouth'. By the same token, it was said of the tales told of the miraculous deeds of St William of Lindholm in south Yorkshire, that they remained purely local and rather muted as a consequence of never having been written down: 'the pitty is that this worthy saint has not had any one to set forth his strang works or else perhaps they might have been as great, wonderfull and fabulous as K[ing] Arthur's are'.

Even contemporaries who believed that they were witnessing pure


oral tradition passing down the generations unadulterated by the infiltration of writing were usually mistaken in this. Elias Ashmole seems to have thought that the legend of St Joseph of Arimathea and the Holy Thorn of Glastonbury Abbey provided an example of one such tradition, for until the work of a few recent writers he could 'not remember to have read any author who hath taken notice of this thorne in print'. Otherwise, 'all the remembrance we have of it, hath past along among us by tradition only, which I have often heard spoken of...'. In reality, however, the monks at Glastonbury had been fabricating miraculous stories of St Joseph since the twelfth century and they had enjoyed wide manuscript circulation long before the Tudor herbalists popularised the legend of the Thorn.38

Many such legends of saints and their miracles which still enjoyed widespread currency in the early modern period probably had their origins in this kind of monastic fabrication. Accounts of their lives had been written by chroniclers since the early Middle Ages and by the twelfth and thirteenth centuries had assumed a standard format. In this guise they became a staple of manuscript culture and sermon exempla and represented some of the most widely known of all traditionary tales in late medieval England. Given that they were, in Gerald Owst's words, 'definitely presented as true history, not to be confused in the popular mind with lighter forms of pulpit illustration', it is hardly surprising that they were widely and faithfully believed by the majority. Many of them were included in compilations such as the famous Golden Legend, the thirteenth-century continental collection which was to be translated and printed by Caxton in 1483 and reissued seven times by 1527. There were scores of individual lives, too, especially of English martyrs like St Thomas of Canterbury, St Oswald and St Edmund.39

Thus the origin of a tradition in Canterbury that the devil had once tried to prevent St Augustine preaching at the chapel of St Pancrace, was, according to William Somner, the work of some monastic chronicler which he had seen. But it had passed subsequently into popular tradition and 'of latter time ... became vulgarly received'. Similarly, the tales which travellers often encountered from the mouths of local people at Crowland Abbey in Lincolnshire, of the torments once inflicted by frightful devils upon St Guthlac and the monks, could be


traced back, so it was said, to ‘the chronicler Felix’. The scores of other local saints’ legends to which communities loyally adhered were all just as likely to be the products of written hagiographic tradition. This was to end at the Reformation, of course, but the continuation of such stories throughout the eighteenth century and beyond in some cases is testimony to their survival in oral tradition.

The large role played by the devil in so many popular traditions was also a product of centuries of preaching and didactic writing which had played upon the notion of a malevolent fiend active in the temporal world who tempted mankind and whose evil projects to wreak havoc explained the shape of so much of the landscape. Rocky outcrops, stone circles, caves, ditches and gorges were all likely to be attributed to the work of ‘old nick’. ‘It is a strange taste which our ancestors had’, William Cobbett could later muse, ‘to ascribe no inconsiderable part of these wonders of nature to the devil.’ Equally, large man-made structures such as dykes, causeways or Roman roads were just as likely to be explained in these terms: ‘for the vulgar’, observed William Stukeley, ‘generally think these extraordinary works made by the help of the devil’.

Another prominent theme in popular tradition was tales about dragons. These, too, had a long lineage in the bestiaries and emblematic writings of the Middle Ages, but many owed their popularity in the early modern period to another series of spurious charter myths. From an early date it had been common for noble or gentle families, and

