The Cambridge History of Libraries in Britain and Ireland

Edited by Elisabeth Leedham-Green, Teresa Webber

Book DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CHOL9780521781947

Online ISBN: 9781139055307

Hardback ISBN: 9780521781947

Chapter

23 - The libraries of the antiquaries (c. 1580–1640) and the idea of a national collection pp. 527-562

Chapter DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CHOL9780521781947.026

Cambridge University Press

23

The libraries of the antiquaries (*c.* 1580–1640) and the idea of a national collection

RICHARD OVENDEN

The libraries formed by the group of individuals known as antiquaries during the period 1580 to 1640 were of crucial importance for the long-term development of the great research collections of the modern period. They are, for this reason alone, worthy of consideration, but the study of these libraries illuminates other aspects of early modern society and culture, since the context in which they were formed, and the impact they made, impinged significantly on the political, religious, cultural and intellectual life of Britain. In order to shed light on these collections, the individuals who formed them, and the emergent concept of a national collection which they helped to develop and articulate, a number of questions arise concerning the contents of the collections, why and how they were acquired and the uses to which they were put. But before these questions are answered, we must first turn our attention to the antiquaries themselves, and what distinguished them from their contemporaries.

To be an antiquary in the period 1580 to 1640 was not be a member of a profession, or to belong to a specific sector of society, for individuals who could in some circumstances be described as antiquaries could also be described and categorised in different circumstances in other ways, such as noblemen, clerics, politicians or heralds. Although antiquity was not specifically a subject studied at university,[1] in general antiquaries were those who engaged in the study of antiquity, defined in Renaissance Britain as not only the classical past, but the classical and medieval periods together. To be an antiquary in early modern Britain meant engaging in a number of different kinds of activities, or betraying certain traits which, when identified, can help in determining those individuals during this time-span who could be so described.

1 L. Brockliss, 'Curricula', in H. De Ridder-Symoens (ed.), *A history of the university in Europe*, III: *Universities in the early modern age, 1500–1800* (Cambridge, 1996), 575–7; K. Thomas, 'The life of learning', *Proceedings of the British Academy* 117 (2001), 201–35.

Some of these activities and traits related to books, and were described by John Earle in his often quoted *Microcosmographie* of 1628. Antiquaries were, in his opinion, 'strangely thrifty of times past', they were 'enamour'd of old age', and loved 'all things . . . the better for being mouldy and worme-eaten', and he identified the antiquary as 'a great admirer . . . of the rust of old Monuments'. More specifically, Earle characterises an antiquary thus: 'a manuscript he pores on everlastingly, especially if the cover be all Moth-eaten'.[2]

There were a handful of individuals, however, who did earn their living by antiquarian activity. John Leland had been given an official title as King's Antiquary (or recorder of antiquities) by Henry VIII, and some of the royal librarians undertook activities which were those of an official antiquary in all but name. John Joscelyn was employed by Matthew Parker 'as one of his Antiquaries', to judge by an inscription in an ex-Parker manuscript (now Lambeth, MS 959).[3] The paradigm case, however, was that of Patrick Young, royal librarian, who was charged by James I 'to make a search in all cathedrals for old manuscripts and ancient records, and to bring an inventory of them to His Majesty'.[4] Young made catalogues of the contents of a number of English cathedral libraries. The visits he made and the catalogues he compiled were used to assist the transfer of books from the cathedral libraries to newer collections, including the royal collection itself, but Young was also responsible for alienating books from the royal collection. He made numerous gifts of royal library books to his fellow antiquaries, including James Montagu, Sir Robert Cotton, and a number of influential Scottish antiquaries, including James Reid, and Sir James Balfour of Denmilne, the Lyon King of Arms.[5] Heralds were another group of individuals whose living to some extent depended

2 C. E. Wright, 'The Elizabethan Society of Antiquaries and the formation of the Cottonian library', in Wormald and Wright, *English library*, 176.

3 J. P. Carley, 'The manuscript remains of John Leland, "The King's Antiquary"', *TEXT: Transactions of the Society for Textual Scholarship*, 2 (1985), 11–120; J. Evans, *A history of the Society of Antiquaries* (Oxford, 1956), 9. For the fate of Leland's own collections, see O. Harris, '"Motheaten, mouldye, and rotten": the early custodial history and dissemination of John Leland's manuscript remains', *BLR* 18 (2005), 460–501.

4 I. Atkins and N. R. Ker, *Catalogus librorum manuscriptorum bibliothecae Wigorniensis, 1622–1623, by Patrick Young* (Cambridge, 1944), 1–2. See also T. Webber, 'Patrick Young, Salisbury Cathedral manuscripts and the Royal Collection', *English Manuscript Studies 1100–1700* 2 (1990), 283–90; J. P. Carley, 'The royal library as a source for Sir Robert Cotton's collection: a preliminary list of acquisitions', in C. J. Wright (ed.), *Sir Robert Cotton as collector: essays on an early Stuart courtier and his legacy* (London, 1997), 208–29; J. Kemke (ed.), *Patricius Junius (Patrick Young), Bibliothekar der Könige Jacob I. und Carl I. von England: Mitteilungen aus seihem Briefwechsel* (Leipzig, 1898).

5 For Balfour see most recently I. C. Cunningham, 'Sir James Balfour's manuscript collection: the 1698 catalogue and other sources', *Edinburgh Bibliographical Society Transactions* 6/6 (1997–9), 191–255.

on antiquarian pursuits. Some of these men will be discussed in this chapter, but for the most part they are dealt with elsewhere (see above, chapter 20).

To be an antiquary implied both learning and constant study and curiosity. William Camden was described by a contemporary as 'our learned and studious Antiquarie'.[6] William Somner, registrar of the ecclesiastical courts in Canterbury, writing the preface to his *Antiquities of Canterbury* at the end of our period, outlined his motivation for writing the book:

> My thoughts and affections ever much inclined to the search and study of Antiquities, (to which also my particular calling did in some manner lead me) I have more particularly as bounde in duty and thankfulnesse, applyed my selfe to the Antiquities of Canterbury, the place of my birth and abode. And to me this was sufficient motive why I should of all other places desire to know the antiquities and former estate thereof.[7]

He goes on to describe the sources for his information: 'This work was chiefly collected from old Manuscripts, Leiger-Bookes and other Records of credit', and it is largely this process of collecting information in manuscript form that will make up the remainder of the discussion in this chapter.

The College of Antiquaries

Before the books and libraries are discussed in detail, it is necessary to provide a brief account of the development of the College or Society of Antiquaries, the most formal expression of antiquarian behaviour developed in this period.[8] The college began to meet in 1585 or 1586, according to John Spelman in his *The original of the four terms of the year* (London, 1614), attended by

> divers Gentlemen in London, studious of Antiquities [who] framed themselves into a College or Society of Antiquaries, appointing to meet every Friday weekly in the Term, at a place agreed of, and for Learnings sake to confer upon some Questions in that Faculty . . . The Society increased daily: many persons of great worth, as well noble as other learned, joining themselves unto it.[9]

6 William Warner, *Albion's England* (London, 1632), 351.
7 William Somner, *The antiquities of Canterbury* (London, 1640), sig. ** r.
8 For the following account see Evans, *Society of Antiquaries*; L. Van Nordern, 'Sir Henry Spelman on the chronology of the Elizabethan College of Antiquaries', *Huntingdon Library Quarterly* 13 (1950), 131–60; Wright 'Elizabethan Society of Antiquaries'; D. R. Woolf, *The social circulation of the past: English historical culture, 1500–1730* (Oxford, 2003), 162–3.
9 Quoted in Evans, *Society of Antiquaries*, 8–9.

After 1607 the College of Antiquaries vanished, despite a brief revival in 1614, the concept of the organisation having fallen foul of royal approbation.

Although there is no definitive list of members, we do know that most were knights, that almost all the rest were gentlemen, of whom there were twenty-one graduates of Oxford, and sixteen of Cambridge, and that there were no clergy. Many of the members had some connection either with the law or with the College of Heralds, and they bound themselves to consult only English sources in their deliberations. The legal profession was particularly prominent among the membership of the society: a number of scholars have drawn attention to the centrality of antiquarian investigation to the establishment of modern civil law, and, in turn, to the articulation of early modern political theory.[10] It is also worth mentioning that there were others connected with the Inns of Court and the legal profession who had active antiquarian interests, but who were not members of the College of Antiquaries – the Cornish Catholic Nicholas Roscarrock being one.[11] A record of the attenders at a meeting of the college in 1591 indicates the spread of interests and backgrounds among the members who participated: William Dethicke (Garter King of Arms), William Camden (Clarenceux King of Arms), William Fleetwood (recorder of London), Francis Thynne (who would become Lancaster Herald), Francis Tate (a lawyer), John Dodderidge (a judge), Thomas Talbot (clerk of the records in the Tower of London), Arthur Agarde (deputy chamberlain of the Exchequer), Henry Spelman (MP and lawyer), Sir Walter Cope (chamberlain of the Exchequer, and master of the Court of Wards); and John Stow and Robert Cotton, both of whom earned their living by a variety of means. The membership of the college changed over the period, but we know enough to be sure that the interests of the generality did not differ much from the examples cited above.

One striking feature which the members had in common was their interest in book-collecting, and in particular the collecting of manuscripts associated with the British medieval past. A crucial turning point in the history of the College of Antiquaries came in 1603, when they petitioned Elizabeth I for the foundation of both a library and an academy dedicated to the study of British antiquity (see below, 548–50), but the antiquaries also formed personal libraries. These took many forms. The defining characteristic common to all,

10 See especially R. J. Schoeck, 'The Elizabethan Society of Antiquaries and men of law', *Notes and Queries* (1954), 417–21; and J. G. A. Pocock, *The Ancient Constitution and the feudal law* (Cambridge, 1987).

11 N. Orme (ed.), *Nicholas Roscarrock's Lives of the saints: Cornwall and Devon*, Devon and Cornwall Record Society, n.s., 35 (Exeter, 1992), 5–7.

however, was the fact that most contained medieval manuscripts. These were largely volumes which had been in religious collections at the dissolution of the monasteries, but other kinds of documents such as charters, as well as printed books, were also collected. In addition to religious texts, historical works were considered especially important and valuable. Some collectors, however, had particular subject-areas where their acquisitions were focused: John Dee's scientific collections and Lord William Howard's illuminated books are two examples. Some collectors considered administrative documents as of equal if not greater importance to literary texts: thus Cotton, D'Ewes and Dering were responsible for saving large collections of medieval charters and cartularies from both religious and secular sources.

