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INTRODUCTION

ALEXANDER THISTLETHWAYTE’S BOOKS IN WINCHESTER COLLEGE FELLows’ LIBRARY

In 1767, Alexander Thistlethwayte (?1718–1771), a Hampshire grandee and bibliophile, donated a large collection of ancient and modern European poetry to the Fellows’ Library of Winchester College, the oldest of the English public schools. The books that make up Thistlethwayte’s benefaction – the largest that the library had hitherto received – are the focus of this thesis, providing both individual case-studies and a window on to Thistlethwayte’s collecting career.

The first part of the thesis concentrates on two of the more remarkable artefacts in Thistlethwayte’s collection, demonstrating their largely untapped potential to advance scholarly understanding in their respective fields. The opening two chapters present case-studies that shed new light on topics relating to the copying and transmission of late sixteenth- and seventeenth-century literary texts. The first of these case-studies examines Thistlethwayte’s copy of James VI of Scotland’s first published work, *Essayes of a Prentise, in the Divine Art of Poesie* (1584). In this copy, the printed anthology is supplemented by a number of manuscript poems, making the book a unique witness to the transmission and reception of James’s poetry in Scottish elite circles. My study reveals how the owners of this book used scribal networks to reframe James’s identity as a published poet, as well as to participate in the innovative poetic culture of the Jacobean court in late sixteenth-century Scotland. The second case-study is based on the largest

---

1 Winchester College (founded in the 1380s by William of Wykeham) is the oldest of the seven elite boys’ schools named in the Public Schools Act 1868; *The Statutes of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, 31 & 32 Victoria, 1867–8*, ed. by George Kettilby Rickards (London: printed by George E. Eyre and William Spottiswoode, 1868), p. 544.
surviving portion of Lewis Theobald’s printer’s copy for his ambitious 1733 edition of Shakespeare’s plays. Theobald used the preceding edition as his copy-text, despite his public scorn for its editor, Alexander Pope. This chapter re-examines Theobald’s motives for doing so, and argues that his success in tackling the widespread inaccuracies that he inherited from Pope was compromised by a specialist methodology which has not hitherto been properly understood.

Building on the insights of these case-studies into the material history of manuscript and printed texts, the following chapter turns its attention to the physical and intellectual construction of the books that Thistlethwayte gave to Winchester College. Over one third of the nearly 1300 titles which Thistlethwayte donated are preserved in composite books, or Sammelbände, bound together according to the needs and interests of an individual collector. Extending Jeffrey Todd Knight’s recent work on the literary culture of compilation in the early modern period, this chapter turns the spotlight on compiling habits in a later era, through a comparison of Thistlethwayte’s own practices with those of a clergyman born half a century earlier whose books Thistlethwayte bought and kept in their original state.² It makes the case that custom-made compilations form a hitherto neglected dimension of late seventeenth- and eighteenth-century anthology culture, one in which individual collectors reconfigured literary history as an act of social and cultural self-fashioning.

Having demonstrated the distinctive potential of Thistlethwayte’s books in Winchester College Fellows’ Library to generate new knowledge in several diverse branches of literary scholarship, the thesis proceeds to reconstruct Thistlethwayte’s career as a collector. The fourth chapter examines the part played by Thistlethwayte’s special

interest in books in his life as a gentleman; in the process, it charts the growth and character of a previously unexplored library of the mid-eighteenth century. By the late 1760s, when Thistlethwayte made his donation to Winchester College, he had amassed an uncommonly large library of at least eight and a half thousand volumes, with broad and up-to-date coverage of almost all the major branches of knowledge. Thistlethwayte made careful arrangements to secure his legacy as a collector: four years after sending a large share of his poetry collection to Winchester College, he made a second donation of books to his alma mater, Wadham College, Oxford, this time giving prose works in a wide range of subjects including history, theology, geography and science. Following his death in 1771, the remainder of Thistlethwayte’s library was sold, and the fixed price catalogue issued by the bookseller Benjamin White in 1772 provides a useful, though not entirely reliable, record of the books that Thistlethwayte left behind.³

Combining information from White’s catalogue with evidence uncovered by my investigations of the Winchester and Wadham collections, the fourth chapter affirms Thistlethwayte’s enthusiasm for the classical trends of mid-eighteenth-century bibliophilic culture. It also casts new light on the social contexts of Thistlethwayte’s collecting, arguing that to a large extent his library grew out of his cultural inheritance and provincial milieu as a gentleman. Drawing on records preserved among the family papers in Hampshire Archives, part of the chapter contrasts Thistlethwayte’s investment in books during his formative years with that of his younger brother, the Grand Tourist and MP Francis Whithed (1719–1751); the juxtaposition reveals the profound impact on Thistlethwayte’s book-collecting habits of his early social formation as heir to his father’s estates. Throughout his life, it appears that Thistlethwayte relied on local sales and intellectual exchanges to expand his collection, making very few documented purchases

³ Benjamin White, *A Catalogue of the Library of Alexander Thistlethwayte, Esq; Late Knight of the Shire for the County of Hants; and of Various Other Valuable Collections of Books* (London: [n. pub.], 1772).
on the continent or at London auctions. Such habits, however, did not prevent him from amassing a library with a rich European heritage. The final section of the chapter rediscovers the intellectual culture of a Huguenot refugee family, the Mutels, through the books that Thistlethwayte acquired from the first descendant of the family to be born and live in England. This was Thistlethwayte’s largest known second-hand purchase, and the surviving books tell the story of how international networks of intellectual exchange helped the Mutel family in its journey from exile to assimilation.

In light of this new understanding of the cultural contexts of Thistlethwayte’s collecting, the closing chapter of the thesis reassesses the confluence of interests that brought some of Thistlethwayte’s books to Winchester College Fellows’ Library. Until the middle of the nineteenth century, the Fellows’ Library, housed in a converted chantry, was the only repository of books at the school.4 It was ordinarily closed to the boys, and served a relatively small community of Fellows, schoolmasters and their visitors. The history of the library in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries has been informatively surveyed by J. M. G. Blakiston, Fellows’ Librarian in the mid-twentieth century.5 Blakiston’s accounts credit Thistlethwayte with bringing about a watershed in the library’s development: having remained since its foundation a learned and predominantly theological collection, the library ‘underwent a radical change of character’ in 1767, when Thistlethwayte transformed its coverage of the poetic tradition.6 While accepting Blakiston’s assessment of the impact of Thistlethwayte’s benefaction on the scholarly balance of the library, this study provides a new account of the rewards of Thistlethwayte’s donation for the library community and for the school’s cultural identity.

---

In 1766, just one year before the arrival of Thistlethwayte’s books, the College appointed the poet and critic Joseph Warton as headmaster, following eleven years’ service in a lesser post. With his stature in literary circles and his concern for the enrichment of the Fellows’ Library, Warton brought a new cultural energy to the school from its highest level, and this study explores his likely role in securing Thistlethwayte’s poetry collection for the Fellows’ Library.

The Fellows’ Library, like many smaller libraries which have historically lacked a defined public role, has been little explored by scholars. As the first extended study of part of its holdings, this thesis exploits the scholarly potential not only of individual books as unique textual witnesses, but also of a whole collection as a window on to late seventeenth- and eighteenth-century book-collecting cultures. This approach intersects with that of scholars working in the developing field of book history, and highlights the special interest of the Fellows’ Library and other more private collections as resources for this kind of study. In 2009, David Pearson noted that ‘as the digital age gradually diminishes the importance of books for the purpose of accessing texts, there is increasing interest in the systematic study of their non-textual aspects’: the ownership marks, bindings and annotations which show that books have a social and cultural history independent of their authorial identity. Pearson’s remarks introduce a book of essays on the collections which the British Library has absorbed by purchase and donation since its origin in 1753. Contributions to the book exploit the riches of a national library which has preserved numerous collections assembled by distinguished private owners; several of the

---

essays also illuminate the management practices which have obscured and in some ways actively eroded the identity of these collections.⁸

To a far greater extent than the British Library, Winchester College Fellows’ Library has depended on the generosity of private donors to sustain its growth. With limited resources and little institutional pressure to integrate its holdings, the Fellows’ Library has managed its collections with respect for their historical integrity, preserving and systematically recording the evidence of their provenance and use. Two of my case-studies assess the hitherto unexamined relationships between material from the British Library and items held in the Fellows’ Library, creating opportunities to gauge the small-scale impact of the two institutions’ contrasting management practices. The final chapter of the thesis reflects on these opportunities, and emphasises the wider scholarly benefits of the Fellows’ Library’s resistance to disguising or erasing the character of the historic collections within it.

This doctoral research project has been accomplished under the auspices of an AHRC-funded partnership between the University of Birmingham and Winchester College. The partnership has facilitated periods of extended access to the Fellows’ Library, during which time it has been possible not only to undertake a thorough investigation of the Thistlthwayte books, but also to survey the collection electronically using the library catalogue. This computer catalogue, the work of the Fellows’ Librarian, Geoff Day, supplants an old card catalogue; however, its records are not currently accessible online. The challenge of increasing the visibility of collections in a research environment which is increasingly dependent on online resources appears to be a particularly acute one for libraries outside the HE sector. RLUK, in association with The London Library, recently

⁸ For discussion of the reorganisation of foundation collections and new acquisitions by British Museum librarians, and the role of duplicate sales in breaking up collections, see the articles by T. A. Birrell, James Carley and Alison Walker in Libraries within the Library.
published the results of its 2010 survey of ‘hidden collections’ in UK libraries across all
sectors; the report noted that ‘[m]useums, public libraries and independent libraries have a
higher proportion of collections which are invisible online’, with nine survey respondents
reporting that none of their collections could be found on a web OPAC.⁹

In its conclusion, the thesis recommends that the Fellows’ Library explore the
feasibility of providing online access to its catalogue records as a strategic priority for its
digital future. The concluding chapter also considers the range of audiences who might
benefit from increasing awareness of the Fellows’ Library’s collections, including library
professionals and volunteers, local interest groups and independent researchers, as well as
the academic community. This project has already begun to engage these audiences: a
one-day symposium held in Winchester in early 2013 drew participants interested not only
in the Fellows’ Library’s rich holdings, but also in its expertise in managing historic
collections and working with researchers. In 1767, Thistlethwayte’s poetry collection
filled a symbolic gap in the Fellows’ Library’s collections, bringing its holdings into
closer alignment with the active literary culture of the school; in the twenty-first century,
this project has shaped a new understanding of Thistlethwayte’s legacy in the context of
libraries past and present.

⁹ Hidden Collections: Report of the Findings of the RLUK Retrospective Cataloguing Survey in Association
with The London Library (London: RLUK, 2012)
<http://www.r Muk.ac.uk/files/RLUK%20Hidden%20Collections_0.pdf> [accessed 29 August 2013] (pp. 6,
15).
James VI of Scotland, and later I of England (1566–1625), displayed unprecedented range and ambition as a royal author. He became the first British monarch to authorise the publication of his literary output at the age of just eighteen, with the printing of his collection of original poems and translations, The Essayes of a Prentise, in the Divine Art of Poesie, in 1584. No author is named on the title page, but commendatory sonnets praising ‘a King’ and ‘worthy Prince’ are followed by an acrostic unmasking the royal poet as ‘IACOBVS SExTVS’.

Thistlethwayte’s copy of this book contains remarkable new evidence of the ways in which elite Scottish readers reshaped James’s poetic canon and responded to his alliance of poetry and politics during his personal rule in Scotland. This copy is distinguished by a number of contemporary manuscript additions, which reveal that at least one of its former owners had privileged connections with Jacobean royal circles. First, a manuscript supplement to the collection contains three poems by James which remained unpublished during his lifetime and are elsewhere known to exist only in copies made or corrected by James himself. The first section of this chapter looks at the sources and circulation of these texts, emphasising that James’s precocity as a published poet did not go hand in hand with reservation of his manuscript verse in strictly private anthologies. Second, a

---

1 James VI of Scotland, and I of England, The Essayes of a Prentise, in the Divine Art of Poesie (Edinburgh: Thomas Vautroullier, 1584), sigs *3r, *4r, A1. Winchester College Fellows’ Library, Book No. 5446. All references to the Essayes are to the Fellows’ Library copy. In this copy and the Huntington Library copy reproduced in Early English Books Online, the title page reads ‘Divine’, and this is the reading adopted here. ‘Divine’ is also the reading of the variant title given in the ESTC record for the edition (No. S109180); ESTC’s standard title reads ‘Diuine’.
blank page in the body of the *Essayes* carries a fine manuscript copy of a sonnet addressed to James, extending the printed sequence of five commendatory sonnets that precedes it. This anonymous poem, of which no other copy has been found, looks forward to James’s assumption of the English throne in terms which strongly suggest that it was written before 1603. Having reassessed the motives and influence of Scottish developments in the sonnet during James’s poetic renaissance, this study examines the new manuscript sonnet in the context of the confident court culture and political expectations surrounding James in the late sixteenth century.

Thistlethwayte marked very few of his books with verbal annotations. In this case, however, a note on the front flyleaf of Thistlethwayte’s copy of the *Essayes* provides rare insight into the grounds of his interest in the book. Thistlethwayte wrote:

> This uncomatable Book has for its author no less a Person than James 1st. King of England and it bears Date when he was but 18 years old, & before his mother was beheaded.[2]

In addition to stressing the rarity of his bibliographic prize, Thistlethwayte noted details which locate the *Essayes* in its historical context. His note does not distinguish the milestones of James’s royal career, instead giving him a title – ‘King of England’ – which James did not attain until almost two decades after the publication of the *Essayes*. Conversely, Thistlethwayte is correct in his observations about the king’s personal history; James’s mother, Mary Queen of Scots, was executed in 1587, three years after the appearance of his first publication. Thistlethwayte’s interweaving of personal and public histories in this note is mirrored in his construction of the *Sammelband* that contains his copy of the *Essayes*. James’s anthology is the first item in this typically wide-ranging

---

2 In the volume in which Thistlethwayte’s *Essayes* is preserved, this note appears on the verso of the second leaf, which is unfoliated.
compilation of eight printed books, dated between 1531 and 1667.\textsuperscript{3} The compilation includes three collections of memorial verse, one of which is an Oxford scholar’s tribute to his father, \textit{Pietas in Patrem} (1637). These commemorations of individual lives mingle in Thistlethwayte’s binding with works addressing the state of the nation, including an Interregnum dramatic squib, \textit{New-Market-Fayre} (1649), and John Leland’s vindication of the historicity of Arthurian legend, \textit{Assertio Inclytissimi Arturij Regis Britanniae} (1544).

Despite emphasising its rarity in his historical note, Thistlethwayte seems not to have been the only Wiltshire collector who succeeded in obtaining a copy of the \textit{Essayes}. James’s anthology also appears to have been in the library of Thistlethwayte’s friend John Bowle (1725–1788), vicar of Idmiston, a village less than four miles from Thistlethwayte’s Wiltshire manor of Winterslow. Bowle was a literary scholar whose research interests centred on English literature of the age of Shakespeare and on Cervantes’ Spanish classic \textit{Don Quixote}, which he edited with extensive scholarly apparatus in 1781.\textsuperscript{4} In 1764 Bowle wrote to Horace Walpole with information about a number of works that Walpole had omitted from his descriptive overview of monarchical and aristocratic writing, \textit{A Catalogue of the Royal and Noble Authors of England} (1758). These included the first publication of James VI and I, which, though it interested Bowle as a literary historian, did not win his esteem:

\begin{quote}
Perhaps it would be no loss to letters were all the writings of James the First buried in everlasting oblivion: but certainly you did not designedly omit his first sally of authorship—\textit{The Essayes of a Prentise in the Divine Art of Poesie}, Edinburgh, 1585, 4to. ‘Tis a work worthy of him and no one else; for who can
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{3} The contents of this \textit{Sammelband} are detailed in Appendix 5, under ‘K:\textsuperscript{5} James’s Divine Poesie &c.’; Winchester College Fellows’ Library, Book No. 5446.

with any patience read his ‘Reulis and Cautelis to be eschewit in Scottis Poesie’?\(^5\)

Bowle’s dating of the *Essayes* to 1585 indicates that he owned a copy of the second edition; he may not have seen his friend’s copy of the first edition (dated 1584), which Thistlethwayte almost certainly bought and annotated before the apparent deterioration of his handwriting due to ill health in the 1760s.\(^6\) Though Bowle may not have had the opportunity to examine Thistlethwayte’s augmented copy of the *Essayes*, books were a shared enthusiasm of these energetic collectors. The sole direct evidence for their friendship comes from a bound collection of early modern theological tracts now in Wadham College library, in which an inscription by Thistlethwayte records that the vellum-bound volume was a gift from Bowle: ‘dedit Amico suo Johanni Bowle de Idmerston’ (‘given by his friend John Bowle of Idmiston’).\(^7\) Bowle may have found James’s dryly methodical treatise, ‘Reulis and Cautelis’, to be practically unreadable, but his attempt to engage with it illustrates the intellectual curiosity that underpinned his collecting. His association with Thistlethwayte provides a glimpse of the intellectual society that shaped Thistlethwayte’s interests, and which is explored in Chapter 4 of this thesis.

*The Poetry of James VI and I in Manuscript and Print*

James made an early debut in print – and an unprecedented one for a reigning British monarch – by publishing the *Essayes* in his nineteenth year. Steven W. May has described this as a watershed moment in literary publishing: the endorsement of poetry in

---


\(^6\) Thistlethwayte’s note on the front flyleaf of the *Essayes* is written in a fluent hand. In contrast, Thistlethwayte’s latest surviving letter, addressed to his younger brother Robert on 31 July 1766, appears to have been dictated, with Thistlethwayte signing his name in a shaky hand at the end. Winchester, Hampshire Record Office (HRO), 5M50/2222.

\(^7\) Wadham College library, shelf-mark F 15.24.
print by such a high-ranking author ‘se[t] a precedent for publication of other apologies by Sidney, Puttenham, and Harington’. 8 In the following decades James progressed from anonymous ‘prentise’ to cultural figurehead, bringing out a second collection, *His Maisties Poeticall Exercises at Vacant Houres*, in 1591, and reprinting its centrepiece, a martial epic recounting the Battle of Lepanto (1571), in London on his accession to the English throne in 1603. In addition to his performances in print, James participated as a manuscript poet in the exclusive and collaborative literary activities surrounding his court. He produced occasional sonnets, amatory verse, psalm paraphrases and an unfinished masque, and as May observes, he ‘took pains to leave a reliable record of the poems he wrote’. 9

Three substantial collections of James’s poetry in manuscript have survived, all of them containing texts either in holograph or in fair copies corrected by the author. Two of these collections have been conjecturally dated by May to the late 1580s or early 1590s. 10 Bodleian Library MS Bodley 165 is entirely in James's hand, and its eighteen poems appear to have undergone minor revision during the process of copying. They are a heterogeneous assortment, including sonnets, a fragment of a masque, and seven poems that also appear in James’s printed collections. By contrast, British Library Royal MS 18 B.16 is dedicated to James’s psalm translations and biblical paraphrases, just one of which was published during his lifetime. In this manuscript, holograph copies of all but one of the texts are preserved alongside fair copies of a small selection; the latter are in the hands of two secretaries and include minor corrections.