---


43 Stukeley, Itinerarium Curiosum, 171. For examples, see Camden, Britannia, ed. Gibson, 85; Aubrey, Monumeta Britannica, ed. Fowles and Legg, 273, 381, 881, 891, 923, 925; Aubrey, The Natural History and Antiquities of the County of Surrey, iv, 187; Defoe, A Tour Thro’ the Whole Island of Great Britain, ed. Cole, ii, 592; Hutchinson, A View of Northumberland, 1, 80.
institutions or corporations, to try to explain their origins, justify their ownership of a piece of land, or account for the heraldic dragon on their coat of arms, by claiming for an ancient forbear some feat of heroism or conquest. Such inventions might then pass into the popular lore and become generally believed in the locality. The Lordship of Moston in Cheshire, for example, had been in the possession of the Venables family for many generations when it was recorded in 1560 that their ancestor, Thomas, had earned the inheritance by slaying ‘a terrible dragon’ which had once terrified the neighbourhood, piercing it with an arrow while in the very act of devouring a child. The dragon on the Berkeley family crest derived, so an early seventeenth-century document explains, from the dragon-slaying exploits of Sir John Berkeley at Bisterne in Hampshire, where a Dragon Field can be seen to this day. At Sockburn, in County Durham, a monument in the church commemorated the valiant deeds of Sir John Conyers, who ‘before the Conquest’, tradition told, had fought and slain the dragon, ‘a monstrous venom’d and poison’d waverne, ask or worme, which overthrow’d and devour’d many people in fight, for the scent of the poysone was so strong that noe person was able to abide it’. In the reign of Charles I people were still showing the spot known as Graystone where the dragon had fallen, and the deeds of Sir John were commemorated in local ceremonial into the nineteenth century.44

Finally, together with the legends of saints and the fabulous exploits of devils and dragons, tales of giants also occupied a central place in English folk tradition. Once again, the literary origins of these are well attested. It was Geoffrey of Monmouth’s Historia which popularised notions, probably much older, that the island of Albion had been populated by giants before the conquest of the Trojan Brutus. The belief that giants had once inhabited the earth had Old Testament authority, of course, and these ideas were taken up again by the historians of the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. In 1610 the astrologer Simon Forman wrote a genealogy of all the giants from the days of Noah, while at the same time the antiquary William Burton could invoke a variety of scriptural and other authorities to prove their former existence.45 Gigantic figures adorned the frescoes and murals in palaces, cathedrals and great houses.46 And, naturally enough, images

45 Genesis, vi, 4; Bod Lib MS. Ashmole, 244, fos 192-9; William Burton, The Description of Leicestershire (1622), 277.
46 See, for example, Itinerary of John Leland, ed. Smith, 1, 95; Thomas Platter’s Travels in England, ed. Williams, 165-6; Aubrey, Monumenta Britannica, ed. Fowles and Legg, 477; The Diary of Henry Machyn, ed. John Gough Nichols (Camden Society, 1st series, xlii, 1848), 186.
of giants and the legendary stories of Albion found their way into the
great poetry and literature of the day.⁴⁷

Once again, then, it is hardly surprising to find this weight of written
tradition feeding into popular historical consciousness. Camden believed
that the many tales told by Cornish folk of the giants who occupied St
Michael’s Mount, still much talked of in the late nineteenth century,
owed their creation to verses penned in the reign of Henry II.⁴⁸ As
with the devil, giants provided an explanation for much that was
gargantuan or unusual in the landscape. Stonehenge had been known
as ‘the Giant’s Dance’ since Saxon times.⁴⁹ The lone boulder next to
the stone circle at Stanton Drew in Somerset was believed to be the
quoit of the giant Hakewell, while Wookey Hole was designated, in
typical fashion, ‘the gyant’s table’.⁵⁰ Large man-made structures were
similarly explained. Oxfordshire had a number of Grim’s ditches, for
example, and ‘the country people will tell you that this Grymes was a
gyant’, while the Roman road on Wheeldale Moor in the North Riding
was known as Wade’s causeway after the giant and his wife who were
said to have built it in an instant.⁵¹

In general, Roman buildings were ‘so very stately’, observed Camden,
that ‘the common people will have these . . . to be the work of gyants’.
That giants lived in castles was something which readers of Pilgrim’s
Progress would have accepted without a second thought. Typically
enough, of the great ruins above Aldridge in Staffordshire the locals