Some of these collections were very large, took many years to form, and became considerable resources for a wide variety of users. Sir Robert Cotton's is an extreme example, whose collection will be considered in some detail below (550–7), but there were other major collections of considerable size: those of Lord William Howard of Naworth (1563–1640), Sir Simonds D'Ewes (1602–50), Sir Edward Dering (1598–1644), and the Scottish collector Sir James Balfour of Denmilne (1600–57), for example, are significant for both their size and for the importance of some of the individual volumes. At the other extreme, many antiquaries, who existed in more modest financial and social circumstances, nonetheless formed small but significant collections – men such as the Welsh antiquary Jaspar Gryffyth (1568?–1614) and, from Kent, Sir Peter Manwood (d. 1625). What is distinctive about all these collections, however, is that they were deeply interconnected, the small with the large, the provincial with the metropolitan, the courtly with the professional. The networks of collecting, sharing, and exchanging for the purpose of sharing information, in terms of both reading and of the subsequent stage of copying, were often very complex, and can be hard to unravel, but understanding them is essential to explain the *mentalité* of the antiquaries, and on a more practical level, to explain the ways in which the collections were formed, used and dispersed.

As will be seen in the case of Sir Robert Cotton, the major antiquaries attracted circles of like-minded men. The humbler sort of antiquary could also operate in a similar way, however, and this activity often took place away from London, parliament and the court. One example of this can be found in the case of Sir Peter Manwood (1571–1625).[12] Manwood's library can be reconstructed

12 P. W. Hasler, *The history of Parliament: the House of Commons, 1588–1603*, 3 vols. (London, 1981), III. 14–15; H. R. Woudhuysen, *Sir Philip Sidney and the circulation of manuscripts, 1558–1640* (Oxford, 1996), 130–3; and L. A. Knafla, 'Sir Peter Manwood', *ODNB* XXXVI. 572–3.

only from evidence in surviving volumes. To judge from the remnants, it was a small but interesting group of medieval manuscripts, with perhaps an even more interesting group of fair manuscript copies largely of older manuscript exemplars, executed by a variety of individuals (and especially by his men of business, the brothers John and Henry Crispe). Of the older manuscripts, a small number were inherited from the collection of his father, Sir Roger Manwood, lord chief baron of the Exchequer under Elizabeth, including a collection of pieces on the claim of the English kings over France, which Peter 'founde the 26th of Marche 1605 of my fathers bookes'.[13] Sir Peter noted Camden's hand in the volume, and had it rebound soon after its reappearance. Sir Roger had several connections with Matthew Parker, and at least one volume, a copy of John Day's printed edition of *A testimonie of antiquitie*, seems to have been owned by Parker.[14] Some of his medieval manuscripts may share the same provenance. Peter Manwood also received volumes through gifts. His ownership of the Ashmole Bestiary (Bodleian, MS Ashmole 1511) contains Manwood's ownership inscription recording the gift of the volume from his friend William Man, on 3 August 1609.[15] The manuscript had probably been an East Anglian production, but in any case had been in the possession of William Wryght, vicar of Chepynge Wycombe, in 1550. Little is known about William Man other than that he was called to the Bar at the Middle Temple in 1605, that he served first as an official at the Court of King's Bench, and then as filazer for Kent, thus moving in circles which would have given him the opportunity to flatter Manwood in either a county or a court context. Manwood also received volumes from leading antiquaries, receiving a copy of John Stow's *Annales* from the author himself on 24 February 1601; in an inscription on the title page, Manwood refers to Stow as 'my freinde'.[16]

Manwood, as a local grandee in Kent, translated his antiquarian interests into his local Kentish setting, as well as indulging them as part of his London activities. Thus we have a group of writers such as Richard Knolles, Edward Grimestone and Thomas Menfeilde, all of whom received patronage from Manwood. Knolles wrote an influential *Generall historie of the Turkes* (1603), as well as translating Jean Bodin's *Six bookes of a commonweale* (1606), and at the same time was appointed by Manwood to the post of master of the school founded by his father at Sandwich. Knolles borrowed books from his patron to

13 Bodleian, MS Bodley 885.
14 Now BL, MS Add. 18160. I owe my knowledge of it to Henry Woudhuysen.
15 R. Poole, 'A MS from the Tradescant collection', *BQR* 6 (1931), 221–2.
16 Woudhuysen, *Circulation of manuscripts*, 131, n. 7. Stow also gave a copy of his *Survey of London* in 1598, which is now in the Folger Shakespeare Library.

help him complete both works. Four volumes of state papers were presented by Manwood to the Bodleian in 1620.[17] Menfeilde's annotations on a copy of Camden's *Britannia* given to him by Manwood reveal that the recipient thought of the donor as a Maecenas.[18]

Another antiquary who operated in both metropolitan and provincial contexts, and as the centre of distinct circles of fellow users and consumers of books, was Lord William Howard of Naworth.[19] Howard was not just a great collector of books, but a reader and annotator of them. He was a copyist of the records possessed by others, but also happy to open up his collections for the use of his immediate circle and other, more distant antiquaries. The evidence for these networks can be seen principally from annotations and marginalia found on volumes which survive from his collections. Lord William's own hand can be clearly identified in a number of instances: he often supplies chapter or sectional headings in a spiky, quasi-gothic hand, and more commonly, we find him making brief marginal notes, clearly intended to mark out the subject of a passage, in a careful italic. His interests can be clearly identified from these pithy summaries. Names of families and individuals predominate, although he also makes reference to other writers, or indeed to other manuscripts. Thus, in the unique copy of the life and passion of St William of Norwich (CUL, MS Add. 3037), we find neat little genealogies, and various dates in the margins. The second half of the manuscript is a copy of the first recension of the *Life and miracles of St Godric* by Reginald of Durham, and this has also been annotated by Howard, bringing to attention, for example, the passage referring to Godric's death in 1170.[20] His notes are quite often accurate, especially when citing the deaths of heads of religious houses or identifiable members of noble households. Occasionally his pen intervenes in a more substantial way. In BL, MS Arundel 11, for example, Howard created a form of index by repeating the supplied chapter headings. His hand does appear elsewhere in the manuscript, but this activity is clearly aimed at assisting the consultation of the volume on subsequent readings, either by himself or by others with access to his books.

17 One is in a handsome contemporary gilt-tooled centrepiece binding, now Bodleian, MS Bodley 966; see G. Barber, 'Notes on some English centre and corner piece bindings *c.* 1600', *Library*, 5th ser., 17 (1962), 93–5.

18 Maggs Catalogue 1121, no. 15.

19 G. Ornsby (ed.), *Selections from the household books of the Lord William Howard of Naworth Castle*, Surtees Soc. 68 (Durham, 1878); H. S. Reinmuth, 'Lord William Howard (1563–1640) and his Catholic associations', *Recusant History* 12 (1973–4), 226–34; D. Mathew, 'The library at Naworth', in D. Woodruff (ed.), *For Hilaire Belloc* (London, 1942), 117–30; and R. Ovenden and S. Handley, 'Lord William Howard', *ODNB* XXVIII. 452–4.

20 CUL, MS Add. 3037, fol. 159^{r}.

Other hands habitually appear in the margins and flyleaves of the volumes owned by Howard, not all of them positively identifiable. One of them is certainly that of Nicholas Roscarrock, who was a close companion of Howard's from the 1580s, and lived at Naworth after 1607.[21] Howard's factor, Thomas Widmerpoole, was also a man of learning, and annotated some of the manuscripts and printed books. Father Augustine Hungate, Howard's chaplain, would also have had access to the library at Naworth and may well be among the annotators. The others await further study.[22]

To whom outside this inner circle (focused on the Howard stronghold at Naworth) were the Howard collections made available? Cotton and Camden made use of Howard's manuscripts following their first contacts in London in the 1580s, when both were members of the College of Antiquaries.[23] They were certainly not alone. The antiquary and herald Francis Thynne examined material in Howard's collections in the 1590s, seeing one of the volumes of the Fountains cartulary, and notes on the funeral ceremonies of earls from an unidentified book in his possession.[24] The parliamentarian and collector Sir Simonds D'Ewes owned the cartulary of Bermondsey Priory which had been Howard's, possibly indicating a personal connection between the two.[25] Sir George Buc, master of the revels, was another literary figure to make use of the library, making reference to charters and other records seen in 'the cabinet of my good Lord, my Lord William Howard'.[26] James Ussher, a collector and antiquary of the 'first eleven', borrowed one of the four manuscripts of Aldhelm's letters, which he used for his edition, and his antiquities of the British church contains a reference to the Magna Tabula of Glastonbury Abbey, then in Howard's possession at Naworth.[27] In January 1639 Roger Dodsworth visited Howard in the north.

From the end of our period Sir Edward Dering can also be seen as a focus for both metropolitan and provincial collecting, exchanging and related

21 Orme, *Roscarrock's Lives of the saints* (1992).
22 The present author is preparing a comprehensive account of Howard and his circle.
23 There is no documentary evidence for Howard's being a member of the Society until 1617, when his name appears first on a list of those 'living persons fit to keep up and celebrate that Round Table', on a list presented to Buckingham in an attempt to revive the society, printed by Richard Gough in *Archaeologia* 1 (1770), xv–xix.
24 D. Carlson, 'The writings and manuscript collections of the Elizabethan alchemist, antiquary, and herald Francis Thynne', *Huntington Library Quarterly* 52 (1989), 214, 254.
25 BL, MS Harley 231: G. R. C. Davis, *Medieval cartularies of Great Britain* (London, 1958), no. 46.
26 Sir George Buc, *The history of King Richard the Third, 1619*, ed. A. N. Kincaid (Gloucester, 1979), 113.
27 J. Krochalis, 'Magna tabula: the Glastonbury tablets (part 1)', *Arthurian Literature* 15 (1997), 117–18. I owe this reference to James Carley.

antiquarian activity. In 1638, Dering, together with Sir Christopher Hatton, Sir Thomas Shirley and Sir William Dugdale, constituted themselves as a 'Society of Antiquaries' in imitation of the, by then, defunct organisation of the same name. Sharing information concerning original sources was at the heart of their agreement: 'that every one doe helpe and further each others studyes and endeavours by imparting and communicating . . . all such bookes, notes, deedes, rolles, etc., as he hath' and that 'every one do severally gather all observable collections w*hi*ch he can, concerning the foundation of any religious house, or castle, or publike worke, and all memorable notes for historicall illustration of this kingdome' and that 'every one do endeavour to borrowe of other strangers, with whom he hath interest, all such bookes, notes, rolles, deedes, etc., as he can obteyne'. Furthermore, the responsibilities of collecting and copying different classes of materials was divided up between the four men in order to make their activities more efficient.[28] Of the four, Dering was active as an antiquary throughout the period 1580 to 1640, and was the prime mover in the establishment of this society, which flattered its forebear, rather than being a serious attempt at revival. Dering's library has been studied to some degree, but still warrants a detailed examination.[29] Like most of the antiquaries, he owned a substantial reference library of printed books as well as extensive manuscript collections, and many of his printed books survive today, easily identifiable by both ownership inscriptions and armorial bookbindings. Dering was a great annotator of his books: his copy of the 1632 edition of John Guillim's *Display of heraldry*, now in Eton College Library, contains his extensive annotations, and his copy of Lodovico Beccadelli's *Vita Reginaldi Poli, Britanni* (Venice, 1563) shows his close reading of the text, and his ability to draw parallels between the historical events of the previous century and the effects of religious zeal in his own times.[30]

Like Cotton, Dering was educated at both Cambridge and the Middle Temple, and likewise, his dynastic ties were to country estates, with Dering's belonging to rural West Kent, but not far from Canterbury. His county associations, both to Canterbury and Dover, where he was lieutenant, greatly assisted his antiquarian efforts: his position as an antiquary was such that Dugdale referred to him as 'a most complete gentleman in all respects, and an excellent

28 L. B. L[arking], 'On the Surrenden charters', *Archaeologia Cantiana* 1 (1858), 55–9.

29 C. E. Wright, 'Sir Edward Dering: a seventeenth-century antiquary and his "Saxon" charters', in C. Fox and B. Dickens (eds.), *The early cultures of north-west Europe* (Cambridge, 1950), 369–93; and also N. H. Krivatsy and L. Yeandle, 'Books of Sir Edward Dering of Kent (1598–1644)', *PLRE* 4 (I. 137–269).