May has compiled a useful census of manuscript copies of James’s poems. His research ‘found no other manuscript copies of the king’s metrical psalms from the Royal MS’, and located only one other copy of a poem from the Bodleian MS, setting aside printed versions and authorised copies in British Library Additional MS 24195, a collection compiled under royal supervision between 1616 and 1618 to unite ‘All the kings short poesis that ar not printed’.¹¹ The almost complete absence of a manuscript tradition beyond authorised collections is a scenario that applies not only to the poetry of James VI, but also to the work of several of his contemporaries. Roderick Lyall notes that extant manuscript anthologies provide ‘little direct evidence of the manuscript circulation of Scottish Jacobean verse in the seventeenth century’.¹² The coterie poet and aspirant courtier John Stewart of Baldynneis is not represented in any such anthologies: his poetry has a unique source in the manuscript which he prepared for presentation to James, National Library of Scotland MS Adv. 19.2.6.¹³ Furthermore, the poetic legacy of Alexander Montgomerie, James’s ‘maister poete’, is according to Lyall ‘almost wholly dependent on one manuscript, now preserved in Edinburgh University Library (MS De.3.70)’, and probably compiled from Montgomerie’s papers after his death.¹⁴ May is aware that the sparse textual history of much Scots poetry may partly be a result of the relatively poor survival rate of manuscript anthologies produced before the 1620s, and particularly those assembled in sixteenth-century Scotland. He concludes, nevertheless, that in James’s case ‘it appears that the printed editions of [his] verse in 1584, 1585, and

¹³ Katherine McClune has argued that the critical perception of Stewart as a courtly insider should be revised, and that the poet probably composed primarily for ‘a family coterie’; ‘The Poetry of John Stewart of Baldynneis (?1540–?1607)’ (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Oxford, St John’s College, 2006), p. 172.
¹⁴ Lyall, Alexander Montgomerie, p. 2.
1591 forestalled to a surprising degree the manuscript circulation of his poetry in either Scotland or England before 1618. This assessment can now be revised in light of the new evidence provided by the Winchester copy of the Essayes. This quarto book includes a blank final gathering into which two scribes transcribed three of James’s unpublished poems. Two of these poems paraphrase Psalm 148 and Ecclesiastes 12; these are the first poems from the Royal MS to be discovered elsewhere. The third poem is a misogynistic satire, given the concise title ‘On Women’ by a later hand. This is only the second unprinted poem from the Bodleian MS to be found in a copy which its author neither made nor corrected himself. The manuscript poems in the Winchester Essayes are uniquely important in two respects. First, they establish that James’s poetry circulated more widely than previously thought, and that this circulation was stimulated rather than thwarted by the first printing of James’s poetry. Secondly, the three manuscript poems form a group which complements and extends the representation of James’s early poetic attainments in the printed collection. This is the only manuscript gathering of more than one of James’s poems to have survived from Scotland or England before 1603, according to the evidence amassed by May, and it reveals how James’s Scottish audience read and configured his poetic output.

Before examining the coherence of the poems as a group, the following discussion considers the insights that they provide into the circulation of James’s poetry in court circles.

---

16 In the Winchester copy of the Essayes, the four leaves which make up the final gathering are foliated separately, as fols X1-X4. The three manuscript texts in this gathering are transcribed in Appendix 1.
17 This claim disregards the pair of epitaphs in Emmanuel College, Cambridge, MS 89, whose attribution to James is highly uncertain. See May, ‘Circulation in Manuscript’, pp. 209-11.
The scribal characteristics of the manuscript poems in the final gathering of the *Essayes* suggest that they were copied in the late sixteenth or early seventeenth centuries. ‘On Women’ (Fig. 1) appears in a compact secretary hand typical of this period. The biblical paraphrases are the work of a second scribe employing a hybrid italic hand, the residual secretary features of which indicate that it also originates from around the end of

**Figure 1.** ‘On Women’, *Essayes*, sig. X1f. By permission of the Warden and Fellows of Winchester College.
the sixteenth century (flat-topped ‘g’ and ‘c’ are the most pronounced of these features). With regard to the texts of the poems, close comparison with authorised copies has shown that all three derive from authorial versions written down in the late 1580s or early 1590s. For example, the Winchester text of ‘On Women’ differs substantively in just two minor variants from the text in the Bodleian MS (compiled c.1590).18 A later version of the poem in British Library Additional MS 24195 (compiled between 1616 and 1618) incorporates two substantive revisions to the Bodleian text that do not appear in the Winchester copy.19 Finally, it is notable that the copyists of the three poems in the Winchester Essayes preserved their original Scots orthography. This is especially clear in the case of ‘Psalm 148’, a text that survives in two copies in the Royal MS – James’s holograph copy, and an accompanying scribal copy.20 The second copy contains four minor revisions to the text as it came from James’s pen; however, the most pervasive change in this fair copy is its anglicisation. The Winchester copy of ‘Psalm 148’ includes the four seemingly authorised revisions, but reintroduces the Scots orthography that had largely been transmuted by James’s scribe. This fidelity to the king’s native Scots is key to fixing the context of the manuscript additions to the Winchester Essayes. It strongly suggests that the copyists of these poems were Scots, with connections to the Jacobean court in the 1580s and 1590s. Their closeness to royal circles appears to have given them privileged access to the king’s sacred and secular poetry during the period of his most dedicated engagement with the art.

18 Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 165, fols 43-44. For details of the textual variants in authorised copies of each of the poems in the Winchester Essayes, see Appendix 1.
19 London, British Library, Additional MS 24195, fols 25r-27r. This excludes the change of the envoi heading to ‘Exposition’ in the British Library MS – another revision which does not appear in the Winchester copy.
20 London, British Library, Royal MS 18 B.16, fols 39-40 (holograph copy) and fol. 41 (scribal copy).
While these copyists undoubtedly obtained copies of James's verse through exclusive channels, they do not seem to have acquired all of their texts directly from the royal author or from a reliable source close to the king. The text of ‘Ecclesiastes xii’ in the Winchester Essays provides convincing evidence that at least one of the three poems passed through several hands before being copied into the book. ‘Ecclesiastes xii’ (Fig. 2)

Figure 2. ‘Ecclesiastes xii’, Essays, sig. X4v. By permission of the Warden and Fellows of Winchester College.
is by far the least accurate of the manuscript texts in the *Essayes*, in comparison with its surviving authorial version. Set alongside the version in the Royal MS, the Winchester text contains eight corrupt and grammatically confused variants.\(^{21}\) All of these can be explained as the result of careless misreading by a scribe, but the italic scribe at work in the Winchester *Essayes* does not appear to be culpable – his hand is also responsible for the accurate text of ‘Psalm 148’. Instead, it is more probable that these errors were present in the manuscript that the copyist reproduced, and that the poem had already been transmitted by at least one inattentive scribe. Another clue to the prior circulation of ‘Ecclesiastes xij’ is the title: this is the only poem of the three in the *Essayes* to have a title supplied by its copyist, perhaps reflecting the desire of earlier scribes and collectors to record its biblical source. Finally, it may be significant that James’s verse paraphrase of Ecclesiastes 12 is the only one of the thirty-four poems in the Royal MS not to exist in holograph. This apparent anomaly could be a clue to demand for the poem among an exclusive circle of readers: James may have kept apart or given out his holograph copy as he invited others to read and copy the poem.

Based on his census of surviving manuscripts, May has concluded that before the last decade of James’s life the circulation of his manuscript poems was extremely restricted. Instead of being exchanged and copied into anthologies, ‘a handful of [James’s] lyrics was preserved by courtiers or court-connected recipients who seem to have circulated the poems no further’.\(^{22}\) May’s analysis is thoroughly researched and does much to illuminate an obscure textual history. However, the Winchester *Essayes* reveals that the pattern of closed scribal transactions which May identifies does not cover all of the ways in which James’s poems were shared before the late 1610s. Though there is no evidence that the texts of ‘On Women’ or ‘Psalm 148’ circulated beyond the Winchester *Essayes*, it is

\(^{21}\) Royal MS 18 B.16, fol. 43.

\(^{22}\) May, ‘Circulation in Manuscript’, p. 214.
almost certain that ‘Ecclesiastes xij’ was transmitted more freely and less reliably among members of a scribal community. It seems, therefore, that ‘the virtual hoarding of James’s poems in a few private, court-related collections’ is a pattern that has been given too much emphasis.\(^{23}\) The king undoubtedly sought to retain personal control over some poetic transactions – such as the diplomatic gift of a sonnet to the English poet Henry Constable in 1589 – but he also presided over a court culture of informal collaboration, in which a sense of ‘equivalence between the royal poet and other poets’ may well have encouraged the freer circulation of royal verse.\(^{24}\)

In his study of the material culture and social habits of Renaissance collectors of manuscript texts, Arthur Marotti notes that ‘Often the final gatherings in printed editions left room for augmenting the verse of a single poet with the work of others’.\(^{25}\) It may be a reflection of James’s authority over his texts – both as their author and as the royal centre of an exclusive literary culture – that the copyists adding to the Winchester Essayes chose not to create a miscellany of works by various authors at the end of the book. Instead, the poems they transcribed represent the variety of poetic genres in which James wrote, and in particular those which were rarely or never given a place in his published collections.

The result, at first glance, may appear to be a miscellaneous gathering of sacred and secular poems, divinity and satire. One of the printed texts in the Essayes is a translation of ‘The CIII. Psalme’, the first and only specimen of James’s abilities as a metrical psalmist to appear in print during his lifetime (Essayes, sigs N2-N4). The manuscript supplement to the Winchester Essayes broadens this sample of James’s biblical poetry by including paraphrases of Psalm 148 and Ecclesiastes 12, poems that gave creative

\(^{23}\) May, ‘Circulation in Manuscript’, p. 216.
substance to James’s self-fashioning as heir to the Old Testament psalmist David.26 In contrast, the third poem copied into the Winchester Essays represents James’s self-fashioning as a coterie poet finding inspiration in courtly female subjects. The poem that appears under the title ‘On Women’ in the Winchester Essays is also found in British Library Additional MS 24195 among the Amatoria, an unpublished group of poems ostensibly dedicated to James’s queen, Anna of Denmark, and several courtly mistresses.27 The inclusion of the anti-feminist ‘On Women’ alongside relatively conventional love lyrics in the British Library manuscript has been interpreted as an overt manifestation of the misogyny that persisted as ‘a culturally acceptable facet of coterie literary production’ in sixteenth-century Scotland.28 ‘On Women’ is not the only one of James’s Amatoria poems to have survived in a copy outside the British Library manuscript; a further seven poems from the sequence are included in British Library Additional MS 22601, an anthology compiled around 1603-04, and these provide an ambiguous glimpse into the collaborative activities of James’s poetic coterie.29

Despite the diverging contexts of ‘On Women’ and the biblical paraphrases copied into the Winchester Essays, the three poems can be read as a coherent sequence. This reading engages all three texts in a dialogue about the splendour of Creation and the gendered aspect of its spiritual order. The first poem in the manuscript gathering, ‘On Women’, devotes seven of its ten stanzas to a copious catalogue of similes portraying ‘leving

27 Additional MS 24195, fols 4-30.
29 Seven of the Amatoria lyrics can also be found in London, British Library, Additional MS 22601, fols 24-36. The texts in this manuscript differ in form from the versions in James’s collection and Sir Thomas Erskine’s name follows the last one, leading some scholars to argue that James and Erskine, the king’s long-time friend, composed the sequence collaboratively. For the case in favour of collaborative authorship, see Curtis Perry, ‘Royal Authorship and Problems of Manuscript Attribution in the Poems of King James VI and I’, Notes and Queries, n.s., 46 (1999), 243-6. For a more cautious view, see May, ‘Circulation in Manuscript’, p. 215.
thingis’ and their characteristic traits, from tigers that ‘fleis the watteris & the weittis [rains]’ to dolphins that ‘loves all bairnes in wondrous soirt’ (Essayes, fol. X1r, X1v). It is only in the eighth stanza that the poem reveals the import of these similes: just as ‘all leving thingis ar euer bound / To follow nature rewling tham alway’, so female behaviour is governed by natural instinct and appetite. In the closing stanzas, as Sarah Dunnigan explains in her insightful analysis, the poem’s rhetorical relish for the diversity of species and their habits becomes an argument for the ‘sensual, not least bestial, characteristics’ of women (p. 168).

The next poem in the sequence, ‘Psalm 148’, also draws its rhetorical energy from the diversity of the universe, urging all created beings from ‘Heauenis induellaris’ to ‘beasts and cattell tame’ to unite in praising God (Essayes, fols X2v, X3r). However, in this poem the natural order embraces female spiritual purity, and ‘uirginis’ are given special acknowledgement in the roll-call of praise. The last of the three poems, ‘Ecclesiastes xij’, completes the thematic inversion by placing the burden of spiritual accountability on men. While the biblical text of Ecclesiastes 12 does not apostrophise its audience, the poem addresses ‘young men’, reiterating the appeal of ‘Psalm 148’ in eschatological terms: ‘on thy creatur think you sall … / quhill the tyme is not quhen yow sall say / Nou in thir yeiris my pleasur is away’. The vision that ensues of humankind in its last days emphasises above all that the male pursuit of sensual ‘lust and pleasur’ is futile (Essayes, fol. X4r, X4v).

Thus, the satirical ‘On Women’ does not stand apart thematically from the scriptural poems in the Winchester Essayes. On the contrary, it can be read alongside these poems as a provocative assertion that gender has a fundamental impact on human spirituality – an assertion that the biblical poems go on to adapt but not to overturn. It is conceivable that these common concerns influenced the selection and sequencing of the three manuscript
poems that appear in the final gathering of the *Essayes*. It is also notable that this selection includes biblical paraphrases and a poem on the subject of women, but does not sample the third genre which appealed to James as a manuscript poet – occasional verse. Leading a Scottish revival of the sonnet, James adopted the form to address foreign luminaries, recognise literary achievements closer to home, and respond to notable events and deaths. For example, British Library Additional MS 24195 preserves a short sonnet sequence in praise of the astronomer Tycho Brahe, whose observatory James visited during his Danish honeymoon in 1590, and another in response to a 1591 incursion into Holyroodhouse by the volatile Francis, Earl of Bothwell.\(^{30}\) The absence of such poems from the manuscript gathering in the Winchester *Essayes* may help to date these copies to the later 1580s, before many of James’s occasional sonnets had been composed. Alternatively, it may reflect a decision by the copyists to bring together poems which extend James’s exploration of the sensual and the spiritual. The result is a selection of texts that presents James as a poet in tune with the maxim advanced by Urania, the muse of religious poetry, in one of James’s printed translations: ‘wyse is he, who in his verse can haue, / Skill mixt with pleasure, sports with doctrine graue’ (*Essayes*, ‘The Vranie’, sig. F3r).

The Winchester *Essayes* contains one other contemporary manuscript addition, which is distinct from the poems in the final gathering in both material and literary terms. This is a hitherto unknown sonnet in praise of James, and it forms an extension of the printed sequence of five commendatory sonnets which introduces the *Essayes* (signs *2r*-4r). In preparation for a literary analysis of this sonnet, the next section discusses Scottish innovations in the content and form of the sonnet in the context of the European history of

---

\(^{30}\) The sequence on Tycho Brahe, comprising two sonnets and a sestet, is found in Additional MS 24195, fols 32r-33r. Three sonnets on the Bothwell incident are found in Additional MS 24195, fols 39r-40r. These poems are printed in *The Poems of James VI. of Scotland*, ed. by James Craigie, 2 vols (Edinburgh: Scottish Text Society, 1955-1958), II, pp. 100-1, 110-11.
the form, emphasising the influence of Jacobean experiments on the development of the form both within and outside Scotland.

**The Scottish Sonnet in Context**

The peaceful accession of James VI of Scotland to the throne of England in 1603 created unique opportunities and problems for the budding panegyrist in his new kingdom. Curtis Perry has argued that James’s long-established status as a published author and acclaimed poet upset the Elizabethan economy of poetic praise; James’s perceived arrogation of cultural as well as political authority threatened to deprive English poets of their traditional role in creating and canonising the monarch’s image. It is true that Elizabeth I had attracted praise for her achievements as a poet, with three of her poems appearing in print during her lifetime and several more circulating in manuscript. But the small size of her canon (only nine reliably attributed poems in May’s edition) and the restricted or unauthorised circulation of her poems underline the fact that Elizabeth could gain far less cultural capital as a female author than she was able to exercise as a royal icon and patron of the arts.

In contrast, James VI began a campaign at the outset of his personal rule in Scotland to ally his political position to his authorial status. In the early 1580s, James set out to promote his dual authority as a ‘Laureat king’, and so to rebuild a supportive relationship between poetics and politics in Scotland. Sandra Bell has described the publication of James’s *Essayes* in 1584 as ‘part of a larger movement’, supported by parliamentary

---

34 The epithet is used by John Stewart in his poem, ‘To his Maiestie the Day of his Coronation vith Laurell’ *Poems of John Stewart of Baldynneis from the MS. in the Advocates’ Library, Edinburgh*, ed. by Thomas Crockett (Edinburgh: Blackwood, 1913), p. 130.
legislation, to suppress a tradition of anti-monarchic satire in Scotland and to establish James as the cultural leader of the nation.  

James was able to use his political authority to secure the cooperation of Parliament in implementing his cultural policy. Conversely, in his creative endeavours James relied on the cooperation of fellow authors inspired not primarily by political necessity but by social and creative ties. Jane Rickard has shown that James sought to realise his ambitions for a revival of Scottish poetry ‘within a context of exchange and collaboration’ (p. 35). The Jacobean court in Scotland was ‘an informal, masculine place where little attention was paid to etiquette’, and in this familiar environment the king encouraged a number of court servants and political agents to participate in his literary renaissance. This group of poets has since become known as the ‘Castalian Band’, a name derived from the epitaph on Alexander Montgomerie that James composed in or after 1598. Priscilla Bawcutt has interrogated the modern use of this phrase to refer to the court poets of the 1580s, arguing that under its cover critics have tended to invent a self-conscious creative identity for the group that has little basis in fact. However, the term ‘Castalian’ need not imply the existence of a ‘literary “brotherhood”’, and this study follows many recent critics in applying it to the poets associated with the Jacobean court in the early 1580s and to their shared poetics. In dedications and sonnets of praise, these poets helped to fashion James as a sun-king who had yet to reach his zenith – a ‘bright Apollo’ or

36 Maurice Lee, Jr., Great Britain’s Solomon: James VI and I in His Three Kingdoms (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1990), p. 142.
‘goldin Titan’. In turn, James wrote commendatory sonnets to introduce their work and even lent his hand to revising their poetry, as Thomas Hudson testified in the dedication of his *Historie of Judith* (1584) to the king (Rickard, p. 50). In England after 1603 James may have been at risk of monopolising the roles and profits of both poet and patron, but in Scotland he created a coterie culture in which these roles could be adopted and exchanged by all.

One of the defining achievements of this culture was its reinvention of the sonnet. The Scottish sonnet of the 1580s and 1590s can claim a unique place in the history of the form on the basis of its distinctive structure and unprecedented range of subject matter. Ronald Jack has commented that ‘only in Scotland before 1603 does love cease to dominate’ the sonnet. Petrarchism certainly found its way to the Scottish court and had a particularly strong influence on the poetry of the political agent William Fowler, but during this period love sonnets were outnumbered by those addressing friends and fellow poets, voicing creative ambition or frustration, responding to current events, and expressing religious feeling. In Scotland the sonnet enjoyed a thematic freedom and literary self-consciousness that remained unmatched during the English sonnet vogue of the 1590s.