⁴⁷ Among the most famous examples are Edmund Spenser, The Faerie Queene (1596), in
Spenser: Poetical Works, ed. J. C. Smith and E. De Selincourt (Oxford, 1912); Michael
Drayton, Poly-Olbion (1613), in The Works of Michael Drayton, ed. J. William Hebel (5 vols,
Oxford, 1961), iv, 26. For discussion, see C. B. Millican, Spenser and the Round Table
(Cambridge, Mass., 1932); Ernest Jones, Geoffrey of Monmouth 1640-1800 (Berkeley and Los
Angeles, 1944), 406–17.
⁴⁸ Camden, Britannia, ed. Gibson, 4. For legends of Cornish giants, as they were
recorded in the mid-nineteenth century, see Robert Hunt, Popular Romances of the West of
England (1865), 44–75.
⁴⁹ L. V. Grinsell, ‘The Legendary History and Folklore of Stonehenge’, Folklore, 87
⁵⁰ Aubrey, Monumenta Britannica, ed. Fowles and Legg, 46. 68; Rawdon, The Life of
Marmaduke Rawdon of York, ed. Davies, 178. For other examples of giants’ boulders, see
Plot, The Natural History of Staffordshire, 397–8; Martin Martin, A Description of the Western
Islands of Scotland circa 1695 (Glasgow, 1884), 152–3, 220, 364; Joseph Taylor, A Journey
to Edenborough in Scotland, ed. William Cowan (Edinburgh, 1903), 19–20; Ralph Thoresby,
Ducatus Leodiensis: or, the Topography of the Ancient and Populous Town and Parish of Leedes
(1715), 194; Sir Robert Atkyns, The Ancient and Present State of Gloucestershire (2nd edn, 1768), 188;
James Hardy (ed.), The Denham Tracts (2 vols, Folklore Society, 1892–5), ii, 217. There was
another ‘giant’s table’ outside Penrith: Celia Fiennes, The Journeys of Celia Fiennes, ed.
Christopher Morris (1947), 201. There were also numerous giants’ caves, chairs and
gravestones.
⁵¹ The Remains of Thomas Hearne, ed. John Buchanan-Brown (1966), 199, 205; Westwood,
had 'a tradition that there lived a gyant ... and another att a castle in Wall[sall] and that when either went from home he used to throwe the key to the other'. Once upon a time, the story went, a throw fell short and the key plummeted into a pit of water below where it was found by a poor man who used it as 'a share and coulter for a plow'. The benign and friendly, almost comical, character evidenced by the giants in this tale, as in so many similar anecdotes, attests to the way in which they had been adopted and absorbed to fit local needs. Frequently they milked cows, fought on behalf of the community or bequeathed some enormous gift. At Brent Pelham in Hertfordshire there was a monument in the church to their particular giant, Shonk. An 'old farmer ... who valued himself for being born in the air that Shonk breathed', explained to Nathaniel Salmon in the 1720s how 'Shonk was a giant that dwelt in this parish, who fought with a giant of Barkway, named Cadmus, and worsted him; upon which Barkway hath paid a quit rent to Pelham ever since.'

To the manuscript culture of the Middle Ages, then, can be traced the foundation of much of what passed into oral tradition, where it was to take on a life of its own. Moreover, by the early modern period these written sources were being enhanced by printed ones which would, in turn, enormously stimulate the creation and augmentation of the legendary repertoire. In particular, the tremendous growth of antiquarian writings in the form of chronicles, county histories and itineraries from the sixteenth century was responsible not only for recording much popular belief but also for helping to create and sustain it. Once again, this cautions against the notion that writing necessarily destroys memory and undermines oral tradition. Rather, it is more instructive


53 Nathaniel Salmon, The History of Hertfordshire (1728), 289–90, and cf. 184. For other examples of giants or men of extraordinary stature, said to have performed heroic deeds for the community, see Camden, Britannia, ed. Gibson, 126; Thomas Machell, Antiquary on Horseback, ed. Jane M. Ewbank (Cumberland and Westmorland Ant. and Arch. Soc., extra series, 19, Kendal, 1963), 126–7; Sir Daniel Fleming, Description of the County of Cumberland, ed. R. S. Ferguson (Cumberland and Westmorland Ant. and Arch. Soc., 3, Kendal, 1889); 18; Sandford, A Cursory Relation of all the Antiquities and Families in Cumberland, ed. Ferguson, 37; Westwood, Albion: A Guide to Legendary Britain, 258.
to view it in many cases as an agent of invigoration and recreation.