30 Patrick King, *Catalogue 16*, no. 2.

Antiquarye, and will in some things stand us in stead, out of his ritch treasurye of collections in that kynde'.[31] Dering sat in Parliament during the eventful years leading up to the English Civil War, and sided with the king. He probably owned around 2,000 printed books, and the subjects represented betray a number of interests, and include a passion for contemporary theatre, with many purchases of English dramatists, notably Shakespeare and Jonson, being recorded in his Booke of Expenses. His library also included sections on history, heraldry, genealogy, law, agriculture, education, mathematics, natural history, travel and medicine, as well as English, French and Italian literature. Dering's own deep political interest in contemporary religious debates is reflected in the large number of books on contemporary theological controversies, but his accounts record especially purchases of books on heraldry, both new and second-hand, and include a reference, for example, to the £18 he spent on heraldry books from the sale of the library of Ralph Brook, York Herald.[32]

Dering's collection of charters and manuscripts was of sufficient stature to rank him in the 'first eleven' of British antiquaries. Not only did he secure for Cotton a contemporary copy of Magna Carta from Dover Castle (see below, 537), but he also possessed a huge number of early charters, many of which passed into the Cottonian collection, others remaining at Surrenden until they were sold between 1861 and 1865,[33] although many of the pre-Conquest charters were acquired by the antiquary Thomas Astle in the eighteenth century.

Dering's manuscripts have long since been dispersed, but, although no significant contemporary list survives, many can be identified from inscriptions or armorial bindings. They include an important copy of Thorne's Chronicle of St Augustine's abbey (CUL, MS Add. 3578), and a copy of the *Historia Britonum*, probably the result of an exchange with Cotton (now National Library of Wales, MS Llanstephan 175), a cartulary from Christ Church, Canterbury, another from St Augustine's, and a fragment of a register from Dover Priory (BL, MSS Add. 25109, 46352, 26766), a twelfth-century glossed gospel of St John also from St Augustine's, a thirteenth-century French copy of the *Summa* of Raymundus de Pennafort (Bodleian, MSS Lyell 1 and Lyell empt. 3), a fifteenth-century Italian manuscript of Cornelius Nepos (now Harvard University Library, MS Lat. 1), a Wycliffite bible (London, British and Foreign Bible Society, MS Eng. 1, 2), and another Middle English manuscript (now JRUL, MS Eng. 92). The Dering Roll of Arms, now in the British Library, was one of

31 Krivatsy and Yeandle, 'Sir Edward Dering', 139.
32 Wright, 'Sir Edward Dering', 386.
33 The collection, estimated to include over 2,000 charters, as well as numerous printed books, was sold by Puttick and Simpson in four sales in their London rooms.

two manuscripts purchased from the antiquary Ralph Starkey in 1597, and he also owned an important Roll of Arms containing copies by Robert Glover, Somerset Herald (now Oxford, Queen's Coll., MS 158).[34] His pocket-book records copies of Joscelyn's Anglo-Saxon–Latin Dictionary and Laurence Nowell's *Vocabularium Saxonicum* (copied from originals in the Cottonian library), and a copy of Thomas Stubbs's Chronicles of the archbishops of York; a volume containing transcripts of Cinque Ports records, 1540–50, was sold recently.[35]

The antiquaries did not rely solely on interdependent collecting for the formation of their libraries. Other methods played their part. Those with access to the sites of medieval collections clearly had an advantage. The acquisition of manuscripts from these sites has been seen, to some extent, as an activity of the early phases of the dispersals: in the 1540s, and later in the 1560s. Books and other documents, especially charters, however, could be had by those with the ability to gain access to muniment rooms and other storage areas as late as the 1630s. Dr William Wats, for example, was carefully gathering evidence of manuscripts that had been removed from the muniment room at Canterbury Cathedral in the 1630s, and announced to the dean and chapter that he had discovered a trove of materials: 'For plainly gentlemen there are other manuscripts in the same nest which some time were your or the moncks' before you.'[36] Tantalisingly, Wats also referred in his letter to activities he undertook on behalf of Sir Robert Cotton in Cambridge 'some 20 yeares ago' (i.e. 1618). As we have seen, Sir Edward Dering had access to significant quantities of charters, many of which he passed on to Sir Robert Cotton. Most significant among these was a copy of Magna Carta which Dering gave to Cotton in 1630 and which he had discovered among the muniments of Dover Castle, a repository to which he had free access, as lieutenant of the castle, and to which he liberally helped himself.[37]

Dering was not the only collector of charters. Sir Simonds D'Ewes, another antiquary with a penchant for medieval manuscripts, amassed an enormous collection of deeds and charters, some from sources within his own family, but others from landowners with no interest in retaining ancient deeds, and others by acquisition *en bloc* from other sources: many hundreds of charters relating to Lincolnshire monastic houses came into his possession in the early

34 A. Wagner, *A catalogue of English medieval rolls of arms*, Harleian Society publications, 100 (Oxford, 1950), 14–16.

35 H. P. Kraus, *Catalogue 176*, no. 57.

36 C. E. Woodruff and W. Danks, *Memorials of the Cathedral Priory of Christ in Canterbury* (London, 1912), 393; N. Ramsay, 'The cathedral archives and library', in P. Collinson *et al.* (eds.), *A History of Canterbury Cathedral* (Oxford, 1995), 381.

37 Wright, 'Sir Edward Dering', 375–7.

1640s through a gift from Montagu Bertie, 2nd earl of Lindsey, and others came from gifts from the heralds Sir William Le Neve, Sir Richard St George and John Philpot in the 1630s. A further significant tranche came in 1628, when D'Ewes acquired the printed and manuscript collections of the recently deceased antiquary Ralph Starkey, which collection itself included a significant quantity of John Stow's own papers.[38]

Antiquaries gave and received books and manuscripts for a variety of reasons. One reason was to seek friendship or favour on behalf of the giver. Thomas Sparke, for example, gave a manuscript treatise on the Ten Commandments to John Sanford, a prebend of Christ Church, Canterbury, in 1622. Describing Sanford as 'a most worthy favourer of learning and lover of antiquities', Sparke gave the manuscript 'in regard of your care and good ende towards the preferment of my child in his learning'.[39] Sanford had been a prominent Oxford don in his time, teaching French, Italian and Spanish at Balliol and Magdalen, in addition to publishing grammars of Latin, Italian and Spanish.[40]

How were these libraries formed, and in particular what were the sources for the supply of medieval manuscripts to the libraries of the antiquaries? The period 1580 to 1640 witnessed the rise of the phenomenon of the second-hand trade in manuscripts. This particular aspect of the book trade has not been the subject of much concerted study, to some extent because the existing evidence for the activities of commercial booksellers in the trade in manuscripts is somewhat scant. Booksellers, of course, became interested in medieval manuscripts as soon as the Dissolution began to encourage the depopulating of libraries of the old learning. But for the most part, these manuscripts were acquired only to be broken up and used as all manner of waste material. By the middle of the century, however, the markets for these manuscripts changed. It became clear that there were those who placed a value on the intact material, and as a result some booksellers began to play a part in the preservation of manuscripts, as opposed to their destruction. Thus in 1574 John Dee acquired a manuscript 'from a stall in London'.[41] By the early seventeenth century a little more evidence becomes extant; here are just a few examples. Particularly active in this area was Stephen Potts, who gave manuscripts to St John's College,

38 A. G. Watson, 'Sir Simonds D'Ewes' collection of charters and a note of Sir Robert Cotton's charters', *Journal of the Society of Archivists* 2 (1962), 247–54; *The library of Sir Simonds D'Ewes* (London, 1966).
39 BL, MS Cotton Cleopatra A. v, fol. 13.
40 M. Feingold, 'The Humanities', in *HUO* IV. 271.
41 J. Roberts and A. G. Watson (eds.), *John Dee's library catalogue* (London, 1990), 17.

Oxford, and who also sold manuscripts to Sir Roger Twysden.[42] Even more important seem to have been Laurence Sadler and Cornelius Bee, both of whom acted as suppliers of quite important manuscripts for figures such as Archbishop Laud, Sir Roger Twysden and Sir Simonds D'Ewes.[43] Scipio Le Squyer patronised Launcelot Toppyn, another London dealer, who had access to medieval manuscripts which had been at Exeter in the middle ages.[44] In 1628, moreover, we have a list returned to the Privy Council of thirty-nine dealers in 'old libraries, mart bookes or any other'.[45]

The rise in the number of booksellers dealing, or to some extent specialising, in medieval manuscripts naturally went hand in hand with a rise in the commercial values attached to such books. William Wats, a Canterbury cleric, wrote in 1638 that he had seen a 'book of the Obites and particular places of burialls of the Priors' and that 'The Bookseller asked me 20s for it, which I being loth to give, and fearing to buye lest you should have said I found it amongst Dr Sympson's books'.[46]

The activities of Lord William Howard also betray some evidence of the liveliness of the second-hand trade in manuscripts. In 1589, Howard's busiest year for acquiring manuscripts (to judge by his dated ownership inscriptions), he purchased the Arundel or Eadui Psalter from John Proctor, who had a shop on Holborn Bridge. On only one manuscript does he appear to have written the price he paid for the book: £5 for a collection of Irish medical texts, now MS Arundel *333* in the British Library. In 1628 we find Howard paying 7s for 'an olde manuscript and 2 other bookes . . . bought at Worcester',[47] one of the few hints we have that Howard was actively pursuing manuscripts outside of London and his network of like-minded scholars and antiquaries, although which book the comment refers to is not known. By and large Howard seems to have had a lengthy relationship with the London trade for printed books. Throughout the seventeenth century he patronised London booksellers, and in the 1620s and 1630s he gave a good deal of custom to Humphrey Robinson, a bookseller

42 Potts sold a manuscript of Jacobus de Voragine, *Legenda aurea*, to Twysden in 1626 (now BL, MS Stowe 49). R. W. Hunt, 'Donors of manuscripts to St John's College Oxford during the presidency of William Laud 1611–1621', in R. W. Hunt, I. G. Philip and R. J. Roberts (eds.), *Studies in the book trade in honour of Graham Pollard*, Oxford Bibliographical Society publications, n.s., 18 (Oxford, 1975), 68.