The late sixteenth-century innovations in Scottish sonneteering, like most other European developments in the form, were driven by the energies of the political culture which embraced the form. Michael Spiller stresses that the Petrarchan sonnet migrated from Italy and rooted itself in the poetic traditions of sixteenth-century Europe because poets recognised in its eloquent expression of love ‘an analogy of desire for political

---

success, for maximising one’s power’.\textsuperscript{41} The strength of this analogy for English poets in the 1590s is clear: Elizabeth allowed herself to be celebrated as a ‘Queene of loue’ commanding all men’s affections, and in the final phase of her reign her would-be servants participated in ‘an intense competition’, according to William Oram, ‘for what seemed to be an increasingly limited number of court prizes’.\textsuperscript{42} In contrast, for Scottish poets before 1600 the desire for understanding replaced the desire for love and power at the core of the sonnet. In discarding the traditional focus of the form, these poets turned to literary creativity, its motives and reception, for new inspiration.

They did so, as Katherine McClune has recently argued, in response to the advice and example of James VI himself.\textsuperscript{43} James’s manual of poetic craft, ‘Some Reulis and Cautelis [cautions]’ is one of the texts printed in the \textit{Essayes}. It prescribes not only the form but also the subject matter of the sonnet, recommending it to Scottish poets for ‘compendious praysing of any bukes, or the authouris thairof, or ony argumentis of vther historeis’ (\textit{Essayes}, sig. M4\textsuperscript{r}). McClune explains that James’s manual ‘effectively defined usage of the sonnet as testing the ability and proficiency of both poet and reader’: the poet is challenged to produce sonnets which are accomplished enough to receive and confer praise, while the reader is called upon to exercise his or her interpretative ability and moral intelligence.\textsuperscript{44}

McClune attributes the popularity of this ‘self-reflexive sonnet form’ in late sixteenth-century Scotland to the readiness of James’s poet-subjects to embrace the guidelines set out by their ‘Laureat king’ in the ‘Reulis’. However, James’s prescriptive treatise alone

\textsuperscript{44} McClune, ‘The Scottish Sonnet’, pp. 172, 166.
cannot account for the scope and subtlety of his influence on his fellow poets. James’s iconography as a ‘bright Apollo’ pervaded his court in ceremonies and social rituals as well as poetry, and the manuscript titles of early poems by John Stewart of Baldynneis are evocative of these occasions: among them are ‘To his Maiestie the Day of his Coronation with Laurell’ and ‘To his Maiestie the First of Ianvar with Presentation of ane Lawrell Trie Formit of Gould’. In such an environment, poets faced the challenge of recognising James’s twofold authority while sustaining the play of poetic roles and responses that James engaged in. This challenge is closely related to the core concern of the numerous ‘self-reflexive’ sonnets composed at James’s court – a concern about the relationship between author and audience as creators of meaning. The prevalence of this sonnet form in Scotland can thus be ascribed not only to the imperative to obey the king’s ‘Reulis’, but also to the co-existence of a ‘Laureat king’ and an audience of fellow poets in Jacobean literary culture.

James followed his own advice in demonstrating the potential of the sonnet as a vehicle for ‘compendious praysing’, or critical engagement with the achievements of others. The late manuscript anthology of James’s poems, British Library Additional MS 24195, collects twenty-eight sonnets under the heading ‘Miscellanea’, many of which are addressed to authors and men in public life. In the 1580s and 1590s, the sonnet became an important means by which members of James’s circle responded to each other’s work and explored matters of private and public concern. Seventy sonnets by Alexander Montgomerie are extant, around half of which are addressed to fellow poets, patrons and adversaries on friendly and topical themes. Furthermore, there is evidence that sonnets were composed collaboratively at the Jacobean court in Scotland. Rickard has argued that

---

45 Stewart, Poems, pp. 128, 130.
46 These sonnets, mixed with stanzaic poems and short verses, are found in Additional MS 24195, fols 31-49.
the sequence of five commendatory sonnets printed in the preliminary leaves of James’s *Essayes* has the hallmarks of ‘a coterie model of poetic production, more usually associated with manuscript poetry’ (p. 46). In Rickard’s view, the formal similarities and verbal echoes linking these poems to James’s ‘Twelf Sonnets of Invocations to the Goddis’, also printed in the *Essayes*, indicate that James and his fellow poets engaged in creative exchange and discussion prior to the publication of the collection (pp. 50-51).

Few accounts of the European history of the sonnet have integrated the Scottish development of the form into their narrative. This is all the more surprising given that Scottish poets in the 1580s, like Wyatt, Surrey and Marot before them, invented a sonnet form which achieved great popularity in their language; this was, moreover, a form that probably influenced one of the leading English sonneteers. The favoured Scottish form has a distinctive rhyme-scheme in which rhymes are carried over from the first quatrain into the second, and from the octave into the sestet (*abab bcbc cdcd ee*), generating momentum through the structural divisions in the sonnet. This form is now known as ‘Spenserian’, but as McClune is the most recent critic to note, Spenser was not the author of the first published sonnets in this form. The first so-called ‘Spenserian’ sonnets to appear in print are those in James’s *Essayes*; besides the two sequences already mentioned, which adopt the ‘Spenserian’ rhyme-scheme, the collection includes three further sonnets in this form focusing on the relationship between poet and reader. The following discussion presents a brief account of the early history and experimental development of the sonnet in England and Scotland. It evaluates critical conjectures about the origins of the ‘Spenserian’ sonnet, and uncovers new indications that James’s *Essayes*
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48 These are ‘Sonnet of the Avthovr to the Reader’ (*Essayes*, sig. K3*’*), ‘Sonnet Decifring the Perfyte Poete’ (sig. K4*’*), and ‘Sonnnet of the Authour’ (sig. P3*’*). All of these poems appear to have been written by James.
formed part of the literary context which informed Spenser’s experiments with the sonnet in the 1580s.

By the turn of the sixteenth century, the Petrarchan sonnet had long been a favourite verse form at the courts of Italy; poets adopted it to construct passionate and articulate selves whose struggles were enmeshed in the competition for place and patronage at court. However, it was not until the 1530s, following the Italian poet Pietro Bembo’s critical revaluation of Petrarch as a model of eloquence for vernacular poets, that the sonnet travelled north to the courts of France and England (Spiller, p. 72). Sir Thomas Wyatt visited Italy in 1527 on diplomatic business, and according to Spiller he ‘probably began writing sonnets’ on his return (p. 84). Importing the form into Britain for the first time, Wyatt also became the first poet in three hundred years to reinvent its structure. He grafted the Petrarchan octave on to an innovative sestet, composed of a quatrain and a closing couplet instead of the traditional pair of tercets. Wyatt developed his sestet from a popular Italian song form, the strambotto, setting a precedent for the conjectural evolution of the ‘Spenserian’ sonnet from another continental short form.

Ironically, however, it was the sonnet’s close association with lyric poetry of all kinds that played a part in delaying its emergence in Britain as a pre-eminent vehicle for courtly self-fashioning. Wyatt’s sonnets and those of his Henrician contemporary Henry Howard, earl of Surrey, first appeared in print in Richard Tottel’s oft-reprinted miscellany, *Songs and Sonettes*, published in 1557. The title of this collection perpetuated the vague application of the term ‘sonnet’ to any ‘light poem’ whose text was not obviously suited to musical performance (Spiller, p. 94). Moreover, its miscellaneous character proved an influential model for both manuscript and print collections, encouraging poets and anthologists to combine sonnets and other short poems into loose gatherings of lyric
voices, rather than the coherent and carefully structured sequences which had become popular in France.

One example of this miscellaneous tendency in a Scottish context is the *Amatoria*, a series of poems collected under this title in the last manuscript of James’s poetry that he himself compiled. The *Amatoria* opens with twelve sonnets whose authorised titles indicate that they form a sequence narrating the early fortunes of James’s marriage to Anna of Denmark. These sonnets are followed by a further eight poems in a variety of stanzaic and metrical forms, including a ballade, a love complaint in rhyme royal, another in alexandrine couplets and two songs. If these poems are read as an extension of the former sequence, they cast a bitter light on the decline of James and Anna’s relationship. However, recent criticism has moved away from such a schematised biographical reading. The possibility has already been noted that James’s friend Erskine lent a hand in the composition of the *Amatoria* sequence; whether this is true or not, the collaborative context of James’s poetic activities has led Rickard to argue that the *Amatoria* sequence is best understood as an ‘exploration of different poetic personas and literary conventions’ (p. 57). Therefore, in the *Amatoria*, as in other collections of sonnets and assorted lyrics, the illusion of coherence created by the titles and arrangement of the poems is complicated by their detached and conflicting voices. In Tottel’s miscellany, Spiller has observed that the editorial titles frequently identify the speaker of any unsettled poem as ‘the lover’, creating a desiring figure marked by ‘an element of randomness and confusion that is not present in the sequences of Petrarch’ or of contemporary French poets (p. 98).
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49 The sequence runs from ‘A complaint against the contrary Wyndes that hindered the Queene to com to Scotland from Denmarke’ to the sonnet beginning ‘O womans witt that wauers with the winde’, in Additional MS 24195, fols 4-9. *Poems of James VI. of Scotland*, II, pp. 68-73.

50 This group opens with ‘Constant Loue in all Conditions’ and ends with the song beginning ‘When as the skillfull archer false’, in Additional MS 24195, fols 10-30. *Poems of James VI. of Scotland*, II, pp. 73-98.
Before 1580, critics have agreed that most English and Scottish poets failed to respond to innovations in the structure of the sonnet pioneered by their French contemporaries. In the quarter-century after the publication of *Songs and Sonettes*, English poets were largely content to reproduce the forms invented by Wyatt and Surrey, showing little interest in the recently evolved French sonnet form or the Petrarchan sequences published by leading poets of the Pléiade from the late 1540s on (Spiller, pp. 101-2). French sonneteers found a more receptive audience in Scotland, which had historically looked to France for its cultural and political direction. Around 1560, Mary Queen of Scots (and Dowager Queen of France) became a patron and inspiration to Pierre de Ronsard, a French sonneteer and member of the Pléiade group whose *Amours* (1552) was the first of many sonnet sequences. Ronsard had been employed as a child at the court of James V of Scotland, and Dunnigan notes that he later made Mary ‘the dedicatee and subject of many of his eulogies and ceremonial verse’.\(^{51}\) Ronsard remained publicly loyal to the Catholic queen throughout both her reign and her imprisonment in England, addressing a sonnet to her in 1578 deploring her captivity. His stance attracted the hostility of Scottish Reformist pamphleteers in the 1560s and gave his poetic example a contentious political colouring. Thus, it was not until the early 1580s that Montgomerie embraced Ronsard as one of the chief models for his ground-breaking vernacular sonnets, at a time when James VI was beginning to form a coterie of court poets who could emulate the achievements of the Pléiade.\(^{52}\)

There is, however, one English poet whose early engagement with French models is less often discussed in the context of the development of the sonnet in Britain. Spenser’s versions of French sonnet sequences predate the reinvention of the sonnet in late

---


sixteenth-century Scotland, though they do not definitively prefigure the innovations of Scottish poets in either the form or content of the sonnet. In 1569, the seventeen-year-old Spenser’s translations of two Petrarchan lyric sequences appeared in print. The first of Spenser’s French originals was ‘a version by Clement Marot of Petrarch’s *canzone* “Standomi un giorno solo a la fenestra”’, while the second was ‘a sonnet sequence by Joachim du Bellay […] which was itself inspired by Marot’s translation’ of the *canzone* (Spiller, p. 103). Marot had been a successful court poet under Francis I (King of France 1515–1547), and at much the same time as Wyatt he had evolved a new sonnet form by reinventing the Italian sestet. Du Bellay repudiated Marot’s example in his *Défense et Illustration de la Langue Française* (1549), an important influence on James VI’s ‘Reulis and Cautelis’ for poets writing in Scots. Du Bellay favoured a classical programme for the renewal of French poetry, but he continued to develop the sonnet as one of its principal forms.

Spenser’s translations of Marot’s and Du Bellay’s sequences appeared initially as ‘Epigrams’ and ‘Sonets’ in Jan van der Noot’s militantly Protestant compilation *A Theatre wherein be represented [...] the miseries and calamities that follow the voluptuous Worldlings* (1569).53 In these early renderings, Spenser conspicuously chose not to replicate the Petrarchan structures of his French originals using the English sonnet forms that his countrymen had consistently favoured in the decades after 1557. While two of his ‘Epigrams’ turned Marot’s twelve-line stanzas into sonnets on Surrey’s model, his ‘Sonets’ recast Du Bellay’s poems as a sequence of blank verse sonnets. Richard Schell suggests that Spenser’s decision to renounce rhyme in his translation of Du Bellay’s sonnets was influenced by the fact that ‘rhyme is not found in classical poetry’, and

---

53 Jan van der Noot, *A Theatre wherein be Represented as wel the Miseries & Calamities that Follow the Voluptuous Worldlings, as also the Greate Joyes and Plesures whic the Faithfull do Enioy* (London: printed by Henry Bynneman, 1569). Spenser’s ‘Epigrams’ appear on sigs B1v-B7v. The ‘Sonets’ are found on sigs B8r-D6r.
Spenser’s version may thus ‘reflect a humanist value’ congenial to the French poet’s reforming principles.\(^{54}\)

In 1591, Spenser included revised texts of the ‘Epigrams’ and ‘Sonets’ in his anthology of *Complaints*. The translations now appeared as ‘The Visions of Petrarch’ and ‘The Visions of Bellay’, and both had been remodelled as sonnet sequences with the rhyme-scheme favoured by Surrey.\(^{55}\) But this was not the end of Spenser’s experimentation. In the same collection a third sonnet sequence, ‘Visions of the Worlds Vanitie’, made its first appearance.\(^{56}\) This was an original sequence of twelve sonnets with the ‘Spenserian’ rhyme-scheme, heavily influenced by Du Bellay in its emblematic reflections on the trials of human life. These were not the first ‘Spenserian’ sonnets to be published, but they can claim another distinction. By Spiller’s reckoning, the sonnet sequences in Spenser’s *Complaints* were the first English sonnet sequences animated by a subject other than erotic or divine love to appear in print. (Spiller discounts the sonnets in George Gascoigne’s 1573 collection *A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres* and those in the *Theatre [for] Worldlings* on the grounds that these short sequences mingle too closely with other lyrics.)\(^{57}\)

The first Scottish sonnet sequence on a theme other than love was published seven years before Spenser’s *Complaints*. This was James VI’s ‘Twelf Sonnets of Inuocations to the Goddis’, a sequence appearing in the *Essayes* and introducing the king’s aesthetic principles and poetic ambition. McClune describes this sequence as a ‘literary test, examining the reader’s interpretative, or moral, strength’.\(^{58}\) In this respect, James’s


\(^{56}\) *Spenser, Complaints*, sigs X3r-Y1v.

\(^{57}\) Spiller, *The Development of the Sonnet*, p. 103.

‘Twelf Sonnets’ and Spenser’s ‘Visions of the Worlds Vanitie’ share a purpose, the emblematic mode of the latter challenging the reader to discern a sorrowful truth in worldly shadows. It is impossible to date the composition of Spenser’s ‘Visions of the Worlds Vanitie’, but it appears that in the 1580s both Spenser and James were breaking new ground in looking beyond traditional Petrarchan themes for the subject matter of their sonnets.

The thematic development of the sonnet is not the only area in which James VI’s *Essayes* precedes the published poetry of Spenser. This discussion has already noted that James’s 1584 collection contains the first printed examples of the ‘Spenserian’ sonnet. It was not until 1590 that the first ‘Spenserian’ sonnets written by Spenser himself appeared in print: this series of seventeen dedicatory sonnets introduced the first instalment of Spenser’s romance epic, *The Faerie Queene* (1590). Once again, it appears that during the 1580s Spenser and the Scottish poets embraced the same formal innovation, and critics have advanced a number of conjectures about its origins. Ian Ross suggests that the form could ‘have been a natural refinement of Surrey’s sonnet form (abab cdcd efef gg), well represented in *Tottel’s Miscellany* (editions 1557-1587), a book that was certainly known to the Scots’. Alternatively, Maria Philmus speculates that the ‘Spenserian’ sonnet evolved as a result of experimental contact between sonnet and stanzaic forms, as Wyatt’s English sonnet had done over half a century before. The interlinked quatrains of the ‘Spenserian’ form may thus have been an expansion of the French ballade stanza (*ababbcbc*), introduced into Britain by Chaucer for his ‘A B C’ poem and ‘The Monk’s Tale’, and championed by James as a form suited to ‘heich & graue subiectis’ in his

---

treatise on Scots poetry (Essayes, sig. M3\textsuperscript{v}). The ballade stanza is also a probable ancestor of the Faerie Queene stanza (ababcbcc, where the final line is an alexandrine), of which Spenser had composed at least two thousand by 1590.

Comparing the earliest datable examples of ‘Spenserian’ sonnets in England and Scotland provides a clearer picture of the likely order of precedence in the discovery of the form. Helena Mennie Shire states that ‘Montgomerie introduced the sonnet to Scottis Poesie by 1582 at the latest’, and his corpus of miscellaneous sonnets is one of the largest to survive from the Jacobean renaissance of the 1580s and 1590s (p. 150). Most of Montgomerie’s sonnets are ‘Spenserian’ in form, and by the time that James’s Essayes reached print in 1584, containing fifteen ‘Spenserian’ sonnets by the king and five by members of his coterie, the form had established itself as the overwhelming favourite of Scottish poets. On the other hand, there is no positive evidence that Spenser composed a sonnet in what became his signature form before 1586, when he addressed a ‘Spenserian’ sonnet to his friend Gabriel Harvey from ‘Dublin: this xvii. of July’.\textsuperscript{62}

It is through Harvey that the ‘most persuasive possibility for contact’ between the Scottish poets and Spenser exists, according to an insightful review of the debate surrounding the ‘Spenserian’ sonnet by McClune.\textsuperscript{63} Harvey was a dedicated reader and book-collector; by 1586 he had acquired a copy of the second edition of James VI’s Essayes, printed in Edinburgh the year before. This copy is now in the Old Library of Magdalene College, Cambridge, and Harvey’s inscription on the last page notes that he finished reading the book on 24 February 1586.\textsuperscript{64} In the course of his reading, Harvey recorded his responses to James’s texts in copious marginalia and manuscript additions,

\textsuperscript{63} McClune, ‘The “Spenserian Sonnet”’, p. 535.
sustaining what Jennifer Richards has described as an ‘imaginative dialogue’ with James VI as king and poet.\textsuperscript{65} In light of this intensive and admiring engagement with James’s writings, McClune concludes, ‘it seems inconceivable that [Harvey] would not have brought the [\textit{Essayes}] to the attention of Spenser’.\textsuperscript{66}

Harvey’s enthusiasm for James VI’s early poetry may have been instrumental in introducing Spenser to the sonnet form that now bears his name. This appears an even stronger probability in light of Spenser’s avowed interest in the French Protestant poet Guillaume de Salluste Du Bartas, an interest which may have been encouraged by Harvey in connection with James VI’s role as a translator of Du Bartas. It is clear from the physical configuration of Harvey’s copy of the \textit{Essayes} that James’s relationship with Du Bartas was a focus of Harvey’s intertextual mode of reading. Harvey’s copy is part of a \textit{Sammelband} which also contains James’s second poetry collection, \textit{His Maiesties Poetickal Exercises at Vacant Houres} (1591), and Josuah Sylvester’s 1592 translations from Du Bartas. Eleanor Relle states that Harvey had these books bound together ‘at some time in the early 1590s’, and Du Bartas is the unifying presence in all three (p. 401). The \textit{Essayes} contains the first translation of any poem by Du Bartas into a modern language; the original text of Du Bartas’ ‘L’Uranie’, depicting an encounter with the Muse of religious poetry, is printed in parallel to James’s Scots translation (Rickard, p. 47). \textit{His Maiesties Poetickal Exercises} features another translation from Du Bartas which demonstrates his fulfilment of the resolution signalled in ‘L’Uranie’ to write biblical verse; this is James’s rendering of part of Du Bartas’ \textit{La Seconde Sepmaine}, a compendious treatment of sacred history, as the Scots poem ‘The Furies’. In 1590 Sylvester became the first and ultimately the most successful poet to publish English

\textsuperscript{66} McClune, ‘The “Spenserian Sonnet”’, p. 536.
translations from Du Bartas, and Relle observes that Harvey’s copy of his second collection is in part ‘practically worn out with repeated energetic readings’ (p. 401).