A number of examples of printed history infusing oral culture are discernible. Thus local tradition in London knew the great building in Basing Lane as 'Gerrards Hall' after its supposed one-time inhabitant Gerard the Giant. When the curious John Stow went to investigate in the 1590s he was assured by the master of the house that the story was true and was advised to 'reade the great chronicles, for there he heard it'. This was a reference to the mention of Gerard in Harrison's *Historicall Description of the Island of Britaine* which in 1577 had been included in the first part of Holinshed's *Chronicles*. In the late seventeenth century, the clergyman White Kennett discovered the view among the inhabitants around Ot Moor in Oxfordshire that the Roman road, Akeman Street, had run north–south across the county between Wallingford and Banbury, when it actually ran east–west through Thame and on to Bath. The origin of this error he attributed to William Camden, who had indeed published it in the sixth edition of his *Britannia* in 1607, and now the misapprehension had 'resolv'd into the oral tradition of the common people'.

A good example of this process of 'feedback' is also evident in the tradition of the 'Danish yoke'. One of the most potent themes in the popular memories of the past in early modern England was a strong sense of the ravages and atrocities committed by the Danish armies during their occupation from the ninth century. Hundreds of communities up and down the country harboured traditions about battles once fought between local people and the brutal armies who oppressed them. Place-names and buildings, barrows and natural features of all sorts were explained in these terms. But it is doubtful that there was much continuous folk memory of such events passing in oral tradition.

---


from the time of their occurrence down to the seventeenth century when they are most plentifully recorded. Instead, the demonisation of the Danes seems to be a product quite specifically of the late fifteenth century. The historian John Rous may have been responsible for initiating it in his influential *Historia Regum Angliae*, which recounts the Danish conquest of Mercia. In the fields of his native Warwickshire he pointed to the red flowering dwarf elder (*Sambucus ebulus*), or walwort as it was popularly known, which marked the spots where blood had been shed. By the time that William Turner published his list of plant names in 1538, walwort was called for the first time danewort. By 1590 Camden was using the name ‘danes-bloud’ when he discovered it growing on the Bartlow Hills in Essex and found that the ‘country people’ knew it ‘by no other name’. It has been suggested that the etymological derivation of walwort from the Old English *wealh* could imply the shedding of foreign, or specifically Welsh, blood. Could it be that Rous, whose *Historia* was fulsomely dedicated to Henry VII, replaced the association of battle grounds long regarded as the scenes of victory over the old Welsh enemy with that of a new foe in order to flatter, or not to offend, his new Tudor master? If so, he may have instigated a rich theme in English folklore which was to last for at least two centuries.  

Credence to this theory is given by the fact that the famous Hocktide plays performed on the second Monday and Tuesday after Easter seem also to have become widely popular from the late fifteenth century. This drama, together with the processions led through towns, and symbolic fights enacted between men and women which commemorated the defeat of the Danes must have done much to create and keep alive these traditions.

Another equally ubiquitous series of traditions which the Tudor dynasty and the new technology of print did much to reinvent and nourish were those of King Arthur. The fabulous legends of Geoffrey

---


of Monmouth had been much popularised by the renaissance in chronicle and romance writing during the fifteenth century. Thomas Malory's *Morte d'Arthur*, completed in 1469, was first printed by Caxton in 1485 and would be reprinted in a further six editions by the mid-seventeenth century. It was under the Tudors, for whom Geoffrey's Welsh Arthur had particular appeal, that his myth reached the status of cult with the help of an outpouring of poetry, prose and drama.60 The dissemination of such literature was clearly widespread. The Elizabethan mason from Coventry, Captain Cox, was said to have a copy of 'king Arthurz book' in his remarkable little library of vernacular literature, while the 'book of king Arthures knights' was one that the 'poore husband-man' proposed to buy for his son in a tract of 1586. Whatever evidential basis there may have been for an historical Arthur figure, 'the many incredible stories that have been reported of this prince', lamented one contemporary, had long 'made his history little better than a romance'.61