43 M. A. F. Borrie, 'The Thorne Chronicle', *British Museum Quarterly* 31 (1966–7), 87–90.

44 R. Ovenden, 'Scipio Le Squyer and the fate of monastic cartularies in the early seventeenth century', *Library*, 6th ser., 13 (1991), 325.

45 W. W. Greg, *A companion to Arber* (Oxford, 1967), 40–1.

46 Woodruff and Danks, *Memorials*, 393.

47 G. Ornsby (ed.), *Selections from the household books of Lord William Howard of Naworth*, Surtees Soc. 68 (Durham, 1878), 244.

at the Three Pigeons, St Paul's Churchyard, and one of the most important figures in the London trade. In 1620 we find no less a figure than William Laud purchasing manuscripts from George Loftus, a London bookseller. Laud also purchased manuscripts from his neighbour at Croydon, Daniel Harvey, a merchant, amounting to the substantial sum of £50 in 1638.[48]

One question remains about the operation of the book trade in making medieval collections available – that of the dispersal of large collections. The death of John Dee in 1609 produced a great dispersal of important manuscripts and printed books, many of which were to be found in the collections of other antiquaries soon after Dee's death. How did they get there? What is clear from the work of Julian Roberts and Andrew Watson is that Patrick Saunders and John Woodall, who had come by the largest remnant of the Dee library, had recourse to a bookseller in London – possibly identifiable with John White in Little Britain, a prominent stationer who was involved with the Latin trade – and it is possibly he who marked many of the Dee books with a cipher. Certainly, from the accounts of Sir Simonds D'Ewes, it is clear that a number of Dee's books were being sold in 1625 and early 1626, at least two groups being marked in his accounts as 'Ex Bibliotheca Joh Dee Doctoris 1626'.[49]

One aspect of the collecting activities of the antiquaries which should be considered as culturally significant is the emerging interest in and appreciation of medieval art, which can be detected through their libraries. Ascribing 'modern' notions of concepts so notoriously difficult as aesthetics, taste and appreciation to Renaissance individuals is a dangerous area to become involved with, but some of the libraries of contemporary antiquarian collectors display such a remarkable array of significant examples of medieval art that it would be misleading to ignore it altogether.

The collections of Lord William Howard are particularly revealing in this regard. Of the books which Howard possessed, we see some of the most significant examples of late medieval English illumination, and several examples of highly important work from earlier periods. Howard possessed the Gospels of Queen Margaret of Scotland, for example, a small but highly significant gospel lectionary of the mid-eleventh century (Bodleian, MS Lat. liturg. f.5), and possibly identifiable with one of the five gospel books regarded as relics in a late fourteenth-century inventory of the books at Durham Cathedral Priory. It is not a *de luxe* book, but it does have a group of illustrations – portraits of the four evangelists – and, given its Scottish royal and Durham monastic

48 H. O. Coxe, *Laudian Manuscripts*, ed. R. W. Hunt (Oxford, 1973), xxvii, xxxiii.
49 Roberts and Watson, *Dee's library*, 64–5.

provenance, is a book of considerable significance. The manuscript was one of five in Howard's library which had been previously owned by John Stow. There have been serious claims made for Stow to have been, like Howard, a Catholic, but a shared passion for the past would have been enough to cement the friendship of the two, and certainly enough for them to have exchanged manuscripts as fellow members of the College of Antiquaries.[50] Howard also acquired the manuscript now known as the Arundel or Eadui Psalter (BL, MS Arundel 155). Originally written in the second quarter of the eleventh century, in both Latin and Anglo-Saxon, with the text altered to Gallican use after the Conquest, it is one of a number of manuscripts written by the scribe Eadui Basan, a monk at Christ Church, Canterbury.[51] It is illustrated with a combination of line-drawings and a single full-page miniature carefully executed in full colour and gold, illustrating Eadui holding the psalter at the feet of St Benedict. From Howard's inscription in the volume we know that he purchased the book in 1592. With such significant Christ Church connections, the book would undoubtedly have had a value among the antiquaries of the late sixteenth century as a historical document from the latter stages of the Anglo-Saxon period, but such a beautiful book – the Caroline minuscule is as much an element of its aesthetic value as the illustrations – seems to have avoided the fate of the extensive annotation which befell Howard's other manuscripts.

From the high middle ages, Howard's collection included three of the most important English examples of the illuminator's art. Two of these passed down through the Fitzalan and Howard families, and, given his own regard for the Howard name, their presence raises no eyebrows. The Luttrell Psalter (BL, MS Add. 42130) is one of the most famous of all English medieval manuscripts, known chiefly for the astonishing marginal illustrations by five different artists, which convey a strange and bizarre picture of medieval life.[52] It descended through the Fitzalan family to Mary Fitzalan, who married Lord William's father, from whom Lord William no doubt inherited the volume. Another important work of medieval art with family connections is that now known as the Howard-Fitton Psalter, which is, like Luttrell, now in the British Library (MS Arundel 83, pt 1). This is an important early

50 R. Gameson, 'The Gospels of Margaret of Scotland and the literacy of an eleventh-century queen', in L. Smith and J. H. M. Taylor (eds.), *Women and the book: assessing the visual evidence* (London, 1996), 149–71. For Stow's Catholicism see I. W. Archer, 'John Stow, citizen and historian', in I. Gadd and A. Gillespie (eds.), *John Stow (1525–1605) and the making of the English past* (London, 2004), 20–1.

51 M. Gibson, T. A. Heslop and R. W. Pfaff (eds.), *The Eadwine Psalter: text, image, and monastic culture* (London, 1992).

52 J. Backhouse, *The Luttrell Psalter* (London, 1989).

fourteenth-century manuscript, written and illuminated in East Anglia. The manuscript contains, in addition to its superb illumination, the arms of the Howard family juxtaposed with those of Fitton, probably referring to Lord William's ancestors Sir William Howard and his wife, Alice Fitton. Given these firm family connections, it seems likely that this volume also remained within the Howard family, passing down to Lord William on the death of his father. The same cannot be said for the manuscript which is today bound inside the same covers as the Howard-Fitton Psalter, namely that masterpiece of early fourteenth-century illumination, the De Lisle Psalter (fols. 117–35^{v}). De Lisle, unlike its close neighbour, bears no apparent connection with the Howard family. Codicologically, and palaeographically, the two manuscripts can be shown to have been originally separate. De Lisle is considerably the smaller of the two, now consisting of only nineteen folios, as opposed to the 116 of the Howard Psalter. Howard was not prone to dismembering his own books, unlike many of his contemporaries, Cotton in particular. Furthermore, Howard-Fitton is the larger of the two manuscripts, a fact that whoever had them bound together respected, as to have trimmed it down to the size of De Lisle would have been an act of serious vandalism.[53] The De Lisle Psalter certainly outshines the Howard-Fitton Psalter in the quality of the remaining illumination. The twenty-four illustrations, all large miniatures, comprise a narrative cycle of the life of Christ and a group of theological diagrams and pictorial moralities. The text is lost, suggesting forcefully that whoever preserved what remains did so on account of the quality and beauty of the illuminations. Was Lord William responsible for the pairing? This is suggested by the separate, dated ownership inscriptions on the two manuscripts: on Howard-Fitton, 1591, and on De Lisle, 1590. De Lisle's original recipients were nuns at the Gilbertine house at Chicksands in Bedfordshire. The house was dissolved in 1538, the lands passing through the Snowe and Osborne families, neither of which appears to have any connection with the Howards; it may have been acquired by Lord William through the trade. Given that De Lisle seems to have been acquired first, probably in a fragmentary state, from an unknown source, it seems highly likely that Howard bound the book up with the Howard-Fitton Psalter, and in so doing displayed an understanding and appreciation of the stylistic affinities of these two *de luxe* books. Such a scenario must of course remain conjecture – and indeed it is equally possible that the two manuscripts were bound together in the early seventeenth century, when they were acquired by Howard's nephew Thomas Howard, 2nd earl of

53 L. F. Sandler, *The Psalter of Robert De Lisle in the British Library*, rev. edn (London, 1999).

Arundel, who not only had a sophisticated appreciation of art, but employed a librarian, Franciscus Junius, who may have had a hand in binding books in the Arundel collection (see below, 544).[54]

The nature of Howard's attitude to these books was probably a mixture of several different motives. The presence of the Howard-Fitton and Luttrell Psalters may easily be explained as the evidence of descent through the family, but their preservation within the collection, and the additional presence of other illuminated manuscripts which were undoubtedly purchased, and the fact that all were kept free from the kind of annotation that is a characteristic of other volumes, suggest that some element of appreciation of the books as works of art was present in his consciousness. We must not, however, forget that the English recusants played a major role in the physical preservation of sacred objects. Not only books, but other artefacts were preserved, most famously the body of St Chad and the Syon cope.[55] Howard, too, played his part in this. The Langdale Rosary, a late medieval English rosary of gold with enamelled panels now in the Victoria and Albert Museum, is one example. The piece is connected to both Lord William and Nicholas Roscarrock, who had beads added to the piece with depictions of both St Endelient, a Cornish saint, and St William of Norwich, to whom Howard appears to have held a special devotion, as he owned one of the most important manuscripts of the life of William, now in Cambridge University Library.[56] Howard also had the ornate ceiling transferred from Kirkoswald Castle and placed in his own library room at Naworth – behaviour which further indicates aesthetic appreciation, as well as a taste for medieval heraldry. Given his ownership of altars and inscribed stones from Hadrian's Wall, we can perhaps build a picture of a collector, and one with multiple motives lying behind the basic impulse to collect. It is tempting to conjecture, given the variety of his collections, that Howard was partaking in that aristocratic habit of withdrawing from the world into a place occupied with uncommon objects: books, jewellery, coins and stones (for example), which reflect his own multi-faceted interest in, and relationship with, the past.[57]

One other example can be identified which strengthens the argument for identifying the period 1580 to 1640 as the birth of appreciation of medieval

54 D. Howarth, *Lord Arundel and his circle* (New Haven, CT, 1985).
55 D. Rogers, 'The English recusants: some mediaeval literary links', *Recusant History* 23 (1997), 485–6.
56 Orme, *Roscarrock*, 11–12; R. W. Lightbown, *Medieval European jewellery* (London, 1992), 526–8.
57 A. Emery, *Greater medieval houses of England and Wales, 1300–1500*, I: *Northern England* (Cambridge, 1996), 233–5.