Spenser seems never to have matched the intensity of Harvey’s enthusiasm for Du Bartas, but the French author’s championing of biblical poetry is recognised in Spenser’s Complaints. ‘Ruines of Rome’ concludes by hailing Du Bartas and ‘His heavenly Muse’ (Urania) as the new torch-bearers of ‘free Poësie’ in France.67 In addition, ‘L’Uranie’ stands as a precedent for Spenser’s depiction of Urania as the Muse of religious poetry in ‘The Teares of the Muses’. It is significant that Spenser’s interest appears to have been focused on ‘L’Uranie’, the poem that James VI singled out for his first venture as a translator. There is no firm evidence that ‘The Teares of the Muses’ and ‘Ruines of Rome’ were composed after 1584, but the probability is that Spenser’s conversations with ‘L’Uranie’ in these poems were underpinned by awareness of James’s 1584 version, a familiarity most likely reinforced by discussion with Harvey.

The influence of Du Bartas on Spenser and James VI points to further evidence of creative common ground between these poets in the 1580s which has not hitherto been noted. The printer William Ponsonby’s preface to Complaints mentions a pair of biblical poems among Spenser’s unpublished manuscripts, ‘namelie Ecclesiastes, & Canticum canticorum translated’, neither of which is now extant.68 Similarly, James pursued an interest in paraphrasing biblical texts into the 1590s, collecting his unpublished versions of thirty of the Psalms, the Song of Moses, the Lord’s Prayer and Ecclesiastes 12 in the Royal MS.69 This parallel indicates that further research into the reception of Du Bartas and the production of sacred poetry in Scotland and England may reveal more about the literary relationship between the two countries in the late sixteenth century.

68 Spenser, Complaints, sig. A2’.
In regard to the sonnet, this account has lent support to the hypothesis that Spenser learnt of Scottish developments in the sonnet soon after the publication of the Essayes, and that the new Scottish form appealed to the English poet either before, or because of, his experiments with the related Faerie Queene stanza. It must be stressed, however, that any inspiration Spenser gained from the Scottish sonnet served ultimately to set him on an independent creative path. In his hands the interlinking rhyme-scheme revealed its fullest potential in shaping a great Petrarchan sequence, Amoretti (1595). This was one of seventeen amatory sequences printed in England during the 1590s, a decade in which Fowler’s two Petrarchan cycles, William Alexander’s Aurora (published in 1604) and David Murray’s Caelia (1611) remained in manuscript in Scotland. It seems that while the history of the ‘Spenserian’ sonnet illuminates connections between English and Scottish literary culture, the broad contours of sonnet culture in both countries remain marked by contrast.

Manuscript and Meaning

James VI’s Essayes introduced the ‘Spenserian’ sonnet to print culture and showcased the new poetics of the coterie culture embracing the form. Its sequence of commendatory sonnets featured contributions from five poets connected to the Jacobean court; the initials attached to these sonnets in the Essayes identify the contributors as Alexander Montgomerie, William Fowler, the court musicians Thomas and Robert Hudson, and, less certainly, court servant William Murray.70 These poets not only implemented James’s recommendation that the sonnet be applied to ‘compendious praysing of any bukes, or the authouris thairof’; they also played a part, as Rickard points out, in the ‘construction of James as poet and King’ (p. 51). It now appears that the publication of the Essayes

70 The attribution of the third sonnet in the sequence to William Murray is suggested by Shire in Song, Dance and Poetry, p. 98. The initials attached to this sonnet in the Essayes are ‘M. VV.’ (sig. *3').
inspired other poets to respond to James’s new alignment of royal authority and authorship. The Winchester copy of the *Essayes* uniquely demonstrates that the printed collection continued to generate contributions in manuscript. On a blank page in this copy, the first following the commendatory sonnets, a contemporary transcribed a sixth sonnet (Fig. 3) which contributes anonymously to the chorus of praise for James (*Essayes*, sig. A2r). Though the identity of its author is unknown, this sonnet is the production of a poet deeply interested in courtly verse and possibly enjoying access to unpublished poetry from James’s circle. This analysis reveals the stylistically unsophisticated way in which the sonnet emulates courtly panegyric; it also highlights similarities between the manuscript poem and one of Montgomerie’s unpublished sonnets, providing a new perspective on the circulation and influence of ‘Castalian’ poetry.
‘Each handwritten copy of a poem is unique’, as Arthur Marotti affirms, and the manuscript sonnet bears this out not only in the scribal terms implied by Marotti but also as a textual witness.\(^7\) There is no trace of the poem in the manuscript indexes of the

\(^7\) Marotti, *Manuscript, Print, and the English Renaissance Lyric*, p. 25.
major libraries, nor has it been found in any printed source.\textsuperscript{72} The sonnet is inscribed in a formal humanist italic, a continental hand that began to be taught in Britain in the early sixteenth century and continued to gain ground over the next hundred years.\textsuperscript{73} Jonathan Goldberg has observed that English monarchs cemented the early prestige of the hand by adopting it for private correspondence, and James VI ‘invariably’ wrote letters and poetic manuscripts in his irregular italic (p. 234). By the second half of the sixteenth century, the italic hand had become current among highly educated men and women, in addition to being practised by scribes and calligraphers. The fine penmanship shown by the copyist of the sonnet in the Winchester Essayes is more likely to be that of a member of the Scottish elite than a professional scribe. The same copyist appears to have made a small number of critical annotations on one of James’s poems in the Essayes, and these will be discussed in the final section of the chapter.

The humanist hand helps to integrate the sonnet into its material context by mirroring the italic fount of the Latin epigram on the opposite page (sig. A1\textsuperscript{\textdegree}). The manuscript sonnet also shares the same simple title – ‘SONNET’ – as its printed counterparts. However, in another respect the poem sits uneasily in the space it occupies. The Winchester copy of the Essayes is ruled in red throughout, and the final couplet of the manuscript sonnet falls outside the lower margin drawn on the page. The ruling indicates that this was a presentation copy, which may have been given by a courtier or by James himself to a privileged recipient.\textsuperscript{74} If this is the case, the manuscript sonnet can be seen as one half of a gift exchange – a semi-public acknowledgement of an act of favour made by the king or in his name. The calligraphic features of the copy – extravagantly flourished

\textsuperscript{72} The manuscript indexes of the major libraries can be consulted through the Union First Line Index of English Verse <http://firstlines.folger.edu/>
\textsuperscript{74} The copy of the Essayes in the British Library (shelf-mark G.11237) is also ruled.
letters enlivening the margins and blank spaces around the text—indicate that the copyist had an audience in mind, and the poem may have been shown to the donor of the book or to a select group of participants in the Jacobean revival of court poetry.

The manuscript sonnet adopts the ‘Spenserian’ form exemplified by all five of the commendatory sonnets in the Essayes, and revisits many of the emblematic images and tropes of ‘Castalian’ panegyric:

SONNET

THY race, quhilk you resemblis, come we reid
Of Grecs & Greice, quhilk greitest vves in gloires
Quhilk did the sisters Citheriads breid,
Quha dois with laure thy Diademe decoire,
      Quhairby thy weirds & wirschip salbe moire, 5
Then thairs, that did ald Dardanie distroy:
Quha neuir haid sic honor heirtofoir
As of thair race is rissin sic a Roy.
   As Pergame thai, sua sall you tak new troy,
And greiter wirschip sall obtene thairby, 10
And palme & laure as vvirthiest, enioy.
Thy veirdis and werteu stryues as be inuy
The till aduance, & surlie to conserue:
    That michtie Mars hes machit with Minerwe[.]

This sonnet is unusual in signalling explicitly its indebtedness to other texts. Its first line acknowledges that James’s resemblance to ancient heroes is a topos which ‘we reid’ elsewhere, most obviously in the commendatory sonnets written for the Essayes by the Hudson brothers. Thomas Hudson’s sonnet apostrophises James as a second Alexander the Great: ‘O Macedon, adorne with heauenly grace’ (sig. *2r). Robert Hudson’s sonnet, the next in the sequence, celebrates James as a culture hero more worthy of the praise of

---

75 This transcription of the sonnet silently modernises letter forms, expands contractions, and drops an inserted letter into place. In addition, functional indentation replaces the layout of the manuscript poem. A second transcription in Appendix 1 preserves the original indentation, and adopts semi-diplomatic conventions to signal and gloss departures from the manuscript text.
emperors and conquerors than even Homer or Virgil: ‘What Alexander or Augustus bolde, / May sound his fame, whose vertewes pass them all?’ (sig. *2r). However, while the manuscript sonnet echoes the common tropes of ‘Castalian’ panegyric, it falls short of the style cultivated by the poets of James’s coterie, which is characterised by rhetorical elaboration of a logically developed argument. The octave is encumbered by pronouns such as ‘Quha [who]’, ‘thai’ and ‘thairs’, mapping the points of resemblance and contrast between James and the ancient Greeks. Furthermore, although the argument of the sonnet is amplified by emblematic devices, such as the ‘palme & laure’ (line 11) awaiting James in his future military and creative triumphs, the descriptive vigour and figurative imagination of ‘Castalian’ poetry are notably absent. Thomas Hudson’s sonnet, for example, employs twice as many adjectives as the manuscript sonnet, and culminates in a symbolic vision of James’s pre-eminence among rulers: ‘The Monarks all to thee shall quite their place: / Thy endles fame shall all the world fulfill’ (sig. *2r, lines 11-12).

The privileging of direct expression over stylistic amplification in the manuscript sonnet is an indication that its author was more invested in the task of addressing the king than in the challenge of refining a poetic voice. The poet may thus have been an occasional contributor to James’s poetic renaissance, one who recognised that James’s establishment of a newly intimate relationship between poetry and power had revived a creative medium through which political ideas could be refreshed and interrogated, and new voices could be heard. The courtiers who are known to have participated as poets in James’s cultural politics include the diplomatic contributors to an anthology of Latin verse on the death of Sir Philip Sidney, which was published in England in February 1587.76 Peter Herman states that the book contains ‘English and Latin versions of James’s epitaph for Sidney as well as contributions from Lord Patrick Gray, Sir John Maitland, Colonel

---

James Halkerston, Lord Alexander Seton, and the Earl of Angus, none of whom are
known today as poets, but all of whom were deeply involved with James’s highly slippery
diplomacy toward England’ (p. 166). Similarly, the poet whose sonnet is preserved in the
Winchester *Essays* is likely to have been a courtier or an individual working to
strengthen existing connections with court circles, whose identity is not yet known.

While the manuscript sonnet echoes many of the recurring devices found in the printed
sequence of commendatory sonnets, its structure may reveal a specific debt to an
unpublished poem by the ‘maister poete’ of the ‘Castalian’ group. The argument of the
Winchester sonnet and the structure of its imagery are mirrored in Montgomerie’s ‘In
praise of his Majestie’, a sonnet on Wyatt’s model which revisits many of the familiar
tropes of ‘Castalian’ panegyric with a combination of bathetic playfulness and prophetic
zeal:

Support me sacred Sisters for to sing
His Praise whilk passis the Antartik Pole
Quha fand the futsteppe of the fleing fole
And from Parnassus spyd the Pegase spring,

The hundreth saxt by lyne vnconquest King,
Quhais knichtlie Curage kindling lyk a Cole
Maks Couarts quaik and hyde thame in a hole.
His brand all Brytan to obey sall bring.

Come troup of tuinis, about his Temple tuyn
3our laurell leivis with palmis perftyly plet
Wpon his heid Cæsarean to sett.
Immortalize a noble nor the Nyne,
A Martiall Monarch with Minerva’s spreit,
That Prince whilk sall the Prophesie compleit.\(^77\)

Both Montgomerie’s sonnet and the Winchester sonnet begin by acknowledging James’s
ascendancy over Parnassus. The unknown author of the latter displays rare invention by
styling the Muses ‘the sisters Citheriads’ (line 3). This epithet is more than likely derived

from the name of Mount Cithaeron, or Kithairon, a sacred mountain in the Muses’ native Boiotia. The second quatrain of each sonnet forecasts a future of glorious conquest for James, and both sonnets in their third quatrains envision a composite crown of ‘laurell leivis with palmis perfytyl plet [entwined]’ (‘In praise of his Majestie’, line 10) as a symbol of James’s destiny. An important visual gloss on the meaning of this imagery is provided by the emblematic headpiece (Fig. 4) above the first of the commendatory sonnets in the Essayes (sig. *2r). This woodcut depicts a pair of hands – one armoured and grasping a sword, the other holding a laurel branch – and a royal crown transfixed by both sword and laurel. These are the insignia of the ‘learned yet valiant ruler’, a topos explored by ‘Castiglione, Ariosto, Cervantes, Rabelais, and many other Renaissance writers’, according to Sandra Sider. The woodcut incorporates another common device for denoting the attributes of such a ruler, in the form of a banner reading ‘MARTE ET MINERVA’. These Olympian gods are the patrons of war and wisdom respectively, and James’s embodiment of both their divine natures is a dominant motif of ‘Castalian’ praise which both Montgomerie’s sonnet and the Winchester sonnet reaffirm in their concluding couplets. The latter, re-establishing James as the subject of its final line with an awkward pronoun construction, declares that James’s person ‘hes machit [has united]’ (line 14) the qualities of Mars and Minerva.

Thus, both sonnets adhere to the same fundamental arrangement of tropes and images drawn from the emerging conventions of ‘Castalian’ panegyric. This raises the possibility of direct influence: while there is every chance that both poets independently deployed a number of favourite ‘Castalian’ devices in the same order, it is worth considering the possibility that the author of the Winchester sonnet read Montgomerie’s poem in

Figure 4. Thomas Hudson’s printed sonnet with emblematic headpiece, *Essayes*, sig. *2r*. By permission of the Warden and Fellows of Winchester College.
manuscript and modelled his own composition on its thematic progression. Almost all of
the surviving lyric verse by Montgomerie is collected in a manuscript anthology known as
the Ker Manuscript (Edinburgh University Library MS De. 3. 70), a collection probably
compiled by the noblewoman Margaret Ker from papers left by Montgomerie on his death
in 1598.\(^{79}\) Lyall states that only ‘a few isolated poems’ by Montgomerie are known to
exist in other Scottish manuscript anthologies, and ‘In praise of his Majestie’ is not one of
them (p. 2). However, Lyall has discovered ‘an apparent echo’ of a defamatory sonnet by
Montgomerie in the records of a 1611 legal quarrel, leading him to conclude, ‘it is not
improbable that the manuscript tradition was livelier than the surviving evidence might
suggest’ (p. 3). There are no direct phrasal echoes of Montgomerie’s ‘In praise of his
Majestie’ in the Winchester sonnet, and the latter poem therefore provides equivocal
evidence of the circulation and influence of Montgomerie’s poetry in the 1580s. The
Winchester sonnet appears to be the work of a less accomplished poet, and while it
contains some allusions to the commendatory sonnets in the Essayes neither its argument
nor its declarative rhetoric owe much to these printed examples. Thus, the possibility
remains that its author was more directly influenced in these respects by manuscript
precedents, and the likeliest exemplar is Montgomerie’s ‘In praise of his Majestie’, a
poem which may well have had a more prolific scribal history than is recoverable today.

In regard to form, as has been observed, the Winchester sonnet follows the
commendatory sequence printed in the Essayes in adopting the newly minted ‘Spenserian’
form. However, the poet’s handling of this form is distinctly uneven, in ways that indicate
a greater self-consciousness about the intertextuality of the poem than is evident in the
printed sonnets or in Montgomerie’s ‘In praise of his Majestie’. The contrast with
Montgomerie’s formal execution in the latter poem is instructive. ‘In praise of his

\(^{79}\) This suggestion, put forward by R. D. S. Jack, is accepted by Lyall in Alexander Montgomerie, p. 29.
Majestie’ is one of a minority of sonnets in Montgomerie’s surviving corpus that do not adopt the ‘Spenserian’ form. This sonnet instead follows Wyatt’s model (rhyming \textit{abba abba cdcc ee}), and Montgomerie achieves a balance between containment and freedom in his handling of the form. The enclosed rhymes of the octave bracket two thematically discrete quatrains, one celebrating James as a pathbreaking poet, the second as a formidable king. In the sestet, the poetic and political concerns of these quatrains are brought together, and the syntactic break in the middle (a full stop in line 11) introduces a new rhythm by obscuring Wyatt’s separation of the final quatrain and the closing couplet.

The Winchester sonnet is an example of the form favoured by Scottish poets, in which the carryover of $b$ and $c$ rhymes into the second and third quatrains typically generates a steady momentum towards the climax. In the Winchester sonnet, however, these transitions are accompanied by unexpected leaps in the poet’s argument. The first comes at the start of the second quatrain:

\begin{quote}
thy weirs [fortunes] & wirship salbe moire,  
Then thairs, that did ald Dardanie distroy[.] (lines 5-6)
\end{quote}

This assertion that the favour of the Muses presages ‘moire’ renown for James at first implies an abstract increase. But the enjambment of these lines ushers in a comparative statement that James’s fame will in fact be ‘moire’ than that attained by the ancient Greeks. At the start of the third quatrain, this comparison is modified as the poet introduces a parallel between James and his ancient Greek forebears. It is forecast that James will emulate the Greeks’ most famous conquest, triumphing in London (which had originated, according to legend, as a Trojan settlement in ancient Britain) as the Greeks conquered Troy:

\begin{quote}
As Pergame thai, sua sall you tak new Troy,  
And greiter wirschip sall obtene thairby[.] (lines 9-10)
\end{quote}
Montgomerie also foresees a future triumph for James over ‘all Brytan’ (‘In praise of his Majestie’, line 8), but in his sonnet this vision comes at the culmination of the octave. In the Winchester sonnet, by contrast, the parallel between James and his ancient ‘race’ (line 8) is introduced at the beginning of the sestet, once again redefining the meaning of previous lines after a structural pause.

The handling of these transitions produces a rhythmically unbalanced sonnet. By refocusing the argument at pivotal moments, the poet seems to be continually exploring both form and content, instead of moving purposely toward resolution. The sonnet is held together by a pattern of verbal repetition – James’s ‘laure’, ‘weirds’ and ‘wirschip’ are introduced in the octave and return in the sestet with heightened senses – and this also has the effect of giving new meaning to central ideas in the course of the poem. This sense of discovery in the manuscript sonnet is a reflection of the poet’s creative process, which, as we have seen, renovated the tropes of the printed commendatory sequence in the Essayes, as well as possibly reworking the argument of Montgomerie’s unpublished sonnet. The sonnet thus manifests a degree of self-consciousness about its intertextual relationships which is not present in its ‘Castalian’ precedents, and illuminates the ‘self-reflexive’ potential of the Scottish sonnet in a new way. In its restless refashioning of printed and perhaps manuscript sources, the Winchester sonnet acknowledges its contribution to an existing poetic culture and its fluidity as a manuscript poem.