The development of the broadside ballad must have been greatly influential in bringing the legend of Arthur to the widest possible audiences. *A pleasante history of an adventurus knighte of kynges Arthurs Couurte* was printed by Richard Jones in 1566. The great ballad-writer Thomas Deloney was responsible for *The noble Actes nowe newly found of Arthure of the round table* which was entered in the Stationers' register in June 1603. In 1598, Fynes Moryson was already describing the many monuments attributed to Arthur's name as 'famous among all ballad-makers'. 'Tis great pity', John Aubrey was later to lament, 'that so famous and great a worthie should have ever been abused, either by monkish verses, or vile painting in an alehouse.

Despite this view, however, Aubrey, who still believed that 'antiquaries, when they cannot meet with better authority, will not disdain to give an old ballad in evidence', borrowed Elias Ashmole's copy of Robert Laneharn's *A Letter* (1575), which contained a song said to be taken from 'king Arthurz book', and transcribed it into his *Monumenta*

---


Bell, and Clymme of the Clough, and such other old romances or historicall rimes. 65

The most famous of these, the rhymes of Robin Hood, were again not born so much of popular oral tradition as of the literary romances written for performance among the social elite. 66 But it was probably the widespread dissemination of his story in the famous Gест, which was reprinted several times during the sixteenth century, together with broadsides such as A ballett of Robyn Hod (1562), and the play-books informing mummings and May games, which was responsible for fixing the legend in its present form. 67 It also ensured the place of Robin in local folklore. For Robin Hood’s Bay is not known to have been so named before 1544 and his many ‘strides’, hills and mills, or the examples of his butts which are to be found in a least six counties of England, were probably attributed no earlier. 68 His famous well with accompanying chair at St Anne’s, about a mile to the north of Nottingham, is of similar date, while there is no reference to that by the side of the Great North Road between Doncaster and Pontefract before the first quarter of the seventeenth century. 69 Robin Hood’s grave at Kirklees in the West Riding was first noted by Richard Grafton in 1565. A generation later, the early fifteenth-century tomb of Elizabeth Fitz Walter in the church at Little Dunmow, Essex, was reinvented as the resting-place of Matilda the Fair, or Maid Marion, thanks to two plays by Anthony Munday, The Downfall of Robert, Earl of Huntingdon (1601) and its sequel The Death (1601), which ensured the currency of the fable well into the nineteenth century. It may also have been around


this time that the huge grave in Hathersage churchyard, Derbyshire, ‘with one stone set up at his head, and another at his feete, but a large distance between them’, was first ascribed to Little John, whereafter local people would show part of his bow hanging up in the church.70

Memories of the past in early modern England reflect the nature of this society as one in which oral and written tradition overlapped and interacted in reciprocal and mutually reinforcing ways. Verbal communication remained the medium through which knowledge was most often transmitted. A powerful quasi-autonomous oral tradition thrived at a time in which literacy levels were limited and popular culture could be highly parochial. And yet the influence of the written word, and increasingly of print, lay behind so much of this repertoire, informing it, structuring it and sustaining it. In this period, as for many centuries before, writing had supplemented and complemented the vernacular repertoire rather than necessarily undermining it. What began with the pen of a learned author could very quickly pass into the oral tradition of the people and even more quickly be assumed to be ancient. In 1812 Sir Walter Scott visited Rokeby. His guide, J. B. S. Morritt, observed that he ‘was but half satisfied with the most beautiful scenery when he could not connect it with some local legend, and when I was forced sometimes to confess ... “Story! God bless you! I have none to tell, sir” – he would laugh, and say, “then let us make one – nothing so easy to make as a tradition”’.71