books as works of art. Some of Sir Robert Cotton's practices with the volumes he has bound up show an aesthetic sensibility at work. For example, Cotton occasionally identified his books in his own catalogues as being beautiful, normally referring to decoration or illumination rather than to script. He also wrote about books that he had seen and to which he took a liking – partly because of their decoration. More tellingly, Cotton was frequently to be found removing decorated leaves from highly illuminated manuscripts (often psalters and other liturgical books) to be found homes in undecorated volumes as frontispieces; such acts were not normally undertaken without thought by Cotton, for he clearly had an eye for the significance of iconography, provenance or decorative schemes both in the inserted leaves and in the places where they were inserted. Clearly, the inserts and the recipients were consciously and carefully chosen to complement one another. Such actions are not normally regarded as the behaviour of the connoisseur, but examples of artistic appreciation from this period are scarce: Cotton's behaviour, if we can see beyond our twenty-first-century sensibilities, can be identified with fledgling aesthetic judgements.[58]

At the very end of our period emerges the first clearly identifiable connoisseur of medieval and Renaissance illumination, in the person of Thomas Howard, 2nd earl of Arundel, the nephew, as has already been noted, of Lord William Howard.[59] Arundel's collection, partly inherited from his uncle, became one of the greatest in England, and must be seen as one facet of a much broader and equally impressive collecting strategy, ranging from architectural drawings to antique sculpture (the famous 'Arundel Marbles', now in the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford). In the 1630s, Arundel became the head of a diplomatic mission to Nuremberg, and there acquired the library of the great Renaissance collector Wilibald Pirckheimer, which included a number of books illustrated by Dürer. The most significant example of illumination in the Arundel collection, however, was the Gritti/Arundel Psalter, which was given to Arundel by Francesco Barberini's secretary Cassiano dal Pozzo, who was closely attuned to Arundel's collecting interests – the book was therefore a supremely well-chosen diplomatic gift. Although he cannot be regarded as specifically an antiquary, Howard as a courtier and officer of the state did encourage antiquarian activity (through employment of Franciscus Junius as his own librarian, promoting the antiquarian work of the artist and printmaker

58 M. Brown, 'Sir Robert Cotton, collector and connoisseur?', in M. P. Brown and S. McKendrick, *Illuminating the book: makers and interpreters: essays in honour of Janet Backhouse* (London, 1998), 281–98.

59 Howarth, *Lord Arundel*.

Wenceslaus Hollar, and financing the research of Selden and others on the Arundel Marbles). The combination of Arundel as antiquary, collector and connoisseur can therefore allow him to be identified as the heir of the generation of Howard and Cotton, and the prototype of the 'modern' collectors that were to follow.[60]

An integral part of building the collections of antiquaries was the exchange of originals for the purpose of obtaining copies. Until the recent work of Henry Woudhuysen and Peter Beal, this particular aspect of collecting has not been widely recognised.[61] There is much evidence to demonstrate this kind of activity as being integral to the development of the libraries of antiquaries during this period. Peter Manwood, for instance, regularly borrowed manuscripts from his fellow antiquaries, and the fair copies survive: a copy of the English translation of Camden's *Britannia* by Richard Knolles; he borrowed Stow's original of the life of Henry V; and in the letter from Manwood to Cotton already referred to, there is mention of Manwood 'writing oute of an oulde booke, but itt goeth forward slowely because of ye ould hande out of use with us'.[62] The Society of Antiquaries established by Dering, Dugdale and others in 1638 had copying as a central facet of its activities, and we know a good deal about Dering's own antiquarian methods, thanks to the copies he made of his substantial collection of charters, long since dispersed, but often relating closely to his relationship with Cotton, to whom he would send the originals of his Saxon charters 'as fast as I can coppy them'.[63] Ussher recommended 'Mr Thomas Downes, stationer' as a copyist 'who dwelleth at White Hart Court in Warwick Lane'.[64]

Exchanges also took place of original manuscripts. Sir Robert Cotton and Sir Simonds D'Ewes, for example, shared a manuscript from Dee's library in 1626, probably as part of an exchange of manuscripts between the two, and passed some of these parts on to Thomas Allen of Oxford.[65] The Welsh antiquary

60 D. Jaffé *et al.*, 'The earl and countess of Arundel: Renaissance collectors', *Apollo* 164/414 (August 1996), 24–6; H. G. Fletcher *et al.*, *The Wormsley Library* (London, 1999), 62–7; R. Ovenden, 'Thomas Howard, second [=14th] earl of Arundel', in W. Baker and K. Womack (eds.), *Pre-nineteenth-century British book collectors and bibliographers* (Detroit, 1999), 155–63.

61 Woudhuysen, *Circulation of manuscripts*, 116–33; P. Beal, *In praise of scribes: manuscripts and their makers in seventeenth-century England* (Oxford, 1998).

62 BL, MS Lansdowne 85, fol. 185^{r}.

63 These volumes are now BL, MSS Add. 5481, Add. 43471, Stowe 853 and Stowe 924: see Wright, 'Sir Edward Dering', and B. S., 'A Dering Manuscript', *British Museum Quarterly* 8 (1933–4), 26–7, citing the letter from Dering to Cotton (BL, MS Cotton Julius C. iii, fol. 143^{r}).

64 C. R. Elrington (ed.), *The whole works of the Most Rev. James Ussher, DD* (1847–64), xvi. 46–7.

65 A. G. Watson, 'A Merton College manuscript reconstructed', *BLR* 9 (1976), 207–17.

Jaspar Gryffyth regularly borrowed books from Cotton, and on one occasion in 1613 sent him a lot of over forty manuscripts from his own collection for borrowing in return. Gryffyth was clearly anxious to demonstrate that he also was a serious collector, who had items worth borrowing, no doubt to maintain access to Cotton's burgeoning library: 'I would gladlie knowe wherin I might anyway gratifie you & requite in some measur your greate kindnesse'.[66]

Not surprisingly, such a situation conspired to encourage not only circles of antiquaries working closely together, bound by ties of religion, family and shared interest, but also rivalry, envy and suspicion. The evidence for these aspects of collection-building is scant, but there are hints to be found. In a letter from Sir Peter Manwood to Sir Robert Cotton, for example, he asks Cotton 'to please remember me for H. the 8. Lyff wch I exsedingly desire to reade. I will keepe itt p*r*ivatt to my self',[67] which suggests that Cotton himself might be anxious not to let others have access to the volume. Likewise the death of antiquaries and collectors also created the opportunity for competitive instincts to come to the surface among the antiquaries of early seventeenth-century London. In his autobiography, D'Ewes described the size and importance of the collection, formed by a man for whom D'Ewes himself had few kind words to say, while he nonetheless 'had an earnest desire to buy the librarie, but mine owne wants, and diuers other men being about the acquiring of it likewise made mee feare I should misse of it'.[68] The Society of Antiquaries formed by Dering, Hatton, Shirley and Dugdale drew up clauses which insisted that their rough copies 'be not imparted to any stranger without the g*enera*ll consent of this society'.[69]

Many antiquaries, especially those from titled families, were able to acquire materials from within their own family. Simonds D'Ewes, for instance, wrote to Dering in 1633 complaining that he could not get 'the great harvest of old deedes touching my wives seuerall families out of the Ladie Tracies hands'.[70] Lord William Howard was able to benefit from family connections to acquire books, such as the Luttrell and Howard-Fitton Psalters noted above. Of course, his connections were rather better than most of his fellow countrymen, so this was a considerable advantage. Several printed books have a dated *ex libris* of Lord William's father, the 4th duke of Norfolk. The Yale copy of Upton's *De officio*

66 R. Ovenden, 'Jaspar Gryffyth and his books', *BLJ* 20 (1994), 107–39.
67 BL, MS Lansdowne 85, fol. 185^{r}. The manuscript may be BL, MS Cotton Vespasian B. xvii: C. G. C. Tite, *The early records of Sir Robert Cotton's library: formation, cataloguing, use* (London, 2003), 178.
68 Watson, *Library of Sir Simonds D'Ewes*, 24.
69 L[arking], 'Surrenden charters', 56.
70 Watson, 'Sir Simonds D'Ewes' collection', 248.

militari has the inscription of Henry Fitzalan, 12th earl of Arundel, one of the greatest book-collectors of the sixteenth century, and was presumably acquired by Howard through the same route. In the early stages of the production of the 1607 edition of the *Britannia*, Camden was forced to hold up the printing, as his friend Lord William Howard of Naworth, 'for the love that he beareth the studies of antiquity, willingly imparted unto me the Manuscript Annales of Ireland . . . which I thought good to publish'.[71] The volume (Bodleian, MS Laud Misc. 526) had been acquired by his grandfather, Thomas Howard, 2nd earl of Surrey, Henry VIII's viceroy in Ireland, and Lord William no doubt acquired the volume through family descent. He also owned two other Irish manuscripts, both collections of Irish medical texts, but they appear not to have come to him by the same route.

Howard seems to have been particularly close to his uncle Henry Howard, the earl of Northampton. Northampton, too, was deeply interested in literature, learning and antiquarian pursuits. After his death, the majority of Northampton's books were acquired by his nephew Thomas Howard, 2nd earl of Arundel, in 1615 for £529. But not everything passed in this direction. Of particular importance are the five volumes of Northampton's commonplace books, four of which are with the remnants of the Howard library now at Durham; one strayed with part of the Howard estate papers and is now at Castle Howard. As with his medieval illuminated manuscripts, Lord William resisted the temptation to annotate the books, leaving them reverentially alone. Further evidence of this respect is the fact that Lord William purchased one of the most important pieces of English Renaissance silverware from Northampton's estate (of which he was an overseer and a financial beneficiary) for £7 12s. The item in question is known as the Howard Grace Cup, and is now in the Victoria and Albert Museum. It is hallmarked 1525–6, but encompasses an ivory bowl which tradition has ascribed to Thomas Becket.[72]

The acquisition of the Dacre estates in the late sixteenth century also brought new sources of books. One case in point is the Lanercost cartulary, missing since the eighteenth century, but now safely residing in the Cumbria County Record Office. Lanercost, a short stroll from Naworth Castle, had been granted to the Dacres after the Dissolution, and many of the outbuildings had been appropriated by the family for residential purposes. Cartularies, of course, tended to be transferred along with the lands which they document, and so the Dacres would have taken possession of the cartulary of

71 William Camden, *Britannia* (London, 1607), 794.

72 L. Levy Peck, *Northampton: patronage and policy at the court of James I* (London, 1982); P. Glanville, *Silver in Tudor and early Stuart England* (London, 1990), 394–7.

the Augustinian Priory at Lanercost at the same time as they acquired the priory buildings and the lands which had accrued to it since its foundation in 1169.