*The Politics of Prophecy*

Unlike its printed precedents, the manuscript sonnet in the Winchester Essayes defines James VI’s future success in terms of a measurable political objective. The poem looks forward to James’s conquest of ‘new Troy’ (line 9), alluding to the well-known fable that
London originated as a settlement founded by the Trojan Brutus in ancient Britain. With his cousin Elizabeth I ageing and childless, the greatest prize within James’s reach in the late sixteenth century was the English throne. In its acknowledgement of this fact, the Winchester sonnet invests the triumphal notes of ‘Castalian’ panegyric with a sense of incompleteness, implying that the true import of its predictions would only be revealed in the course of future events. This discussion emphasises the difficulties that James encountered in attempting to secure his claim to the English throne in the 1580s and 1590s, and reveals how the Winchester sonnet captures both Scottish pride in James’s destiny and concern about the struggle to achieve it.

In 1562 the poet Alexander Scott offered a ‘New Yer Gift’ in verse to Mary Queen of Scots, who had returned from France to her native realm less than five months earlier. Scott’s poem anticipates a royal marriage in the coming year (though it was not until 1565 that Mary married her second husband Henry Stewart, Lord Darnley), and reaffirms the dynastic importance of such a union by relating a prophecy. Old ‘sawis’ pronounce that a ‘berne sould bruke [possess] all bretane be þe see’, and Scott concludes that ‘þe same sowld spring of þe’, the newly repatriated Queen of Scots. Prophecies of union had therefore played a part in speculation about Scotland’s future since before James’s birth, and as the sixteenth century wore on Elizabeth I’s refusal to name her successor on the English throne lent such prophecies increasing political weight.

Montgomerie invokes this prophetic tradition at climactic moments in his sonnet. The second quatraine culminates in a restatement of the prophecy elucidated by Scott in his

80 Stephen A. Barney explains that according to a tradition derived from Geoffrey of Monmouth, the Trojan ‘Brute founded a city named Trinovantum […], that is, Troynovant, Troia Nova, ‘New Troy’ (the latter names concocted by Geoffrey)’, which later became known as London. Stephen A. Barney, ‘Troy’, in The Spenser Encyclopedia, ed. by A. C. Hamilton (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990), pp. 701-2 (p. 701).
‘New Yeir Gift’: the poet declares that Mary’s son will in future compel ‘all Brytan to obey’ (‘In praise of his Majestie’, line 8). The speaker’s visionary stance is laid bare in the final line of the sonnet, which hails James as ‘That Prince whilk sall the Prophesie compleit’ (line 14). The oldest authority for this prophetic tradition is Geoffrey of Monmouth’s seminal contribution to British national myth, the twelfth-century *History of the Kings of Britain*. The first book of this history tells the story of Brutus, a descendant of the Trojan refugee Aeneas and the founding father of ancient Britain. Once settled on the island – a territory that then ‘had no inhabitants save for a few giants’ – Brutus established ‘a city which he called New Troy’ and thus laid the foundations of early modern London. On his death, Brutus’s three sons ‘divided up the kingdom of Britain among them’ and founded the nations of England, Wales and Scotland. In a supplement to the history, Geoffrey records a prophecy forecasting the eventual reunion of these alienated territories: Merlin foretells that ‘The island will be called by Brutus’ name and the foreign term will disappear’ (p. 148).

Therefore, underpinning Montgomerie’s sonnet and many other prophetic statements on both Scottish and English sides was a conception of James’s bid for the English throne as a historic endeavour to unify the divided legacy of Brutus. In 1602 Elizabeth’s godson Sir John Harington concluded his manuscript treatise on the English succession by adducing a Welsh prophecy ‘elder then my great grandfather’, according to which ‘a babe crownd in his cradle […] shall make the ile of Brutus whole and unparted’; James VI, King of Scotland from the age of thirteen months, could easily be identified as the prophesied monarch. Roberta Brinkley notes that in 1603 the prophecies were fulfilled,

---

as James ‘had himself proclaimed King of Great Britain, giving up his separate titles to
the kingdoms’ and re-enacting the founding myth of the nation.84

However, James’s casting as a second Brutus provided a compelling fiction to
counteract a fraught reality. To many English eyes in the late sixteenth century and
beyond, James was a foreign king, and he faced years of uncertainty during Elizabeth’s
reign over the acceptance of his claim in England and the threat of international hostility
after her death. In 1586 James signed a treaty with England, agreeing to defer to
Elizabeth’s direction in foreign affairs in return for her promise to ‘abandon the internal
meddling she had engaged in […] since the overthrow of [James’s last regent] Morton’ in
1578 (Lee, p. 64). But at no point in these negotiations did Elizabeth submit to the most
insistent of James’s requests by granting him the formal recognition that he craved as a
rightful claimant to the succession. The queen continued her intransigence to the end,
withholding from her Scottish cousin any positive assurance that his hereditary claims
were not invalidated by English common law or by the terms of Henry VIII’s will. This
politic reserve on Elizabeth’s part led James to undertake tactical manoeuvres of his own.
‘Until the end of the century’, as Susan Doran has shown, ‘[James] feared that some
would rally round the other candidates on the queen’s death’, and he took steps to
strengthen his position both at home and abroad.85

In 1597 James ‘told the Scottish parliament that he expected to have need of arms to
win the throne’, and obtained oaths from twenty-seven of his nobles to support him in the
event of such an enterprise (Doran, p. 607). James’s diplomatic manoeuvres were no less
bold: he sought to convince the Protestant princes of Germany and his brother-in-law,

84 Roberta Florence Brinkley, *Arthurian Legend in the Seventeenth Century* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins
85 Susan Doran, ‘Revenge her Foul and Most Unnatural Murder? The Impact of Mary Stewart’s Execution
Christian IV of Denmark, of the justice of his claim, while courting the good will of the Catholic powers in Europe. However, James’s fear of Catholic resistance had a dangerous influence on his policy closer to home. In 1589 he refrained from taking action against the earl of Huntly and other Catholic nobles when evidence emerged that they were in secret contact with Spain; three years later he showed the same reluctance in the midst of a political crisis precipitated by their murderous feuding. Maurice Lee has pointed out that these episodes not only threatened to overturn James’s political authority in Scotland, but also put the Anglo-Scottish alliance of 1586 ‘in serious danger’ of collapse, as England reverted to its old habits of interference in an attempt to neutralise the Catholic faction north of the border (p. 75). In the 1590s, therefore, James’s efforts to build a broad base of support for his claim to the English succession risked dividing and alienating even his Scottish subjects. His calculation that a moderate stance towards Catholics would tip the political balance in his favour on Elizabeth’s death instead provoked a series of crises during the years following the defeat of the Spanish Armada.

The events of the 1590s came about as a result of irreconcilable tensions between James’s long-term tactics and the demands of the immediate political climate. The Winchester sonnet acknowledges these uncertainties on the path to James’s eventual triumph by setting his future career alongside the past glories of the ancient Greeks. The octave elevates the future renown of the Scottish king above ‘thairs, that did ald Dardanie distroy’. Dardania is the name of an ancient city founded and ruled by Dardanus, whose son established the nearby city of Troy. However, the Scottish poet Gavin Douglas, in his translation of the Aeneid (completed in 1513), employs ‘Dardanus’ and ‘Dardane’ to signify the entire region centred on Troy, and it is in this sense that the Winchester sonnet
refers to ‘ald Dardanie’.\textsuperscript{86} The author of the sonnet states that James’s pre-eminence over the conquering Greeks is assured by the Muses’ gift of ‘laure’ (line 4) to adorn his crown. This symbol of eloquence suggests that James might surpass the Greeks by becoming his own laureate and chronicler, and thus glances at an important strain of ‘Castalian’ panegyric representing James as a modern Caesar. Robert Hudson’s contribution to the \textit{Essayes}, for instance, concludes by renouncing its laudatory efforts, ‘For \textsc{caesars} works, shall iustly \textsc{caesar} crowne’ (\textit{Essayes}, sig. *2\textsuperscript{v}). But the hint of this Roman character in the manuscript sonnet is soon displaced by a bold analogy between James and his ancient Greek ancestors: ‘As Pergame thai, sua sall you tak new Troy’. ‘Pergame’ is a form of the name given in classical poetry to the citadel of Troy, glossed by Douglas as ‘Pergama, the Troiane wallys wyg [strong]’.\textsuperscript{87} The sonnet indicates that James has the potential to surpass the Greeks in cultural endeavours, but he is destined to emulate them in military conquest.

Montgomerie, Scott and other political prophets envisioned James’s future as the fulfilment of a British national myth, the coming of a king destined to reunite the nation founded by Brutus and his Trojan people. In contrast, the Winchester sonnet identifies James with the enemies of the Trojans – the ancient race ‘Of Grecs’ (line 2) – and thus portrays him as the leader of an autonomous Scottish nation with its roots in Greek antiquity. This portrayal invokes a mythology that had been systematised in the late thirteenth and fourteenth centuries by Scottish clerics setting out to counterbalance the imperial vision of Britain derived from Geoffrey of Monmouth.\textsuperscript{88} John of Fordun’s


Chronica gentis Scotorum (c.1363) articulated what became the standard narrative of Scotland’s ancient history; Fordun claimed that ‘the Scots were not descended from Troy, but from a Graeco-Egyptian pedigree, in particular the elopement of Scota, the daughter of Pharaoh, with Gathelos, a Greek prince, whose descendants came to Scotland – eventually – by a maritime route via the Mediterranean, Iberia, and Ireland’ (Kidd and Coleman, p. 64). In the Winchester sonnet, as in earlier articulations of this myth, the emphasis on the Greek origins of the Scottish nation can be seen as a reaction against the mythology of a united Britain. In the late sixteenth century, when British mythology allowed both Scottish and English observers to express hope that James would build a new and stronger nation through peaceful means, the author of the Winchester sonnet insisted that it was James’s destiny to enlarge and enrich Scotland through conquest south of the border.

Through its construction of James as a ruler in the ancient Greek mould, the manuscript sonnet expresses pride in the future of Scottish kingship. At the same time, however, it acknowledges the impact that English resistance to James’s succession could have on this future. The analogy between James’s anticipated triumph in London and the Trojan War not only underlines the possibility of militant opposition to James in England, but also raises the prospect of a long and violent struggle to subdue it. It is unclear, in the closing lines of the sonnet, whether James will win the ‘palme & laure’ (line 11) as Elizabeth’s acknowledged successor, or as England’s conqueror, bringing war to London as the ancient Greeks brought destruction to Troy. In the last decades of the sixteenth century, James demonstrated his readiness for the latter role, publicly announcing that he would claim the English throne by force when the time came. The Winchester sonnet makes space for this tactical role within the prophetic terms of ‘Castalian’ panegyric, emphasising that James’s political destiny, like his poetic self, was still in the making.
The Trojan legend forms the basis of a similar exploration of the implications of unfulfilled prophecies in another courtly poem linked to the Essayes. In his ‘Reulis and Cautelis’, James gave as a specimen of the form he called ‘Commoun verse’ (stanzas rhyming ababcc with octosyllabic lines) the final stanza of Montgomerie’s poem commencing ‘Before the Greeks durst enterpryse’ (Essayes, sig. M4v). This short poem tells the story of the Greek delegation to the oracle of Apollo at Delphi, hoping to learn ‘Hou they suld speid and hai’f succes’ if they were to wage war on Troy. Their sacrifices made,

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Apollo made them Ansueir soon} \\
\text{Hou Troy and Trojans haiv they suld} \\
\text{To vse them hailly as they wold[.]}^{89}
\end{align*}
\]

In the final stanza, the poem’s speaker steps forward to draw a parallel between the Greeks’ delight at this oracular pronouncement and his own pleasure in a promise received:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{thus spak Apollo myne,} \\
\text{“All that thou seeks it sall be thyne”.}
\end{align*}
\]

However, as Lyall observes, this is the naïve conceit of a petitioner apparently oblivious to the fact that ten years of struggle stood between the ancient Greeks and their prophesied victory (p. 114). The speaker’s self-disclosure in the final stanza is thus an ironic denouement, isolating him from the reader aware that a painful delay may follow his initial elation. It is also a self-conscious strategy on the part of the poet, whose position implicitly parallels that of his speaker: ‘how long, the poet (as distinct from his gullible persona) seems to be asking, will you make me wait for the fulfilment of your promise?’ (Lyall, p. 115). If ‘Apollo myne’ is understood to represent James, the poem may be seen as part of Montgomerie’s campaign for the royal pension that he was granted on 27 July
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89 Montgomerie, Poems, I, p. 74.
1583. However its enigmatic subtext is interpreted, there can be no doubt that the poem exposes the slipperiness of oracular and performative speech, exploiting the disjunction between rhetoric and reality in order to dramatise the precarious state of a courtier. The Winchester sonnet, though it exposes the same disjunction, is without the ironies of Montgomerie’s poem. Its speaker adopts the authoritative rhetoric of ‘Castalian’ panegyric, emulating the commendatory sonnets printed in the *Essayes* in its construction of James as a rising cultural and military leader. At the same time, its central analogy implies that in the political climate of the 1580s and 1590s the implications of this rhetoric were not fixed. In this respect, the poem brings a new interpretative openness to the ‘Castalian’ mode, and just as it extends the printed sequence of five sonnets, so it prepares the ground for further debate.

*The Story of Troy*

Both the Winchester sonnet and Montgomerie’s self-ironising lyric, ‘Before the Greeks durst enterpryse’, harness the Troy legend to develop an equivocal mode of courtly address to James VI. There is a further context for the role of the Troy story in the Winchester sonnet, one determined not primarily by intertextual affinities but by the reading practices of the copyist or author of the manuscript poem itself. There are two references to the ancient city of Troy in the texts printed in the *Essayes*, both of which occur in James’s translation of *L’Uranie, ou Muse Celeste*, a vindication of sacred poetry first published by Du Bartas in 1574.90 In the Winchester copy of the *Essayes*, one of these references is underlined and the other corrected with the same dark ink used to transcribe the sonnet, and probably by the same hand. Since these are the only marks on
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90 This statement discounts a third reference to Troy which differs from the two mentioned in that occurs as an epithet describing the ancestry of a person. The eighth of James’s ‘Twelf Sonnets of Inuocation to the Goddis’ features Misenus, ‘the *Troyan* trumpetour most raire’ (*Essayes*, sig. B3’), whose demise Virgil depicts in the sixth book of the *Aeneid*. 
the printed text in the book, it appears that a reader with a special interest in the poetic uses of Trojan history found and interrogated the two allusions to this history in James’s Scots ‘Vranie’. James’s references to Troy in his translation correspond to two of his boldest departures from the sense of Du Bartas’ poem, and they show that the ancient city played a supporting role in James’s self-construction as an apprentice poet.

In his Preface to ‘The Vranie’ James professed to have printed the French poem and his Scots version in parallel ‘to let appeare more plainly to the [...] reader, wherin I haue erred, to the effect, that with lesse difficulty he may escape those snares wherin I haue fallen’ (Essayes, sig. C3v). James’s confession of inadequacy authorises the reader to correct the errors in his translation of Du Bartas’ poem. This posture deflects any attempt to understand James’s deviations from the original as intentional or instinctive revisions. There is, however, much to be gained from such a reading. Perhaps the most politically sensitive of James’s departures from the sense of his original occurs early in his translation. In the opening lines of Du Bartas’ Uranie the poet recalls ‘l’Auril de mon aage [sic]’ (Essayes, sig. C4v), a youthful phase characterised by restless ambition and persistent uncertainty about the value of secular poetic endeavours. The poet begins to record his discarded ventures:

\begin{verse}
Tantost i’entreprenoy d’orner la Grecque Scene
D ’vn vestement Francois. Tantost dvn vers plus haut,
Hardi, i’ensanglantoy le Francois eschafaut
Des Tyrans d’Ilion, de Thebes, de Mycene.
\end{verse}

The poet states metaphorically that he attempted to refine Greek drama by presenting it in a contemporary language and theatre, or ‘un vestement Francois’ (‘a French garb’). On another occasion, he claims to have transplanted the history of ancient kingdoms onto ‘le François eschafaut’ (‘the French boards’), staging the bloody rule of the ‘Tyrans d’Ilion, de Thebes, de Mycene’ (‘tyrants of Troy, Thebes and Mycenae’). The poet thus reveals
his early ambition to further the humanist rediscovery of Greek tragedy, a movement that reached France shortly after 1500 and produced both original plays set in the ancient world – such as Robert Garnier’s *La Troade* (1579) and Jean Robelin’s *La Thébaïde* (1584) – and translations from Sophocles and Euripides.\(^9^1\) The image of a bloodstained stage (*eschafaut* also translates as ‘scaffold’) indicates both that the poet endorsed theatrical violence and that his tragic vision had a cautionary import for autocratic rulers and their subjects.

The corresponding passage in James’s translation is underlined in the Winchester *Essayes*:

> I whyles essaide the *Grece* in Frenche to praise,  
> Whyles in that toung I gaue a lusty glaise [gallant attempt?]\(^9^2\)  
> For to descryue the *Troian* Kings of olde,  
> And them that *Thebes* and *Mycens* crowns did holde.  (*Essayes*, sig. D1\(^5\))

James’s version neutralises the political stance of the original, most obviously by reappraising the ancient rulers as crowned ‘Kings’ and remaining silent on their tyrannical government. This emphasis on royal status over political conduct seems to encapsulate James’s mature position as a king asserting an inviolable divine right to rule, but in its immediate context the change is symptomatic of another anxiety. In the Scots ‘Vranie’ there is no hint that the young poet had theatrical ambitions: he merely aspired ‘to praise’ and ‘to descryue’ ancient leaders in verse. Furthermore, these rulers are insistently historicised: the rhyming phrases ‘of olde’ and ‘did holde’ represent them as static figures in a remote past. Thus, the poet in James’s translation understands history as a story to be
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\(^9^2\) The *Dictionary of the Older Scottish Tongue* (*DOST*) cites this as the sole usage illustrating a second sense of the noun ‘glaise’; however, it merely notes that the meaning of the word in this context is unknown. *DOST* is part of the online *Dictionary of the Scottish Language* <http://www.dsl.ac.uk/> [accessed 21 October 2013].
retold and reinterpreted, suppressing the enthusiasm shown by his counterpart in Du Bartas’ poem for history as a living presence in the theatre. This revision, privileging the individual poetic voice over the popular theatrical experience, can be seen as an early manifestation of the anxiety about historical drama and its communal creation of meaning that James explored more directly in his later poetry. Rickard has argued that by the early 1620s James seemed ‘anxiously aware that kings might indeed be dangerously like actors in terms of being dependent on their audiences’ (p. 195). In the Winchester copy, the underlining in this part of James’s translation gives no clue to the impressions formed by the annotator, but a close comparison of the parallel texts would have illuminated some of the young king’s enduring anxieties.