The idea of a national collection

Despite, or perhaps because of, the multitude of substantial private collections of antiquaries, and the frequent and significant interaction between them during this period, a number of these individuals recognised the need for a 'national' collection. In 1602 or early 1603, three prominent members of the Society or College of Antiquaries – Sir Robert Cotton, Sir James Ley and John Dodderidge – drew up a petition which was presented to Elizabeth I outlining 'A proiect touching a petition to be exhibited vnto her maiesty for the erecting of her library and an Academy'.[73]

The scheme focused on preserving what the antiquaries regarded as the memory of the nation, and embraced both the formation of a collection, governed by specific collection development policies, and the arrangements for the continued management of it, alongside proposals to develop an 'Accademye for the studye of Antiquity and Historye' which they hoped would be populated with persons 'studious of antiquitie for the better preservation of the said Library & encrease of knowledge in that behalfe'. The forming of a central repository for materials crucial to the nation's past was at the heart of the proposal: they highlighted 'divers old bookes concerninge mater of history of this Realme originall Charters & monuments' which they regarded as needful of preservation, for these materials are 'rare & . . . otherwise maye perishe'. Numerous examples are cited: 'their ar divers & sundry monuments worthe observation whearof the orygynall is extant in the hands of some privat gentleman & allso divers others excellent monumentes whearof there is no record now extant which by theise meanes shall have publick & salfe [*sic*] custody for vse when occasion shall serve'. Furthermore, the public good is not being served, for 'there are divers treatises published by auctoryte for the satisfaction of the world in divers matters publicke which after they are by publik auctoryte prynted & dispersed they do so after som tym become

73 The petition is found in two copies in the Cottonian collection (MSS Faustina E. v (fols. 89–90) and Titus B. v (fol. 210)). The text was printed in part by Richard Gough in his preface to *Archaeologia* 1 (1777), i–xxix, and completed by J. Ayloffe in his edition of Thomas Hearne's *Collection of curious discourses* (London, 1771), 324. The most recent and accessible printing is to be found in N. Barker (ed.), *Treasures of the British Library* (London, 1996), 43.

very rare for that there is no publick preservation of historye & Antiquity of which the vniversityes being busyed in the artes tak little care or regard'. The centralisation of these manuscripts should also include material at present in the royal library, which was known to be in the doldrums during Elizabeth's reign.[74] One of the clauses of the petition therefore suggested 'that it may please her Maiesty to bestow out of her gratious library sutche & so many of her bookes concernying history & Antiquity as yt shall please her highnes to graunt for the better furnishing of this library'.

The benefits of such a scheme are not detailed in the petition, but from some of the clauses we can see that the antiquaries clearly felt that such a state-driven development could derive clear benefits for the state. The members of the academy would be 'enabled to do vnto her Maiesty & the Realme sutche service as shall be requisite for their place', and they were quick to point out that such persons would be above reproach in terms of loyalty: 'none shall be admitted . . . except that he take the othe of the Supremacy'. The petitioners were anxious that the deliberations of the academy should be flexible enough to allow for the members to be able to indulge their own curiosities without fear or suspicion from the state, but indeed for the state's long-term benefit: 'To this corporation may be added the Study of forreyn modern Tongues of the nations our neighbors Countryes & regard of their historyes & state whereby this Realm in a short tyme may be furnished with sundry gentlemen enabled to do her Maiesty & the realme service as agentes or otherwise to be Imployed.'

By this final strategically placed suggestion that the knowledge to be derived from antiquarian and related studies could be placed at the state's disposal, especially in relation to foreign affairs, the petitioners were clearly hoping that Elizabeth's own sense of her vulnerable international position would lead to a favourable answer. The end result is clear: no such endeavour was embarked upon, but the reasons for inaction are less obvious. As no formal reply has survived, some have doubted whether the petition was ever formally delivered, suggesting that the copies in the Cottonian collection are merely drafts.[75] If the petition was presented, then it is also clear that it was drafted for Elizabeth, in the last year of her reign, but that it probably remained for James VI and I to consider a response. The inaction can be explained in a variety of ways. The Scottish king had little knowledge of antiquaries, and therefore no reason to favour their proposals. He also had reason to dislike the

74 Birrell, *English monarchs and their books* (London, 1987), 24–6.
75 Barker, *Treasures*, 42–4.

suggestion that the royal library be dismembered; not only was James scholarly, but he brought his own librarian, Peter Young (later to be succeeded by his son Patrick), down from Scotland with him.[76] More importantly, the strategic value of the academy and its library disappeared with James's attempts to cease the war with Spain.[77]

Whatever the reasons, the attempt of the antiquaries to establish a national collection and an academy of scholars to go alongside it failed. But, perversely, a by-product of this failure can be perceived to be the creation of the most important private collection of the seventeenth century, for Sir Robert Cotton went on from the failure of the petition to amass what would in the eighteenth century be one of the founding collections of the Britain's national library itself.

The library of Sir Robert Cotton

The library of Sir Robert Cotton is of pivotal importance in the history of libraries, not just of the period 1580 to 1640 (a period which, in fact, spans Cotton's own career in collecting), or indeed of the seventeenth century as a whole, but in the history of libraries *per se*. Cotton's collection is so vast, and the materials it contains so important for such a wide range of studies, that the collection itself to some extent still defies a single comprehension. Indeed, Cotton himself was a man of such diverse interests and activities that, until Kevin Sharpe's monograph of 1979, he had not been the subject of a comprehensive biographical study. Fortunately, the Cottonian collection received a good deal of scholarly attention in the latter part of the twentieth century, and as a result it is now possible to attempt to place Cotton and his library in the context of the antiquarian movement and the libraries of the antiquaries in the period 1580 to 1640.[78]

Cotton is one of the more difficult antiquaries of this period to categorise. Born in 1571 into gentry stock, he would, had he been of a different

76 Birrell, *English monarchs*, 26–30.

77 S. Adams, 'Spain or the Netherlands?', in H. Tomlinson (ed.), *Before the English Civil War* (London, 1983).

78 See especially Wright, 'Elizabethan Society of Antiquaries'; K. Sharpe, *Sir Robert Cotton, 1586–1631: history and politics in early modern England* (Oxford, 1979); C. C. G. Tite, *The manuscript library of Sir Robert Cotton* (London, 1994); the contributions to C. J. Wright (ed.), *Sir Robert Cotton as collector: essays on an early Stuart courtier and his legacy* (London, 1997); G. Parry, *The trophies of time: English antiquarians of the seventeenth century* (Oxford, 1995); and, most recently, Tite, *Early records of Sir Robert Cotton's library*. The following account of Cotton is particularly indebted to the published and unpublished contributions and friendship of Colin Tite, the doyen of all Cotton scholars.

temperament, perhaps have been satisfied with a life managing his inherited estates. But thanks to a series of influences during Cotton's education, he was spurred with an extraordinary impetus to embark on a life of antiquarian pursuits. The first of these occurred during his time at Westminster School, where William Camden had recently been appointed master and was working toward the first edition of his *Britannia*. Camden and Cotton were to remain close friends for the rest of their lives. From Westminster School Cotton went up to Jesus College, Cambridge, where Richard Bancroft was a tutor, prior to his taking up a post at St Paul's Cathedral and eventually appointment to the see of London. Bancroft, a serious book-collector, although not an antiquary, may have exerted an early influence on Cotton, but some of the Cambridge contacts he made were more tangible.[79] More significantly, Cotton entered the Middle Temple in 1588. As we have seen, the College of Antiquaries, founded just a few years earlier, drew many of its early members from the legal profession, and confined its meetings to the law terms. The milieu around the Inns of Court in the 1580s was clearly conducive both to antiquarian discussions and to fostering nascent collecting instincts. In 1588, Cotton's first recorded acquisitions take place: three manuscript volumes: a mid-tenth-century collection of pieces on confession and penance, a fifteenth-century copy of Higden's *Polychronicon*, and a compendium which included Giles of Rome's *De regimine principum*.[80]

Throughout the next decade more manuscript acquisitions followed, including manuscripts from the collection of John, Lord Lumley, and perhaps his first really significant acquisition – the remarkable Vespasian Psalter (Cotton Vespasian A. i), which bears Cotton's signature dated 1599. As Colin Tite has pointed out, one indication of both the size and the notoriety of Cotton's collection at this time is the fact that Sir Thomas Bodley thought Cotton worth approaching to solicit manuscripts for his library in Oxford.[81] The failed petition to Elizabeth in the early years of the seventeenth century therefore came at a time when not only was Cotton establishing himself in the middle of a network of men with similar antiquarian interests, but his own collecting was beginning to become a major part of his life. The petition's failure also coincided with a time when Cotton's own library was becoming an institution, not only within the circle of cognoscenti, but for a wider audience within both erudite and political circles of London. In 1604, for example, we have the first

79 D. Pearson, 'The libraries of English bishops, 1600–1640', *Library*, 6th ser., 14 (1992), 235.
80 Tite, *Manuscript library*, 5.
81 Tite, *Manuscript library*, 6; H. Ellis, *Original letters of eminent literary men of the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries* (London, 1843), 103.

evidence that Cotton was lending material from his collection, and on a scale which prompted him to record the items in a list (the first of many); and the fact that the borrowers included Cotton's own patron, the earl of Northampton, suggests that the range of uses to which his collection was being put matched the aims outlined in the petition to Elizabeth. His collection has been described as 'effectively the library of the Society of Antiquaries', but, as later events would show, contemporaries also viewed it as a potent political force.[82]

The library grew at a remarkable rate during the following thirty years, and by a variety of means. A surprisingly high proportion of the acquisitions consisted of gifts: William Lambarde, Richard Carew and of course Camden and Arthur Agarde were donors from among his Society of Antiquaries friends (the latter two leaving him a proportion of their libraries in their wills). Significant books were given by parliamentarians such as Sir Edward Dering and Sir John Selden, and by contacts outside of London such as the Irish collectors James Ussher and Sir James Ware.[83]

But Cotton could not have built up such a large collection through the gifts of his friends and admirers alone. Like many of the antiquaries, Cotton used every method available to acquire his favoured materials. Manuscripts, as has already been shown, were freely exchanged and traded among the antiquaries, and in this respect Cotton must be regarded as the centre of this trading network. Patrick Young, Sir Simonds D'Ewes, Archbishop Richard Bancroft and others all engaged in exchanging and trading manuscript volumes with Cotton. This activity did, however, encourage the kind of breaking up of volumes now regarded as highly unethical, as it destroyed much vital provenantial evidence. From the scale of dismemberment in the context of exchanges, however, contemporaries clearly regarded it as a valid method of building a collection, and there is therefore a danger of being overly critical in hindsight.[84]

Cotton also had access to the principal official repositories of records and documents, a fact that certainly aided his efforts to build up the part of his