Unlike the first, the second of James’s noted departures from the original Uranie appears not to have been intentional. In James’s translation, Urania advises the gifted poet to devote himself to the study of his cultural inheritance:

> How oft thou lykes reid ouer booke efter booke,  
> The bookes of Troy, and of that towne which tooke  
> Her name from Alexander Monark then[.] (Essayes, sigs D4r, E1r)

Troy is an incongruous partner to Alexandria as a famous repository of ‘bookes’, and a comparison of these lines with Du Bartas’ text on the facing page reveals the source of the confusion. In the original poem Urania recommends ‘Les liures de Pergame’ (Essayes, sig. D3v): the contents of the ancient library at Pergamon, second only to the larger collection at Alexandria as a centre of learning in the ancient Greek world. The lost and unrecorded holdings of both libraries could not be accessed physically, but Urania implies that their texts and scholarship were extant in a tradition of humanist learning. Just as the inspiration of all true poets flows from ‘the fyrie heauen’ (Essayes, sig. E1r), so
knowledge of the art of poetry has its ultimate source in two extraordinary, inaccessible libraries.

An error in James’s translation transforms this allusion to the ancient library of Pergamon in a way that reflects one of James’s personal burdens of influence. In the manuscript sonnet transcribed earlier in the Winchester Essayes, ‘Pergame’ signifies the Trojan citadel, and it is this sense that James adopts in his translation of ‘Les liures de Pergame’. Thus, in the Scots poem Urania no longer refers to an ancient source library for humanist knowledge, but to a tradition of writing about ancient Troy that began long after the city’s destruction. James’s interest in the rich poetic aspect of this tradition may have left him prone to misunderstanding Du Bartas’ text. The surviving records of his library indicate that he owned eight editions or translations of Virgil, including recent annotated texts edited by Henri Estienne (c.1575) and Germain Vaillant de Guélis (1575). In the last of his ‘Tvvelf Sonnets of Inuocations’, a sequence laying bare his aesthetic principles, James announced his ambition to emulate Virgilian epic: ‘I lofty Virgill shall to life restoir’ (Essayes, sig. C1v). Therefore, James’s erroneous substitution of ‘The bookes of Troy’ for the library of Pergamon in Urania’s advice to the ambitious poet reflects the importance that he attached to the Aeneid in particular as a poetic model. Whether or not the annotating reader of the Winchester Essayes understood this, he discovered the error and acted on James’s prefatory guidance to avoid ‘those snares wherein I haue fallen’. The word ‘Troy’ is lightly crossed out in the Winchester copy and the correction ‘Pergame’ is written in the margin.

The appearances of Troy in the Scots ‘Vranie’ present a revealing case-study of James’s refashioning of the ambitious poet in Du Bartas’ poem in his own image.
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Furthermore, the annotations associated with both of these references in the Winchester *Essayes* show that either the copyist or the author of the manuscript sonnet carried its thematic focus on the Troy story into their reading of James’s published poetry. It is notable that in the Winchester *Essayes* the name ‘Pergame’, having appeared in the sonnet, is restored to ‘The Vranie’; this may indicate that the author of the sonnet read and annotated James’s translation before composing and copying his own poem.

Whatever the role of the annotator in the production of the manuscript sonnet, it is clear that the annotations form an interpretative bridge between two roles which belong at opposite poles of James’s repertoire as a ‘Laureat king’. They record an encounter with James as the subject of a panegyric poem on the one hand, and as the author of an imperfect translation on the other, held together by the same thematic concern. Scholars of the ‘Castalian’ movement at the Jacobean court have agreed that its collaborative practices and early productivity were sustained by the king’s willingness to play a variety of creative roles. The copyist and annotator of the Winchester *Essayes* bears out this conclusion in a new way: by interacting with James in two dissimilar guises, he demonstrates that a culture of potential contradictions could nevertheless be understood coherently and imaginatively by its participants.

Thistlethwayte may have treasured his copy of the *Essayes* as the creation of a royal author not yet nineteen years old, but its manuscript additions can now be understood as the products of a confident and exclusive culture. The manuscript gathering at the end of the book reveals how privileged readers forged their own alignments between the manuscript and published poetry by James in circulation in the late 1580s and 1590s. Furthermore, the manuscript sonnet demonstrates that one less experienced poet drew on a growing corpus of panegyric poetry to add his voice to the construction of James as a
martial monarch. In its multi-faceted and richly interactive combination of manuscript and printed texts, Thistlethwayte’s copy of the *Essayes* is an outstanding illustration of the exchange of creative roles and influences which sustained James’s poetic renaissance. Its provenance may be untraceable, but it carries a rich and eloquent history.
In 1726, Lewis Theobald made his debut as a Shakespearean textual critic with the publication of *Shakespeare Restored: Or, a Specimen of the Many Errors, as well Committed, as Unamended, by Mr. Pope in his Late Edition of this Poet*. Focusing the body of his work on the text of *Hamlet*, Theobald criticised the conservative editorial approach that Pope professed to have followed in his deluxe quarto edition of 1725, and insisted that judicious intervention to rectify corrupt and unintelligible passages in Shakespeare was warranted. Five years later, in 1731, Theobald secured a contract to produce a new edition of Shakespeare’s plays, and he agreed to base his new text on its immediate predecessor, Pope’s second edition of 1728.\(^1\) Part of the printer’s copy for Theobald’s edition has survived: the British Library holds the copy for *Antony and Cleopatra*, while the copy for a further nine of the thirty-one plays in the edition survives in Winchester College Fellows’ Library, as part of the collection donated by Alexander Thistlethwayte.

In 1986, Richard Corballis gained brief access to Theobald’s printer’s copy in the Fellows’ Library, verifying that it forms part of Theobald’s marked-up copy of Pope’s 1728 *Shakespear*, and publishing a short account of its array of printing-house annotations.\(^2\) This chapter begins by extending Corballis’s study of the bibliographical make-up of Theobald’s copy and its use in the printing process. The copy’s physical
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transformation from interleaved duodecimo gatherings to batches of individual leaves is explained, and the pressures of the working relationship between Theobald and his printers are reconsidered.

In the remainder of this study, evidence from the Winchester portion of Theobald’s printer’s copy informs a broader revaluation of Theobald’s rationale for adopting Pope’s second edition as his copy-text and his success in tackling the problems that he identified in *Shakespeare Restored*. It is argued that in adopting Pope’s edition as his copy-text, Theobald sought to appropriate and add to its modern paratexts and accidentals, as well as to identify and root out its substantive errors using a combination of specialist knowledge and critical acuity. However, my analysis of the texts of *King Lear* reveals that most of the unauthorised readings introduced into this text by Pope were allowed to remain in Theobald’s edition. The methodology of this analysis follows that of Simon Jarvis in his study of Theobald’s editing: where Jarvis based his conclusions on a collation of Theobald’s text of *Hamlet* against his copy-text, the present study draws on a new collation of Pope’s and Theobald’s texts of *King Lear*, a play less often discussed in modern studies of Theobald’s editing.³ The present study, moreover, revises Jarvis’s conclusions about the eclecticism of Theobald’s practice. It argues that Theobald relied not on systematic collation but on critical analysis of his copy-text to locate and rectify inaccurate readings. This approach had a notable precedent in the work of the classical scholar Richard Bentley, but it was not well-suited to the task of eliminating the pervasive errors in Theobald’s copy-text.

From Printing-House to Library

On 26 October 1731, Theobald and the younger Jacob Tonson contracted to publish ‘a Correct Edition of … Shakespear’s Plays’ (Seary, p. 215). The terms of their agreement required Theobald to send in the copy ‘comp[let]e for ye press’ within two months, and Tonson acted promptly to supply his editor with the necessary materials. In November Theobald reported in a letter to Warburton that ‘Tonson has sent me in a Shakespeare interleav’d; & I am now extracting such notes & Emendations, as upon the Maturest Deliberation, I am certain will stand the Test.’

Corballis has correctly identified the printer’s copy for nine plays preserved at Winchester College, and the copy for one more play held at the British Library, as originally part of this ‘Shakespeare interleav’d’. Theobald’s interleaved Shakespeare is described by Corballis as belonging to ‘the second edition of Pope’s Shakespeare [sic], published in 1728 in eight volumes’ in cheaper duodecimo format (p. 157). The eight volumes of this edition were issued as part of two Tonson products in 1728. First, they made up an eight-volume set of Shakespeare’s plays issued under Tonson’s individual imprint. Secondly, they were reissued with new title pages, according to ESTC, as part of a ten-volume set including older texts of Shakespeare’s poems and apocryphal plays; the imprint on the overall title page names ‘J. and J. Knapton’ and a consortium of fourteen other booksellers. Tonson was one of these partners, and the expanded edition pursues his policy of incorporating texts and critical apparatus retailed initially by other
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7 The Works of Mr. William Shakespear, ed. by Alexander Pope, 10 vols (London: J. and J. Knapton and others, 1728). This edition is ESTC No. T138590.
booksellers (in companion volumes to the first editions by Pope and Rowe) into revised versions of his editions.

Appendix 2 contains a bibliographical description of the volumes of Theobald’s printer’s copy assembled by Thistlethwayte and donated to Winchester College Fellows’ Library. Each of the three volumes contains the copy for three plays, organised and bound as a collection of individual leaves. The printed and inserted leaves are no longer arranged in alternating sequence; as Corballis has noted, the annotated leaves are grouped together following the printed leaves of each play and often bound into the volumes out of order or at the wrong edge (p. 157, note 6). The sometimes careless arrangement of the leaves is matched by the untidy binding of the volumes. The binder made stab-holes well into the inner margins at the top and bottom of the leaves (many have torn as the threads have loosened over time), and used overcast stitches and copious amounts of hide glue to secure them to five cords at the spine. The results are covered by Dutch marbled boards and handsomely lettered spine labels, both characteristic features of many of Thistlethwayte’s books.

The dilapidation of these poorly constructed volumes is in sharp contrast to the careful conservation of the smaller portion of Theobald’s copy held at the British Library. The copy for *Antony and Cleopatra* has a fine late twentieth-century binding, and trimming and tissue repair have neatedn the uneven edges of the leaves and reinforced sewing holes. While this has produced an object whose condition reflects its value as a rare Shakespearean artefact, it has done so at the expense of evidence of the copy’s material history. As a result of the conservation work, many physical traces of the prior construction and deconstruction of Theobald’s printer’s copy have either been lost or obscured.
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8 Theobald’s *Antony and Cleopatra*. British Library, shelf-mark C.45.b.11.
In Winchester, by contrast, the Fellows’ Library has not intervened to improve the condition of Thistlethwayte’s volumes, and as a consequence it is possible to rediscover some features of Theobald’s printer’s copy as it first came into his hands. In the Winchester volumes, the inner edges of leaves are sometimes exposed, and those which have been cut outside the fold occasionally reveal neat sewing holes along it. These indicate that the ‘Shakespeare interleav’d’ with which Tonson provided Theobald was stitched into a temporary configuration. It is highly unlikely that this interleaved Shakespeare was bound into the eight volumes which the printed leaves alone were intended to form. Each volume of Pope’s duodecimo edition contains over four hundred pages on average, and the insertion of blank leaves would have swelled each one to an unmanageable size for binding as an enlarged whole.

This is especially true as there is evidence that blank leaves outnumbered printed ones in Theobald’s ‘Shakespeare interleav’d’ by two to one. My analysis of the inserted leaves has revealed that each is one eighth of a blank sheet – their chain lines run vertically and roughly a quarter of the watermark or countermark normally appears at the top of the inner edge. They were not, however, made by folding sheets as if for octavo gatherings. By matching Theobald’s annotations on the inserted leaves to the printed text that they comment on (a task aided by his habit of copying the lemma at the same level on the blank page as the line it duplicates on the printed page opposite), the original placement of these leaves in each duodecimo gathering can be ascertained. The blank leaves which Theobald did not use are now missing from his printer’s copy, and for thinly annotated plays this means that only a fraction of the original quantity of blank leaves remains, but significant patterns can be deduced from other plays.

Thus it has been found that groups of blank leaves, sometimes all those inserted into one printed gathering, tend to exhibit either the top or the bottom quarters of the
watermark or countermark. For example, of the surviving leaves added to gathering G of *Timon of Athens*, the seven which carry a portion of the watermark have one of the bottom quarters of the design. Conversely, of the remaining leaves from gatherings E and F, the four which display part of the same watermark have one of the top quarters. This suggests that the top and bottom halves of blank sheets were commonly cut apart and separated, before being cut up again and folded to form conjugate pairs of blank leaves ready for insertion. It is also notable that where two leaves placed between consecutive printed pages have survived, both normally display the same quarter of the watermark or countermark in the same position. This indicates that blank sheets were cut and prepared in twos, so that two blank leaves could be inserted between each pair of facing pages in a gathering.

If these methods were employed consistently in the making of Theobald’s ‘Shakespeare interleav’d’, they provided space for a considerable quantity of notes, perhaps reflecting Tonson’s initial estimate of the volume of commentary that he had purchased from his editor. These methods also represented a practical response to the fact that a copy of Pope’s edition, if it had been in sheets, could not have been evenly interleaved by folding and cutting blank sheets in the same way as printed ones. The common duodecimo format of the edition would have meant that a gathering made by folding blank and printed sheets together alternated the different kinds of leaves inconveniently in twos. The ‘Shakespeare interleav’d’ that Tonson provided not only overcame this problem, but also gave Theobald ample space and a secure structure within which to prepare his text and commentary.

This is in acute contrast to the current state of the printer’s copy, in which the formerly stitched gatherings are now a mass of singles. The cutting-up of the copy was almost certainly done by the printers, in order to discard the large number of redundant leaves left
blank by Theobald, and to facilitate the exchange of parcels of copy between Theobald and the printing-house. Directions concerning this exchange appear on twelve pages of the surviving copy where the beginning of a new sheet of Theobald’s edition is marked. Ten of these messages ask Theobald ‘to return y8 last Leaf of Copy, & so supply us with some more.’\textsuperscript{9} They were written on the first or last leaf of a section of copy, before it and the proof sheet printed from it were dispatched to Theobald for correction. Corballis has explained that these requests made sure that Theobald returned not only the corrected proof but also the last leaf of copy needed to begin setting the first page of the next sheet (pp. 157-58). These notes are reminders that the duodecimo gatherings which remained integral to the construction of the ‘Shakespeare interleav’d’ ceased to be useful to the printers. By breaking them up, the printers gave themselves the troublesome task of handling a heap of loose leaves efficiently, but in the surviving copy at least the only suggestion of a lapse in their concentration is a false alarm. The last leaves of \textit{Timon of Athens} in the Winchester volume (signed \textit{H} and \textit{H2} in Pope’s sixth volume) are replacements for another pair which, according to a note from the printers, ‘were either not returned, or, if they were, mislaid & lost’.\textsuperscript{10} However, the original pair of leaves is preserved in the same volume, among the annotated leaves which follow, confirming that this pair never reached the printing-house at all.\textsuperscript{11}

Theobald was responsible for the reordering and preservation of the copy for his edition once it had served its immediate purpose. The leaves were returned to him in batches, as aids to correcting the latest proof, and he seems to have collected them carefully. In the Preface to his edition Theobald hinted boldly that his career as a

\textsuperscript{9} Theobald’s Pope’s \textit{Shakespear}, 3 vols; Winchester College Library, Book No. 8815. I: \textit{King Lear, Othello, Richard III}, fol. 28’. ‘Theobald’s Pope’s \textit{Shakespear}’ is the spine title of each of Thistlethwayte’s volumes, and it is adopted here to refer to the portion of Theobald’s printer’s copy preserved in the Fellows’ Library. Book No. 8815 refers to all three volumes in the Fellows’ Library catalogue.

\textsuperscript{10} Theobald’s Pope’s \textit{Shakespear}, II: \textit{Timon of Athens, Titus Andronicus, Troilus and Cressida}, fols 36-37.

\textsuperscript{11} Theobald’s Pope’s \textit{Shakespear}, II, fols 80, 82.
Shakespearean editor was set to continue, ‘as I have been importun’d, and am prepar’d, to give a correct Edition of our Author’s POEMS’.

The volume never appeared, but Theobald may have kept his printer’s copy for the plays as a sign that his editorial work on Shakespeare was far from over. The copy for Antony and Cleopatra in the British Library is enclosed in a blue wrapper, whose front and back covers are separated and bound into the volume as individual leaves. On the verso of one of the covers, now the last leaf in the British Library volume, the title of the play is written in what appears to be an eighteenth-century hand. Both halves of the wrapper have three holes near one edge, corresponding exactly to those cut deep in the inner margins of all of the leaves in the copy for Antony and Cleopatra. These holes represent a basic means of securing bundles of individual leaves together, and they also appear throughout the printer’s copy at Winchester College, although any blue wrappers once attached to these plays have disappeared. It seems, therefore, that the portions of Theobald’s copy for each of Shakespeare’s plays were at some point crudely stitched into blue wrappers, possibly at the instigation of Theobald himself.

Theobald’s library was sold at auction over four evenings between 23 and 26 October 1744. Item 405 in the sale catalogue is arresting:

Pope’s Shakespear’s Plays, in 8 vols. with many thousand Remarks, some curious, some shrewd, in Manuscript, wrote in every Page, by Mr. Theobald[.] (p. 10)

It is tempting to speculate that this was Theobald’s printer’s copy, especially as Item 405 sold for £2 13s. 0d., the highest price fetched by any lot on the third evening of the sale according to a manuscript price list covering only this evening’s lots. Owing to its bulk,
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13 Theobald’s Antony and Cleopatra, fol. X57r.
14 Charles Corbett, *A Catalogue of the Library of Lewis Theobald, Esq.* (London: [n. pub.], 1744). The copy with a manuscript price list (unfoliated) which is referred to here is in the Bodleian Library, and was consulted in *Eighteenth Century Collections Online* <http://gale.cengage.co.uk> [accessed 5 March 2011].
however, it is highly unlikely that Theobald’s printer’s copy was bound into the ‘8 vols’ that the auction catalogue advertises following its return from the printing-house. Alternatively, Item 405 could be a lost copy of Pope’s eight-volume edition, abundantly annotated by Theobald prior to receiving his editorial contract. He and Warburton engaged in an intense correspondence in the autumn of 1729, in a collaborative attempt to locate and repair the ‘Doubts and Depravations’ of Shakespeare’s text.¹⁵ By the middle of April 1730 they had completed their interrogation of the texts of the canonical plays in Pope’s eight volumes, and Theobald wondered

if in your set of Pope’s duodecimo edition, you have the ninth volume, which contains the contested Plays of our Shakespeare: if you have, I will venture to promise you some entertainment from the emendations that I have made upon Locrine and Pericles[].¹⁶

It is plausible that Theobald’s letters drew on a vast fund of corrections and annotations in his copy of Pope’s 1728 edition. Thus, it may be this annotated copy of ‘Pope’s Shakespear’s Plays’, missing the ninth volume of apocryphal plays to which Theobald referred in his letter to Warburton, which was sold at auction in 1744.

While the disposal of Theobald’s printer’s copy must remain a matter of conjecture, it seems at some point to have come into the hands of a bookseller who offered it for purchase in parts. Thistlethwayte, as has been noted, bought the copy for nine plays, including all four of the history plays in Pope’s fifth volume (castigated by Theobald as ‘the dull Fifth Volume’).¹⁷ He had the three parts of Henry VI bound together, while he placed the fourth play, Richard III, in another volume alongside King Lear and Othello. This arrangement reclassifies Richard III as a tragedy of leadership, separating the play from the histories in a manner anticipated by the First Folio’s title, The Tragedy of Richard

---

¹⁷ Nichols, II, p. 416.
the Third. It is part of a broader configuration, moreover, which suggests that Thistlethwayte may have selected his nine plays from a larger array of Theobald’s printer’s copy with generic groupings in mind. His volumes represent English history plays (Henry VI Parts 1, 2 and 3), ancient Roman and Greek plays (Timon of Athens, Titus Andronicus, Troilus and Cressida), and tragedies (King Lear, Othello, Richard III). Shakespeare’s comedies, less frequently performed in the eighteenth century and often castigated for their licentious characters and wordplay, are conspicuously absent.