82 Parry, *Trophies*, 78; Sharpe, *Cotton*, 80; Tite, *Manuscript library*, 20–5.

83 Parry, *Trophies*, 78–9, and Sharpe, *Cotton*, 57–9.

84 See generally Tite, *Manuscript library*, 13–19; and specifically A. G. Watson, 'Sir Robert Cotton and Sir Simonds D'Ewes: an exchange of manuscripts', *British Museum Quarterly* 25 (1962), 19–24; A. G. Watson, 'A St Augustine's Abbey, Canterbury, manuscript reconstructed: Trinity College Cambridge MS R.14.30 and British Library MSS Egerton 823 and 840A', *TCBS* 6 (1975), 211–71; A. G. Watson, 'A Merton College manuscript reconstructed: Harley 625; Digby 178, fols. 1–14, 88–115; Cotton Tiberius B. IX, fols. 1–4, 225–35', *BLR* 9 (1976), 207–17; J. P. Carley and C. G. C. Tite, 'Sir Robert Cotton as collector of manuscripts and the question of dismemberment: British Library MSS Royal 13. D.I and Cotton Otho D. VIII', *Library*, 6th ser., 14 (1992), 94–9.

collection that dealt with more recent history – the state-paper collections relating to the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. This aspect of Cotton's library is the least well investigated, but it was perhaps the most sought-after part of the collection for those who searched for evidence for political purposes. Cotton, Camden, D'Ewes and other antiquaries were aware that the state records were not well cared for, and this may have been their excuse for appropriating those materials which they could into their own collections, for the sake of better safeguarding. As the seventeenth century progressed, however, some of the custodians of public records, at least, were beginning to fear that the utility of the collections in their care – as at the Tower of London, and the Court of Exchequer Records in Westminster Hall – was being undermined by Cotton's acquisitiveness.[85] But Cotton was not the only antiquary to exploit these public collections. Scipio Le Squyer, an official of the Court of Exchequer in the early seventeenth century, is found in 1635 being paid for 'searching, digesting, transcribing, and copeying' various public records in the Exchequer for an unnamed user, and Sir Simonds D'Ewes in his autobiography recorded searching the 'rare and useful records' of the Exchequer, including consulting the Domesday Book under Le Squyer's supervision.[86] Cotton certainly had dealings with Le Squyer, lending him a cartulary from Exeter. Le Squyer's professional interests spilled into his private antiquarian pursuits – the 1632 catalogue of his own collection records over 200 manuscripts, and includes three cartularies, and he later listed as many cartularies then in private hands as he could. This category of 'public' record was highly sought after in the period 1580 to 1640, both from a historical and an antiquarian viewpoint, and more importantly for legal reasons. John Selden, for example, used 'those authorities . . . both printed and manuscript Annalls, Histories, Councels, Chartularies, Laws, Lawiers, & Records as only were to be used in the most accurat way of search that might furnish for the subiect' in his *Historie of tithes*, and specifically listed the cartularies he consulted in the Cottonian library for the work.[87] Cartularies in early modern England became a crucial weapon

85 For the public records in general see R. B. Wernham, 'The public records in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries', in L. Fox (ed.), *English historical scholarship in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries* (London, 1956), 18–20; E. M. Hallam, 'The Tower of London as a record office', *Archives* 14 (1979), 3–10; E. M. Hallam and M. Roper, 'The capital and the records of the nation: seven centuries of housing the public records in London', *London Journal* 4 (1978), 73–94; and on the contemporary fears concerning Cotton's activities with the public records, Tite, *Manuscript library*, 14; K. Sharpe, 'Introduction: rewriting Sir Robert Cotton', in Wright, *Sir Robert Cotton as collector*, 14–15.

86 Ovenden, 'Le Squyer', 323–37; J. O Halliwell-Phillips (ed.), *The autobiography and correspondence of Sir Simonds D'Ewes* (London, 1845), I. 432.

87 John Selden, *The historie of tithes* (London, 1618), p. xii and sig. ** 3^{v}.

in the claims of aspiring gentry for land-ownership, and became sought after as sources of evidence and precedence.[88] They therefore became increasingly protected, and difficult to access. In 1620, William Yonge attempted to act as go-between for Roger Dodsworth in his efforts to consult the cartulary of the Augustinian house at Healaugh Park in Yorkshire, 'which lyes dormant within the precincts of York'. He reported to Dodsworth that 'before [his kinsman] could obtayne a sight thereof', he was ordered to 'conceale it especially from you'. The owner, Philip Padmore, was clearly concerned that he should not be seen to give Dodsworth sight of the book, 'otherwise it would be very preiudiciall to both your future searches',[89] possibly because the volume was to be acquired very shortly afterward by Sir Robert Cotton, who would perhaps have preferred to be the first antiquary to gain access to the volume.

By the early 1620s, Cotton's various collecting methods had brought his collection to a considerable size, large enough for a catalogue to be a necessary tool in managing it. The earliest catalogue of the collection, compiled in about 1621–3, lists over 400 volumes (as can be seen from the dismembering activities, this really means many more manuscripts, the volume in the Cottonian sense normally referring to a *Sammelband*).[90] The remainder of the 1620s saw collections arrive in the Cottonian library in bulk rather than as piecemeal acquisitions. Thus eighty manuscripts arrived from the collection of Sir Henry Savile of Banke after his death in 1617, but in time to be recorded by Cotton in 1621,[91] and a smaller but no less significant number came from the remnants of John Dee's library after its final dispersal in the 1620s, although some may have arrived earlier, probably through direct purchase from John Pontois rather than through the trade.[92] In 1623 he inherited all the manuscripts and printed books from Camden's library (except those on heraldry), including his working papers, such as the copy-text for his *Annales*.[93]

By the time of Cotton's death in 1631, the collection had grown to over 900 volumes, and additions were still being made to it after his death. It contained a staggering number of manuscripts now regarded as national treasures, including highly significant pre-Norman manuscripts such as the Lindisfarne Gospels (MS Cotton Nero D. iv), the eighth-century Vespasian Psalter (MS Cotton

88 Ovenden, 'Le Squyer', 327–8.
89 Bodleian, MS Dodsworth 113, fol. 97.
90 C. C. G. Tite, 'The earliest catalogues of the Cottonian library', *BLJ* 6 (1980), 144–57.
91 A. G. Watson, *The manuscripts of Henry Savile of Banke* (London, 1969), 11.
92 Roberts and Watson, *Dee's library*, 65.
93 Sharpe, *Cotton*, 58; P. Collinson, 'One of us? William Camden and the making of history', *TRHS*, 6th ser., 8 (1998), 152–4.

Vespasian A. i), the ninth-century Carolingian Coronation Gospels (MS Cotton Tiberius A. ii), five of the seven surviving manuscripts of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle (MSS Cotton Domitian viii, fols. 30–70; Otho B. xi; Tiberius A. vi; Tiberius B. i, fols. 112–64; Tiberius B. iv), King Alfred's translation of Orosius (MSS Cotton Tiberius B. i, fols. 3–111), two of the oldest manuscripts of Bede's *Historia ecclesiastica* (MSS Cotton Tiberius A. xiv and Tiberius C. ii), and the unique manuscript of *Beowulf* (MS Cotton Vitellius A. xv). A huge number of histories and chronicles were collected by Cotton, including a twelfth-century manuscript of the *Historia Britonum* (MSS Cotton Nero D. viii, Titus A. xxvii, and Titus C. xvii), Knighton's Chronicle (MS Cotton Tiberius C. vii), Simeon of Durham's *Historia ecclesiastica Dunelmensis* (MS Cotton Caligula A. viii), and Thomas of Elmham's biography of Henry V (MS Cotton Claudius E. iv). There were literary texts in abundance, such as the *Ancrene Riwle*, La3amon's *Brut*, the *Coventry mystery plays*, and the unique manuscript of *Pearl* and *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight* (MS Cotton Nero A. x).

In addition to the cartularies and single-sheet charters described above, the Cottonian collection also possessed a substantial quantity of materials relating to the English Parliament. These were of various types, but principally consisted of the medieval records of a series of volumes of the Parliament rolls, and dated, more or less complete, from 1376 to 1533, a mixture of original documents and scribal copies. There was also a number of volumes of abridgements and extracts from the rolls, as well as collections of writs of summons and writs for the payment of members. A very important aspect of Cotton's collection of parliamentary materials was of course the collections of manuscript volumes of statutes, one of the most important of which, a fifteenth-century set of statutes, bears his ownership inscription dated 1598, and was lent to John Selden in 1622. This material was acquired from a variety of sources, some of it from antiquarian friends such as Sir Peter Manwood and Francis Tate, other parts no doubt harvested from the various repositories containing such records: the Tower, the Exchequer records in and around Westminster Hall, the records kept in Westminster Abbey chapter house, and in the Rolls Chapel in Chancery Lane. As Colin Tite has observed, as Cotton relocated to a house in the close vicinity of the Palace of Westminster in 1622, his collection became increasingly accessible to members of parliament, who began to treat the collection less as a circulating library and more as a reference collection.[94]

94 C. C. G. Tite, 'The Cotton library in the seventeenth century and its manuscript records of the English Parliament', *Parliamentary History* 14 (1995), 121–38.

From the medieval sources of the Cottonian collection, much can be learnt about the availability of ex-monastic books in the period: no fewer than 141 volumes of British medieval cartularies are recorded by Godfrey Davis as being in the Cottonian collection, ranging from those of the Benedictines at Abingdon to St Leonard's Hospital at York, taking in eight of the Ely cartularies and registers, four of those from Christ, Church, Canterbury, and six from St Augustine's, Canterbury, five from St Albans and two from Reading.[95] Of the medieval literary manuscripts, an even more impressive tally can be recorded: no fewer than 337 manuscripts in whole or in part have been identified in *Medieval libraries of Great Britain* (*MLGB*) as being from identifiable British medieval institutional collections, from sources as diverse as Glasgow and St David's, and Dover and Furness; in fact, these 337 books came from a total of 109 separate medieval institutional collections. Few patterns are discernible from the list, save the obvious point that there are few manuscripts from houses where the books had largely remained *in situ* since the Dissolution. Thus there are only seventeen books from Durham Cathedral Priory in the Cottonian library, whereas almost 300 remain in Durham to this day. Likewise, neither Hereford, Lincoln nor Salisbury Cathedral manuscripts are well represented in the Cottonian collection. The houses which did have large collections, and which did witness a widespread dispersal, are therefore well represented, but two houses stand out from the rest as supplying the greatest number: Christ Church Cathedral Priory and St Augustine's Abbey at Canterbury supplied no fewer than fifty-seven manuscripts, with twenty-eight from Christ Church and twenty-nine from St Augustine's. There is no single reason for such an accumulation of Canterbury books (a further singleton from the Franciscan house at Canterbury must be added); rather, a variety of factors accounts for this phenomenon. First, the two Canterbury houses both had very large libraries indeed – it has been estimated that both houses had in the region of 2,000 volumes at the Dissolution,[96] and both libraries were of course dispersed. Secondly, the proximity of Canterbury to London made it easy for books to transfer to the metropolitan area, either through the activities of intermediaries, such as antiquaries like John Twyne, or through anonymous routes, to the London trade. The age and importance of the Canterbury collections no doubt also played their part in attracting Cotton to the available books. Indeed, the fact that Canterbury had been home to some of the really iconic books of the early middle ages – such as the Vespasian Psalter – had attracted collectors like Cranmer and Parker in the generation before Cotton.