The copy for Antony and Cleopatra, now in the British Library, has a curious family history. The half-title bears the signature of ‘Wm Baker’ and the mistaken attribution, ‘Commentary &c. by David Erskine Baker’, in another hand. David Erskine Baker (1730-1767?) was a precociously learned young man whose passion for acting led him into the theatre. In 1764 he published his Companion to the Play-House, a dictionary of plays and dramatists, in which Theobald’s achievement as an editor of Shakespeare receives special mention. According to Theobald’s entry, his Shakespeare ‘is still in great Esteem; being in general prefered [sic.] to those Editions published by Pope, Warburton, and Hanmer.’

David predeceased his father Henry Baker (1698-1774), a natural philosopher, poet, and periodical journalist who married the youngest daughter of Daniel Defoe. Henry’s virtuosic spectrum of interests could well have encompassed the literary scholarship of Theobald, his contemporary, and he could be the Baker family member who first acquired the copy for Antony and Cleopatra.

Henry’s property and papers passed to his grandson, William Baker (1763-1828), and the mixture of family remains which William inherited obscured the true authorship of Theobald’s notes and corrections for two generations. William’s son Henry Defoe Baker (1803-1845) sold many of his great-grandfather’s manuscripts to Dawson Turner, a noted

botanist, antiquary, and autograph collector whose collections found their way in part to the British Library. Baker also gave Turner Theobald’s copy for *Antony and Cleopatra* as ‘a present’, as Turner acknowledged in a note pencilled on one of the flyleaves. Here Turner also expressed his conviction, contrary to the recorded attribution, that the commentary is ‘by Theobald & in his hand-writing, which I do not know’. He verified this by consulting ‘Johnson and Steevens’ Shakespeare [one of a series inaugurated in 1773] where several of these very notes are referred to Theobald.’

This is an apt reminder that Theobald’s edition and his printer’s copy were both in analogous ways deconstructed and reclaimed in the later eighteenth century. Theobald’s printer’s copy for thirty-one plays was sold in pieces, and the surviving plays became part of impressive collections in the hands of a Hampshire bibliophile (Thistlethwayte), a distinguished family (the Bakers), and a polymath collector (Turner). Meanwhile, choice emendations and notes were culled from Theobald’s published *Shakespeare* and absorbed into ever-growing variorum editions, of which Samuel Johnson’s in 1765 was the first. Commercial motives probably lie behind the sale of the printer’s copy in profitable fragments, as they partly account for the emergence of the variorum Shakespeare, which renewed Tonson’s claim to own an authoritative modern text of the plays by laying out its critical heritage in detail. But whereas variorum editors created a canon of Theobald’s most valuable editorial contributions, his printer’s copy achieved a much more sparsely documented transformation from raw material to collector’s item and family relic.
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19 Theobald’s *Antony and Cleopatra*, unfoliated.
Work in Progress

The Winchester portion of Theobald’s printer’s copy carries an array of marks and annotations, which shed light on the working practices of Theobald’s printers and their demands on his editorial labour. Among the more enigmatic are the names and initials which appear in twelve places on the copy, alongside open square brackets whose position helps to indicate their purpose. Some appear to record the work of pressmen: ‘J.R’ and an illegible name with the same initials mark the places where corresponding pages of Theobald’s edition (the twelfth pages of sheet K of King Lear and sheet Cc of Richard III respectively) start in the copy. Others, such as ‘John.’, ‘Jack.’ and ‘J.’, are noted at the top of pages of copy, and may register the division of work between compositors.

The copy has a more uniform collection of marks from a corrector, made using a darker ink and neater square brackets. The majority of these are bibliographical notes, logging the volume, signature, and initial page number of each new sheet of Theobald’s edition at its starting point in the copy. More unusually, the word ‘Out’, circled for emphasis, appears eleven times in the copy, accompanied by square brackets around portions of the text (Fig. 5). Joseph Moxon’s description ‘Of the Correcter [sic.], and his Office’ confirms that these marks were intended to highlight lines accidentally omitted by the compositor in setting the text. However, Moxon’s instructions state that a bracketed ‘Out’ should be marked in the margin of the proof sheet, not the printer’s copy, if the omitted text is ‘too long to be Writ in the Margin’. In this case, Moxon directs that a bracketed note, ‘See the Copy’, should also be added to the proof. It seems, then, that the corrector of Theobald’s

20 Theobald’s Pope’s Shakespeare, I, fols 27’, 219’.
21 See Corballis, p. 158.
Shakespeare attempted either to clarify or bypass these cross-references by introducing a mark used in proof correction (the circled ‘Out’) to the printer’s copy itself.

The portions of text marked ‘Out’ range in extent from two to twenty-one lines of verse, and there are a variety of explanations for the omissions. Five are clear cases of eye-skip affecting no more than four lines of prose. Two seem to have occurred when a
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Figure 5. Notes from the printing-house on the copy for Troilus and Cressida, Theobald’s Pope’s Shakespear, II, fol. 177r. By permission of the Warden and Fellows of Winchester College.
compositor failed to turn over a leaf of Theobald’s annotations; another two were caused by premature page-turning, when a compositor forgot to return to his place in the text after being diverted to the bottom of the page to set degraded or newly incorporated lines. These slips offer glimpses of the practical pitfalls to which compositors occasionally fell victim while working on Theobald’s printer’s copy. The loose, unfoliated leaves of Theobald’s manuscript material could easily be passed over without paying attention to one side, while the lines awaiting reinstatement at the bottom of the page (some handwritten by Theobald and others printed in Pope’s footnotes) could disrupt a compositor’s straightforward progress through the text.

There were, however, more trying setbacks in store for the printers of Theobald’s Shakespeare. On 19 September 1732, almost nine months behind schedule, Theobald gave Warburton the good news that the printing of his edition had begun: ‘Shakespeare is now groaning under two Presses’ (Jones, p. 308). Theobald’s statement indicates that his edition was ‘printed at two or more printing Houses’, as Tonson had stipulated in the contract, but severe delays affected its production from the outset (Seary, p. 216). One bout of disruption may have been caused by the death of John Darby Jr., a printer whose name appeared in the imprint of Pope’s ten-volume edition in 1728, and can be found (as ‘Mr. Darby’) on a parcel of copy for Titus Andronicus.\textsuperscript{23} He died ‘in the early part of 1733’, having participated in the earliest and most productive stages of printing, and his loss may have played a part in the printers’ failure to fulfil Theobald’s hopes of a spring completion date.\textsuperscript{24}

On 30 June 1733, two months after the publication date that he had last forecast passed by, Theobald complained to Warburton, ‘tho’ I recēd 8 Sheets per Week from each Press

\textsuperscript{23} Theobald’s Pope’s Shakespeare, II, fol. 137v.
\textsuperscript{24} Henry R. Plomer, Harry G. Aldis and Arundell J. K. Esdaile, A Dictionary of the Printers and Booksellers who were at work in England, Scotland and Ireland from 1668 to 1725 (London: Bibliographical Society, 1968), p. 53.
at my setting out, that Number has been too often reduc’d to Two’ (Jones, p. 314). It has already been observed that Theobald’s contract with Tonson obliged him to dispatch the copy for his entire edition before printing began. But the printers’ requests for fresh material in the surviving copy confirm that Theobald did not fulfil this condition of his contract and instead supplied copy in instalments. Corballis infers from the notes on the copy that ‘like many eighteenth-century authors, Theobald was only a step or two ahead of his printers’ (p. 157). However, it would have been almost impossible for Theobald to prepare and send copy piecemeal to the printers as rapidly as they returned it to him at times of peak activity. Had he found himself ‘only a step or two ahead’ during the busiest periods, such as the early rush which he mentioned to Warburton, he would have faced at least thirty pages of Pope’s edition (not to mention two proofs for his own) requiring attention every day. It is certainly true that last-minute efforts were an unavoidable feature of Theobald’s pattern of work, as his reference to ‘a passage […] w[ch]. I think I found out the Joak of but the other day while the Press waited’ clearly shows (Jones, p. 309). But to conclude from this that Theobald was under constant pressure to meet demand for copy from the printing-house is to overstate not only the extremity of his predicament, but also the printers’ relentless productivity.

The summer slump, caused by a labour shortage, was the worst delay to strike the printing process. At the end of June 1733 Theobald reflected frustratedly that ‘Hamlet & Othello are All y[,] want to be compleated’, but it was not until 17 October that he finally declared, ‘I thank God, the 7 Volumes are quite printed off’ (Jones, pp. 314, 318). The copy for Theobald’s last volume carries the most urgent of all the instructions from the printing-house, sent not long before the struggle to find compositors began to take its toll. Two-thirds of the way through the copy for sheet E of *Troilus and Cressida* is the following message:
S' If you could dispatch your sheet, so as we could have it back next morning we should be able to send your another to morrow. We want Copy very much.²⁵

The press-figures on all the printed sheets of *Troilus and Cressida* in Theobald’s edition signal a systematic and efficient pattern of production: each forme is numbered 2 or 3, and press 2 is responsible for the inner formes of all but two sheets (B and C). This rule also holds for the first four sheets (H-L) of *Romeo and Juliet*, the next play in Theobald’s final volume. Following this, the number 2 appears on only two more sheets in the volume (P and R of *Hamlet*), and press 1 seems to have taken on the bulk of the remaining work, printing the inner formes of at least ten of the last nineteen sheets, and eventually providing the only press-figure on the last four sheets of *Othello* (Dd-Gg).

The pattern of press figures in Theobald’s last volume indicates that work became increasingly irregular as *Romeo and Juliet* was printed, a discovery which puts the demanding note on the copy for *Troilus and Cressida* into context. It illustrates how swiftly a successful pattern of production could break down, forcing Theobald to adapt to three months of neglect and interruption, and emphasises that the bare, functional marks on the copy rarely tell the whole story. It is unfair, therefore, to portray Theobald as an editor struggling to produce copy at the speed demanded by his printers. Their working relationship is better understood as a cooperative enterprise, in which the changing economic conditions to which the printers were subject gave Theobald a vital measure of flexibility in his work.

The vagaries of the print trade may have dogged the production of Theobald’s *Shakespeare*, but commercial conditions had an impact on the making of his edition from the start. The next section of this chapter interrogates the claim that Tonson placed
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²⁵ Theobald’s Pope’s *Shakespeare*, II, fol. 177v.
commercial strategy over the interests of his editor in determining Theobald’s use of the received text for copy.

*The Received Text: Liability or Asset?*

The Tonsons’ edited texts of Shakespeare’s plays were no different from their unedited predecessors, the Folios, in one vital respect. Just as the Second, Third, and Fourth Folios were all printed from their immediate precursors, all of the Tonsons’ editions (with the notable exception of Edward Capell’s in 1768) were based on the most recent edition produced by one of their editors. Thus, despite his vocal disparagement of the editorial practices of Pope and Rowe, Theobald followed his predecessors’ example by taking as his copy-text the latest edition of Shakespeare’s plays, Pope’s second edition of 1728. His decision to use the received text for copy has posed challenging questions for scholars wishing to emphasise the pioneering features of his edition. Peter Seary has taken up Theobald’s defence, insisting not only that the decision was out of Theobald’s hands, but also that he recognised and overcame the special challenges of basing his edition on the received text. However, Seary’s case overstates the decisive role of Theobald’s publisher and, crucially, underestimates the complexity of Theobald’s motives.

Seary argues that the choice of copy-text, for all of the Tonsons’ editors, was a foregone conclusion determined by the publishers’ strategy for protecting their literary property. In 1710, the Act of Anne introduced fourteen-year terms of copyright and stipulated that following a twenty-one-year extension of existing rights all works published before 1710 would enter the public domain. In the wake of these reforms, according to Seary, ‘Tonson attempted to reinforce his claims to perpetual copyright in the original material [Shakespeare’s plays] by claiming successively the fourteen-year
copyrights in the work of each of his editors’ (p. 134). However, it is significant that after the lapse of statutory copyrights in 1731 booksellers including Tonson resorted most often to Chancery suits, in which they sought injunctions against rival publishers based on their common law rights, not the fixed-term provisions of the Act of Anne. Joseph Loewenstein has explained that these rights were derived from an author’s ‘common law property in his or her compositions’, which was ‘distinct from the property created by the 1710 statute’. In 1739 and 1751 the Tonson firm chose this route in taking legal action against the prolific publisher Robert Walker, who repeatedly trespassed on their exclusive rights to Paradise Lost.

In 1734, however, when Walker began to produce an ambitious series of cheap Shakespeare plays, Tonson’s response was different. Murphy has described how, ‘[f]earful of the consequences of going to law against such a defiantly audacious opponent, Tonson settled on a double strategy for tackling Walker’, squeezing him between aggressive commercial tactics and a publicity campaign (p. 109). Part of the reason for Tonson’s avoidance of the courts in this dispute may lie in the contrasting authorial roles of Milton and Shakespeare. Jacob Tonson the elder bought into the copyright of Paradise Lost nine years after Milton’s death in 1674, and he acquired a manuscript of the first book of the poem attached to its official licence. This valuable survival, an embodiment of the author and his private act of creation, symbolically makes the point that Tonson’s legal arguments in 1751 sought to prove – that Paradise Lost had undergone a direct and undisturbed descent from its author to its present owner. Ronan Deazley states that ‘Tonson’s initial bill of complaint of 26 November 1751 set out the full history of the work as commodity, from the original assignment by Milton himself to Samuel Symonds, down to the present proprietors, including details of additional

comments which had been annexed to the text by Elijah Fenton (in 1727), Richard Bently [*sic*] (in 1732), and most recently, the Rev Thomas Newton (in 1746).*27 In Shakespeare’s case, the question of whether the dramatist had sanctioned the publication of his plays, together with the complexities of the Quarto and Folio traditions, made constructing a similar line of authorial inheritance extremely challenging. Seary asserts that ‘Tonson could have argued his case in court in terms of the current legal view of copyright’ (p. 134), but this overlooks the insecurity of Shakespearean property claims in the author-centred legal climate of the 1730s and beyond. The new fourteen-year copyrights may have given Tonson a useful structure for regulating his business, by determining the maximum interval between editions and distinguishing the separate commodities of text and editorial matter; however, they constituted an unworkable strategy for defending his assets.

Seary holds that Tonson’s enforcement of his copyright protection plan determined Theobald’s use of the most recent printed edition for copy, dismissing the idea that Theobald had any freedom in his choice of copy-text. For Seary, ‘it was as a consequence of legal and commercial considerations and in defiance of editorial logic that Theobald’s edition was based on Pope’s’ (p. 135). However, Jarvis has convincingly shown that neither Theobald’s editorial theory nor his practice display an ‘editorial logic’ of the kind which Seary imputes to Theobald. In light of this, Jarvis declares it ‘unlikely that Theobald would, if left to his own devices, have used early Quartos and the First Folio for copy’ (p. 95). Later in this chapter, a new analysis of Theobald’s editorial practice, based on a collation of his text of *King Lear*, builds on and revises Jarvis’s conclusions about the eclectic way in which Theobald made use of the early Quarto and Folio copies. This section, meanwhile, makes the case for Theobald’s active co-operation with Tonson in the

choice of the received text by identifying the advantages which Theobald likely recognised in the use of a modern edition for copy.

Seary posits an opposition between Theobald’s purely intellectual motives and the ‘legal and commercial considerations’ which thwarted their realisation. However, in *Shakespeare Restored* Theobald offers a critique of Tonson’s business practice which proves that commercial acumen was a part of his scholarly persona from the start. In the Introduction to *Shakespeare Restored*, Theobald observes wryly that Tonson ‘has so far *miserunderstood* himself, (I mean, in Contradiction to the Rule of Trade,) as to be at the Expence of having his AUTHOR revised’. The context of Theobald’s comment implies that the fruits of this project, and not simply its financial burden, should give Tonson cause for concern. *Shakespeare Restored* claims in its sub-title to examine a mere ‘Specimen of the Many Errors’ propagated by Pope’s edition of 1725, and Pope’s poor text was not redeemed by healthy sales. Subscribers bought only 417 of the 750 copies printed, and as the subscription campaign was mounted for Tonson’s benefit this represented a personal setback for the bookseller.

While reminding his readers that Tonson’s gamble on editing has not yet paid off, Theobald is not afraid to indicate that he too is engaged in commercial speculation. *Shakespeare Restored* is dedicated to John Rich, the pioneer of pantomime at Lincoln’s Inn Fields and Theobald’s employer. Despite his affiliation with Rich, Theobald allows himself to ‘prophesy, one Time or other, that the *Rust* of PANTOMIMES will be a *Salve* for the Recovery of DRAMATIC Poetry’ (sigs A2v-3r). Just as Tonson’s decision to fund scholarship is out of character for a businessman, Theobald is unusual among scholars in hoping that his efforts to place Shakespeare the author at the heart of textual criticism


could have a corollary in the theatre. Although adapted texts were performed during Rich’s season of Shakespeare revivals at Covent Garden in 1737-38, Shakespeare’s authorial profile was rising, and by then ‘being seen to esteem the playwright had become sound practice in the theatre business’.\textsuperscript{30} Thus, Theobald represented his theatrical interests in \textit{Shakespeare Restored} in a manner calculated to appeal to Tonson, not only as an editorial qualification but as a counterpart to the bookseller’s own diversifying enterprise. Alert to the opportunities for renewal created by the temporary failings of this enterprise, Theobald tailored his self-presentation as Shakespeare’s restorer to endorse Tonson’s audacious mixture of business and scholarship.

It is difficult to believe, therefore, that Theobald would have rejected the received text and with it Tonson’s investment in editorial work. Don-John Dugas has argued that Rowe’s edition of 1709 relaunched a publishing brand, attracting ‘customers who believed what they were buying was a high-quality product because it carried the Tonson imprint on its title-page’ (p. 159). Above this imprint was a subtitle advertising the edition’s original feature (‘an Account of the Life and Writings of the Author’) and promoting its modern text, ‘Revis’d and Corrected’ by a capable editor from the earliest sources.\textsuperscript{31} This claim to unprecedented accuracy was reiterated on the title page of Pope’s 1725 edition (‘COLLATED and CORRECTED by the former EDITIONS’) and on Theobald’s 1733 title page (‘Collated with the Oldest Copies, and Corrected’). Had Theobald based his text on the earliest available editions, he would have been forced to relinquish a label designed to guarantee buyers the results of over twenty years of cumulative textual improvement.

Theobald expressed strong doubt in the Preface to his edition that his predecessors’ efforts could accurately be called improvements. But he also articulated an important


methodological argument against rejecting the received text. In his Preface, Theobald defined his major innovation in editing as applying the principles of classical textual criticism, developed through the study of manuscripts and scribal error, to Shakespeare’s printed texts. The textual history of Shakespeare’s plays, like that of ancient or ‘classic’ works, had been shaped by the loss of authorial originals and the survival of increasingly unreliable copies. Theobald makes this comparison in his Preface, paving the way for his ‘Method of Cure’:

our Author has lain under the Disadvantage of having his Errors propagated and multiplied by Time: because, for near a Century, his Works were republish’d from the faulty Copies without the assistance of any intelligent Editor: which has been the Case likewise of many a Classic Writer.\(^{32}\)

The textual tradition contains nothing but ‘faulty Copies’ and in many places can only be mended by distinguishing the nature and variety of error, as the true reading is not recorded in any surviving text. Thus, the received text, however degenerate, is a natural object of study for an editor convinced that the nature of the degeneracy is often the key to its reversal.