95 Davis, *Medieval cartularies*. 96 James, *ALCD*, liii, lxii–lxiii.

As such, many of these valuable books (in the historic as well as the financial sense) stood a good chance of becoming available to Cotton, either through the intermediaries from the preceding generation, or from sources in Kent who had access to troves of material, such as Edward Dering, or the Canterbury prebendary Nicholas Simpson.[97] In addition to the great collections of manuscripts, charters and other administrative documents described above, Cotton clearly also owned a substantial collection of printed books, about which we know tantalisingly little.[98]

The Bodleian Library

If the Cottonian collection was to be considered ultimately as the founding element of the British National Library Collection (the British Museum Library, to become the British Library), one institutional collection was founded during our period which rapidly became a storehouse for manuscripts sourced by antiquaries and other collectors, and which can therefore lay some claims to having served as the *de facto* national collection for over 150 years, until the establishment of the British Museum Library: the Bodleian Library in Oxford. The history of the establishment of the Bodleian Library is very well known, both from contemporary sources and from more recent studies. One aspect of the Bodleian's early collections that has not been studied comprehensively, however, is its acquisition of antiquarian materials – medieval manuscripts and other primary documents collected from a variety of British sources, but often from antiquaries themselves. From the inception of his idea to refound Oxford's University Library in the 1590s, Sir Thomas Bodley recognised the need to establish a 'great store of honourable friends' to help him further his design.[99] In reality, this meant individuals who would contribute either books or financial resources to set the new institution on a firm footing. To some extent the motivations both in Bodley's mind and in those of the early donors was to create a 'great storehouse or magazine of antiquities' and, tellingly, 'a most admirable ornament *aswell of the state*, as of the Vniversitie', or a national library in all but name.[100] The fact that the library was open not just to the senior members of the University of Oxford but to the 'whole republic of

97 Wright, 'Sir Edward Dering'; Ramsay, 'Cathedral archives and library', 377–8.
98 C. G. C. Tite, 'A catalogue of Sir Robert Cotton's printed books?', *BLJ* 17 (1991), 1–11.
99 *The life of Sir Thomas Bodley. written by himself AD 1609*, in *Trecentale Bodleianum: a memorial volume for the three-hundredth anniversary of the public funeral of Sir Thomas Bodley, March 29, 1613* (Oxford, 1913), 19.
100 G. W. Wheeler (ed.), *Letters of Sir Thomas Bodley to Thomas James, first keeper of the Bodleian Library* (Oxford, 1926), 88.

the learned' also encouraged the notion that those who gave to the Bodleian gave to support the learned throughout the realm. Associated with both the establishment of a rich manuscript collection and the wide access to it that lay at the heart of the university's policy, the other fact that encourages the view that the Bodleian held the 'national library' banner for Britain during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries was the establishment of the deposit of books from the Stationers' Company from 1610 onwards, which became the cornerstone both of the Legal Deposit legislation of subsequent centuries and of the Bodleian's own collection of printed books.[101]

The petition to Elizabeth was not the first attempt to form a national collection. John Leland, John Bale and John Dee (1556) had all made similar attempts,[102] but it was perhaps the most eloquent statement in favour of establishing a collection which would match the reality of the functions which Cotton's library had begun to fulfil, and would come to deliver in substantial measure during the 1620s and 1630s – so successfully, in fact, that it would ultimately lead to Cotton's arrest and the closure of his library. But if the legacy of this period was not the formation of a national library, it can be found perhaps in the origins of historical scholarship, for the period 1580 to 1640 witnessed the coming of age of British historical writing and editing.[103] From the first efforts of the later Elizabethan era, from Camden's brilliant *Britannia* in 1586 through to the monumental production by William Dugdale and Roger Dodsworth known as the *Monasticon Anglicanum* (published in 1654 but first planned in the late 1630s), publishing was an important facet of antiquarian activity. The publication of editions of medieval texts in particular was a significant by-product of the collecting of manuscripts, and can perhaps be seen as the end result of a connected series of activities that began with the acquisition of manuscripts. The antiquaries eagerly pursued copies of the best chronicles: Henry of Huntingdon, Ralph of Diss, Roger Howden, Thomas Walsingham, Matthew Paris, Geoffrey of Monmouth and Walter of Guisborough were the most sought after. Of the forty-three surviving medieval copies of the *Historia Anglorum* of Henry of Huntingdon, for example, Lord William Howard owned two, Henry Savile (1549–1622), editor of the *Rerum anglicarum post Bedam*

101 For a general account of the arrangement see I. Philip, *The Bodleian Library in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries* (Oxford, 1983), 27–30; see also J. Barnard, 'Politics, profits and ?idealism: John Norton, the Stationers' Company and Sir Thomas Bodley', *BLR* 17 (2002), 385–408. Roberts and Watson, *Dee's library*, 194–5.

102 Roberts and Watson, *Dee's library*, 194–5.

103 J. W. Binns, *Intellectual culture in Elizabethan and Jacobean England: the Latin writings of the age* (Leeds, 1990), 178–95.

scriptores praecipui (1596) (which included editions of William of Malmsebury and Roger Howden as well as Henry of Huntingdon) owned three, Sir James Balfour one, and Sir Robert Cotton two. Of the six earliest manuscripts of 'Florence' of Worcester's Chronicle, Parker owned one, John, Lord Lumley another, and Lord William Howard (the first editor of the text) two, one given to him by the Kentish antiquary William Lambarde, who in turn had acquired it from John Stow.[104]

Very often the chief collectors were also responsible for ground-breaking publications, often editions of medieval historical sources. This phenomenon can be traced back as far as 1567 with Jocelyn's edition of Gildas, made possible thanks to Parker's collections, and continued through our period with Parker's edition of Matthew Paris in 1571, with Asser and Thomas Walsingham following in 1574, Gerald of Wales's *Itinerarium Cambriae* (1585) edited by the Welsh antiquary David Powel, and Lord William Howard of Naworth's edition of 'Florence' of Worcester's *Chronicon ex chronicis* in 1592. Other collectors followed this lead, the most significant of whom was Sir Henry Savile, who oversaw the first printings of William of Malmsbury, Henry of Huntingdon and Roger Howden, published as *Rerum anglicarum scriptores post Bedam praecipui* in 1596. Sir James Ware published lists of Irish bishops and archbishops in 1626 and 1628, and the first biographical dictionary of Irish writers in 1639. John Selden's edition of Eadmer's *Historia novorum* (1623) and Camden's *Annales* of 1615 – albeit based on his great friend Cotton's collections, and dealing with the more recent past, but nonetheless based on the fruits of antiquarian collecting, were also important contributions to what Hugh Trevor-Roper has called 'the intellectual re-validation of the English heritage'.[105]

Although the antiquaries of our period did not see the foundation of a national, co-ordinated collection, and a series of 'harvesting' activities for its development, they did begin the process of forming what today can be termed a distributed national collection, as a number of the antiquaries gave books to what were to become great research collections. Sir Henry Savile gave

104 For Stow's collecting of historical sources, see A. Gillespie, 'Stow's "Owlde" manuscripts of London chronicles', in Gadd and Gillespie, *John Stow*; and, for a more general account of the connection between early modern historiography and the collecting of medieval sources, D. Woolf, *The social circulation of the past: English historical culture, 1500–1730* (Oxford, 2003), 168–73.

105 W. O'Sullivan, 'A finding list of Sir James Ware's manuscripts', *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy* 97C (1997), 69–99; R. R. Darlington and P. McGurk (eds.), *The Chronicle of John of Worcester* (Oxford, 1995), II. lxxxi–lxxxiii; H. Trevor-Roper, 'John Stow', *Renaissance essays* (London, 1985), 97.

over forty manuscripts to the Bodleian in 1620; Sir Peter Manwood gave a number between 1613 and 1620; Sir James Ley, one of the men behind the Society of Antiquaries' petition of 1601, gave four manuscripts between 1611 and 1620. Thomas Nevile, dean of Canterbury and master of Trinity College, Cambridge, gave the college a large number of its most important manuscripts including the Eadwine Psalter from Christ Church, Canterbury, in 1611–12; and John, Baron Lumley, although not a great antiquary, was nonetheless a significant collector of the period, with pronounced historical interests, and gave eighty-seven manuscripts and printed books to Cambridge University Library in 1598. Moreover, as Neil Ker noted almost half a century ago, by 1640 most of the great collections of manuscripts had reached a point where many of them were to remain substantially intact, and form the cornerstones of the major research collections of modern Britain.[106] At the time of Sir Robert Cotton's death, that great library, which was to become the nucleus of the national collection in the British Museum and subsequently the British Library, had more or less reached stasis; with the exception of a few strays, the vast bulk of the collection was to remain together for almost 400 years. The larger part of the substantial collection formed by Sir Simonds D'Ewes was also to remain in the family until swallowed by that great acquirer of collections, Humfrey Wanley, for Robert Harley. Likewise, the collections of Lord William Howard were in significant number absorbed into the library of Thomas Howard, 2nd earl of Arundel (himself no mean antiquary), and were to become the nucleus of the collections of the Royal Society in 1678, whence they were eventually for the most part to find their way into the library of the British Museum in 1831. In Scotland, Sir James Balfour's manuscripts remained together until acquired by the Faculty of Advocates in Edinburgh in the late seventeenth century, and were then to form the cornerstone of the National Library of Scotland. In Ireland, Sir James Ware's manuscripts may have been largely dispersed (although the largest concentration is now in the Bodleian Library), but that of James Ussher came to form the basis of the great manuscript library of Trinity College, Dublin. The collections of Thomas Allen, Kenelm Digby and William Laud were all to become landmark collections in the Bodleian Library, and remain there to this day. This generation of collectors therefore built significantly on the work of those in the first phase of collectors – men who were responsible for the dispersals immediately following the dissolution of the monasteries.[107]

106 N. R. Ker, 'The migration of manuscripts from the English medieval libraries', *Library*, 4th ser., 23 (1942–3), 1–2; repr. in his *Books, collectors and libraries*, 459–60.

107 See above, chapter 10.

The antiquaries of the generation following Matthew Parker made their impact, not simply through the piecemeal survival of individual collections, but through the formation of a new vision of what collecting meant. They were able to articulate the need, not only for an institutional role in building research collections, but for the activity of historical research itself to be recognised as a function inseparable from that of collecting.