This rationale of suspicion in Theobald’s approach to extant texts foregrounds the restorative role of conjectural emendation in the making of his new text. Defending the practice in *Shakespeare Restored*, Theobald asks,

where *SHAKESPEARE* has yet, *thro’ all his Editions*, labour’d under flat Nonsense, and invincible Darkness, I can, by the Addition or Alteration of a single letter, or two, give him both Sense and Sentiment, who will be so unkind to say, this is a trifling or unwarrantable Attempt? (p. vi; italics mine)

Conjectural emendation breaks the chain of corrupt readings which have persisted ‘thro’ all [Shakespeare’s] Editions’, and thus Theobald applies it to entrenched problems in the received text. Theobald’s status as a pioneer of methodologically sophisticated vernacular

\(^{32}\) *Works* (1733), I, p. xxxviii-xxxix.
editing is here explicitly dependent on the history of bad printing and negligent editing that makes his intervention necessary. As the received text is the culmination of this history, it is the logical basis for an endeavour to examine and halt the textual degeneration that has taken hold over time. It is one of the main contentions of this chapter that Theobald’s confidence in his ability to identify degenerate readings without resorting to a thorough collation of his copy-text had a significant impact on the overall accuracy of his edition. This will be discussed later; for now, as far as Theobald’s theoretical approach to the received text is concerned, it is probable that he saw in it an opportunity to apply his methods to the point in the textual tradition where they were most needed.

Finally, the received text had practical advantages that should not be overlooked. Dugas has concluded that ‘a combination of scholarly and practical considerations’, including the Fourth Folio’s availability and its modernised spelling and punctuation, influenced Rowe’s adherence to the received text (p. 146). However, Dugas is unwilling to concede that these concerns had any bearing on Theobald, who faced the added encumbrance of having to recopy Pope’s and Rowe’s stage directions if he chose a seventeenth-century edition as his copy-text. Based on Theobald printer’s copy surviving in Winchester, my count of the punctuation marks which Theobald inserted or changed in his copy for King Lear has produced a total of almost a thousand, averaging between nine and ten on each page. Adding such a multitude of commas and semicolons (609 and 249 respectively) to an already amply punctuated text is a sign of Theobald’s commitment to enhancing its readability, a task which would have been much more onerous if his copy-text had been the sparingly punctuated First Folio.

These practical matters may not alone have determined Theobald in favour of using Pope’s text for copy, but they more than likely offered welcome advantages to an editor for whom the received text also represented an opportunity to exercise his targeted
approach to textual corruption. Therefore, Seary’s contention that ‘legal and commercial considerations’ dictated Theobald’s choice of copy-text ‘in defiance of editorial logic’ is doubly distorting. Seary constructs a dichotomy of business and scholarship that Theobald astutely sought to collapse, and employs a definition of ‘editorial logic’ that he would probably have considered arbitrary and inhibiting. Tonson’s copyright protection plan should not be a distraction from the compelling arguments for Theobald’s voluntary acceptance of the received text for copy.

Ma(r)king the Text

The scholarly debate about Theobald’s choice of the received text has hitherto left little room for analysis of the impact of the received text on the accuracy of Theobald’s edition. There has been little comment on the extent of Theobald’s reproduction of inaccurate readings from the received text, or its implications for reconstructing his editorial practice. Seary observes simply that ‘instead of basing his edition on the printed texts closest to Shakespeare’s manuscripts, [Theobald] based it on a text eight printings removed from the first folio’ (p. 133). Jarvis, despite undertaking a rigorous revaluation of Theobald’s editorial practice, states only that ‘his choice of copy-text often allowed readings introduced by accident or design since 1623 to remain’ (p. 94). Murphy comes closest to assessing the extent of Theobald’s appropriation of the received text: he states that Theobald ‘silently accepted most of the alterations which Pope made to harmonise the metre with eighteenth-century poetic practice’ (p. 73). This is true, but Murphy stops short of considering what this reveals about Theobald’s approach to his copy-text.

Hamlet takes centre-stage in Shakespeare Restored and as a result forms the focus of many recent studies of Theobald’s editing. However, the special attention that Theobald
devoted to this text may have exceeded what he was able to give to Shakespeare’s other plays. This study aims to balance the discussion about Theobald’s editorial practice by examining his text of *King Lear*. Theobald provided a total of ten corrections to Pope’s 1725 text of *King Lear* in the Appendix to *Shakespeare Restored*, and in *The Censor*, his short-lived tri-weekly periodical, Theobald published critical essays on the tragic design and chronicle sources of the play. Theobald dedicated the seventh and tenth issues of *The Censor* to *King Lear*, ‘a Tragedy of Shakespear’s, which, with all its Defects and Irregularities, has still touch’d me with the strongest Compassion, as well in my Study, as on the Stage’. 33

Like the *Censor* essays, Theobald’s repositioning of *King Lear* in the sequence of plays in his edition was an attempt to adjudicate the claims of history and tragedy on the play’s generic identity. *King Lear* is one of six plays that changed places in Theobald’s edition relative to the order of the thirty-six plays in Pope’s *Shakespear*. *King Lear* appeared in Pope’s edition at the beginning of the third volume, ‘Consisting of Historical Plays’, as the earliest in a historical sequence of plays about eponymous native rulers from ancient Britain (*King Lear*) to Tudor England (*Henry VIII*). In Theobald’s *Shakespeare*, *King Lear* found a place in the fifth volume, after *Henry VIII* and before *Macbeth*, another play which Theobald had transplanted from its position in Pope’s sequence. Theobald’s new alignment set the pair of ancient British plays apart from the medieval English histories, and placed them ahead of the Greek and Roman plays. It thus created a reverse historical sequence, from Tudor England to classical antiquity, as well as a generic progression in the later part of the edition through the Greek and Roman plays to the pinnacle of purely Shakespearean tragedy (the last plays are *Romeo and Juliet*, *Hamlet* and *Othello*). Therefore, given Theobald’s regard for *King Lear* and the original criticism that the play
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inspired from him, it is reasonable to expect that if he devoted care and precision to any other texts besides *Hamlet*, this would be one of them.

However, the evidence tells a different story. Theobald’s 1733 text of *King Lear* has been collated against his copy-text – the preceding edition, Pope’s duodecimo of 1728. For comparison, Pope’s 1728 text of the play has also been collated against the text on which it is based, Rowe’s third edition of 1714. The findings of these collations are recorded in Appendix 3. This analysis has revealed that Pope made 210 emendations to his copy-text for *King Lear* without the support of any seventeenth-century editions. In addition to variant readings, this total includes instances where a passage present in Pope’s copy-text is degraded to a footnote in his edition, and where lines from a larger portion of Quarto text which Pope incorporated into his text are omitted. Theobald displaced just sixty-five of these unauthorised emendations from his text of *King Lear*, less than a third of the total. Thus, 145 of Pope’s unsupported readings are left in Theobald’s text, a figure that dwarfs the fifty-six unique readings which Theobald himself introduced to the text.

Theobald’s conjectures have gained a reputation for accuracy and penetration, which Seary underlines by stating that a total of ‘approximately 350 major alterations by Theobald [are] generally found in modern texts’ of Shakespeare’s collected plays (p. 167). But it must be stressed that in his text they coexist with a far greater number of Pope’s conjectures and arbitrary corrections, which Theobald silently appropriated.

The total number of changes that Theobald made to his copy-text for *King Lear* is even more revealing. This number, which includes Theobald’s emendations supported by Quarto and Folio texts, comes to just 212. In practice this means that seventeen pages of Theobald’s 115-page text of *King Lear* do not differ substantively from the equivalent portion of Pope’s text, and on a further thirty-eight pages Theobald’s text has just one substantive emendation. Given the number of inauthentic readings in Theobald’s copy-
text, derived not only from Pope but also from Rowe and from the Folio tradition, Theobald’s relatively low rate of correction strongly suggests that he did not systematically look for authorised readings in the early editions and apply them to his copy-text.

It is true that not all of the unauthorised changes made by Pope and reproduced in Theobald’s text went undetected. Theobald consciously accepted some of them, and was not averse to doing so openly. Faced with Gonerill’s plea to Lear ‘A little to disquantity your Train’ in Act 1, Pope substituted ‘Of fifty to disquantity your train’ for the sake of continuity; Theobald not only approved of the invented reading but also reprinted Pope’s footnote on it as a further endorsement. On other occasions, Theobald tacitly acquiesced in Pope’s omissions, as in the disappearance from the play’s last scene of the bystanders’ brief and unsettling utterances in Lear’s dying moments:

Edg. Or image of that horror.
Alb. Fall and cease.

These lines appear in the First Folio (1623) and in all three Quartos. Theobald found them in the ‘old quarto’ (presumably the First Quarto of 1608) before confessing in a letter to Warburton, ‘what to make of [them], I do not know’. Theobald did not restore the lines to the text in his edition.

---

35 The Works of Shakespear, ed. by Alexander Pope, 8 vols (London: J. Tonson, 1728), III, p. 375. British Library, shelf-mark 11761.b. Subsequent references to the Works (1728) are to the British Library copy. The readings cited do not differ from those in the copy of Pope’s edition which Theobald used as his copy-text; however, a distinction is made to indicate where the evidence can be found in any copy of Pope’s edition, not just the printer’s copy which survives in Winchester College Fellows’ Library.
36 Works (1733), V, p. 128.
38 Nichols, II, p. 386.
Conversely, Theobald took pleasure in exposing some of his predecessor’s more invasive editorial changes, practised by Pope despite the claim in his Preface that all the readings ‘I have prefer’d into the Text are constantly *ex fide codicum*, upon authority’.\textsuperscript{39} Seven of Theobald’s footnotes to *King Lear* expose readings introduced by Pope on no authority (‘This Reading, notwithstanding Mr. Pope’s Declaration in his Preface, is not *ex fide Codicum*’).\textsuperscript{40} One in particular gives the poet’s conservative rhetoric an ironic twist with a pun invoking his infallible namesake: ‘This is Mr. Pope’s Reading, *ex Cathedrâ*’ (literally ‘from the chair’, a phrase associated with papal pronouncements deemed infallible).\textsuperscript{41} Given Theobald’s hostility to ‘Mr. Pope’s Sophistication’ of the text, it is difficult to believe that he covertly approved of many of the more audacious changes that he inherited from Pope through the received text.\textsuperscript{42} In Act 1, for instance, Pope revised the opening tetrameter of Lear’s invocation, ‘Hear Nature, hear, dear Goddess, hear!’,\textsuperscript{43} adding a fifth metrical foot and giving the distraught king a moment of self-dramatization: ‘Hear Nature, hear, dear goddess hear a Father!’\textsuperscript{44} Had Theobald discovered this interpolation, or Pope’s superfluous change of Gonerill’s cry, ‘Oh, the difference of Man, and Man!’,\textsuperscript{45} to ‘the strange difference’,\textsuperscript{46} he is not likely to have let it pass in silence. It is clear that he failed to set his copy-text alongside any early edition in a concerted attempt to identify and eradicate inauthentic readings.

However, Theobald’s editorial practice is not merely defined by casual oversights; his working patterns can more positively be reconstructed through analysis of the variant readings that he adopted. Theobald introduced eighty-four readings supported by the First

\textsuperscript{40} *Works* (1733), V, p. 161.
\textsuperscript{41} *Works* (1733), V, p. 115.
\textsuperscript{42} *Works* (1733), V, p. 149.
\textsuperscript{43} *Works* (1714), VII, p. 27.
\textsuperscript{44} *Works* (1728), III, p. 376.
\textsuperscript{45} *Works* (1714), VII, p. 66.
\textsuperscript{46} *Works* (1728), III, p. 422.
Folio into his text of *King Lear* – a much higher figure than Pope’s twenty-seven, but far from substantial. Fifty-seven of these readings are also found in the First Quarto and Second Folio (1632) texts of *King Lear*, and as a result there can be no certainty that Theobald discovered them through close scrutiny of the First Folio. Theobald’s table of the books that he consulted during the making of his edition lists the First Quarto of *King Lear* together with the First and Second Folios. The table classifies all three as ‘EDITIONS of Authority’, indicating that Theobald did not distinguish the bibliographical authority of the First Folio and the First Quarto from the derivative status of the Second Folio. This classification makes it a probability that in practice Theobald did not pay consistent attention to either the First Folio or the First Quarto, but drew eclectically on all three pre-1633 editions as sources of alternative readings.

There is further evidence that Theobald did not collate his copy-text against the First Folio, adopting authoritative readings wherever possible. A line-by-line comparison of Theobald’s copy-text with the First Folio text of *King Lear* (not recorded in the Appendix of collations) has identified more than 110 First Folio variants which Theobald either did not see or chose not to accept, a figure which exceeds the number of First Folio readings that he did adopt. Theobald’s Folio-based emendations are so thinly scattered that illustrating his choice of variants in action is not easy, but a revealing passage comes in the first scene of Act 3, when Kent discloses the secrets of the new state to a sympathetic Knight. The passage reads as follows in Theobald’s edition:

```
There’s division
(Although as yet the face of it is cover’d
With mutual cunning) ’twixt Albany and Cornwall:
Who have (as who have not, whom their great stars
Thron’d and set high?) servants, who seem no less;
Which are to France the spies and speculations
Intelligent of our state. What hath been seen,
```

(Although as yet the face of it is cover’d
With mutual cunning) ’twixt Albany and Cornwall:
Who have (as who have not, whom their great stars
Thron’d and set high?) servants, who seem no less;
Which are to France the spies and speculations
Intelligent of our state. What hath been seen,

*Works (1733), VII, sigs 2H8, 2I2*.
Either in snuffs and packings of the Dukes; have P1728
Or the hard rein, which both of them have born P F2 hath F1
Against the old kind king; […]48

Eight lines of Kent’s speech, from ‘Who have…’ to ‘(Whereof, perchance, these are but furnishings–)’, do not appear in the First Quarto and are placed in a footnote in both of Pope’s editions; Theobald here reintegrates them into the body of the text. Theobald’s further departures from his copy-text are italicised and annotated above (proper names remain in their original italics). First, Theobald restores ‘mutual cunning’, a reading present in every edition until 1725, in place of Pope’s ‘mutual craft’, a reading invented to regularise the metre.49 In the next line, however, Theobald fails to reinstate the First Folio’s ‘who have not, that’, allowing the reading introduced by Rowe in 1714 (‘who have not, whom’) to remain.50 Even though the First Folio is the sole authoritative source for these lines, it appears that Theobald did not check them thoroughly against the Folio to ensure their accuracy.

Theobald’s second emendation restores a reading – ‘hath been seen’ – which is unanimously supported by the Folios, rejecting the ungrammatical ‘have been seen’ found in the degraded passage in Pope’s second edition only.51 However, this is again accompanied by a telling lapse. In the next line but one, ‘both of them have born’ is the reading of the Second Folio and all later editions. Theobald does not restore the First Folio’s ‘both of them hath borne’, despite it offering a significant parallel for the variant (‘hath been seen’) adopted two lines earlier.52 If Theobald had a First Folio open at this speech, rather than the Second Folio which he classifies as equally authoritative, he cannot have studied it closely.

48 Works (1733), V, p. 156.
49 Works (1728), III, p. 401.
50 Works (1714), VII, p. 48; ‘who have not, that’ appears in all the Folios as well as in Works (1709), V, p. 2509.
51 Works (1728), III, p. 401.
52 Comedies (1623), p. 296.
This passage is one of many instances of large-scale variation between the First Quarto and First Folio texts of *King Lear*, and Theobald’s handling of its individual verbal variants is mixed. He removed both of Pope’s unsupported readings (‘mutual craft’ and ‘have been seen’), but failed to restore two First Folio readings, despite the Folio being the only authoritative source for this portion of Kent’s speech. Theobald’s treatment of this passage lays bare the absence of consistent editorial logic behind his emendatory decisions. Whether Theobald did not discover the First Folio readings, or whether he found and rejected them on stylistic grounds, it is clear that his use of authoritative copies to expose errors in his copy-text was neither consistently reasoned nor applied.

This is in line with Jarvis’s conclusion that ‘Theobald’s editorial theories and practices are in many respects still eclectic ones’ (p. 101). Jarvis’s analysis of the nature of this eclecticism can now be refined in light of evidence drawn from my collation about Theobald’s adoption of First Quarto readings. This evidence strongly suggests that Theobald’s use of the Quartos was directed towards two primary tasks. First, Theobald completed the integration of unique Quarto material into the latest eighteenth-century text, a process which Pope had begun in 1725. Secondly, he appears to have consulted the Quartos in search of alternative readings when a suspicious or problematic reading arose in his copy-text. Theobald adopted a total of seventy-two readings attested by the First Quarto in his text of *King Lear* (generally with the support of one or more of the later Quartos, but without that of any of the Folios). Thirty-five of these readings are either Quarto lines that Theobald integrated into his copy-text or authoritative readings which he restored to lines already introduced and emended by Pope. Theobald incorporated into his text almost all of the Quarto lines which were missing from his copy-text, and it is therefore reasonable to assume that he examined either the First or the Second Quarto thoroughly alongside his copy-text.
The Second Quarto of *King Lear* is a Pavier reprint, published in 1619 but carrying a false imprint (‘Printed for Nathaniel Butter. 1608’) replicating that of the First Quarto.\(^{53}\) It is not known whether Theobald had access to a copy of this edition, or whether he distinguished it from the First Quarto, as it is not listed separately in Theobald’s table of editions consulted. Almost all of the First Quarto readings that Theobald adopted are also found in the Second Quarto; however, one unique First Quarto reading which Theobald introduced into his text confirms that he had access to a copy of the first edition at some stage in his editorial work, and supports the likelihood that he drew all of his Quarto readings from this source. In Act 5, Theobald became the first eighteenth-century editor of *King Lear* to include Edgar’s exchange with Albany describing his meeting with Kent (V. iii. 203-220), a passage not present in the First Folio.\(^{54}\) There is only one substantive difference between the First Quarto and Second Quarto versions of this passage, and here Theobald reproduced the First Quarto’s ‘Told the most pitious tale of Lear and him’ in place of the Second Quarto’s ‘And told the pitteous tale of Lear and him’.\(^{55}\) At this point, and probably at many others, Theobald appears to have been following the First Quarto text.

Though he appears to have had a copy of the First Quarto at hand, Theobald introduced a relatively low number of Quarto readings into his text: setting aside the occasions on which he introduced or emended passages found only in the Quartos, Theobald preferred Quarto readings over Folio or other readings on only thirty-seven occasions. Part of the explanation for this could be that Pope had already adopted 130 First Quarto readings (not supported by the First Folio) into his 1728 text, according to my collation, leaving fewer
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\(^{54}\) *Works* (1733), V, pp. 213-14.

variants for Theobald to choose from. However, my examination of Theobald’s printer’s copy has uncovered another explanation: when it came to identifying errors or resolving problems in his copy-text, looking to the Quartos for variant readings was sometimes a last resort for Theobald.

This is uniquely illustrated in the portion of Theobald’s printer’s copy preserved at Winchester College: a cluster of emendatory alternatives which Theobald noted and rejected in the middle of Act 1 of King Lear reveals the stages of his search for sense in a problematic passage. The passage in question is part of the King of France’s speech declaring his faith in Cordelia. Theobald first noted that Pope’s text of this speech contained unauthorised readings in a letter to Warburton of 30 December 1729. However, the crossings-out and marginal corrections made by Theobald on his printer’s copy (Fig. 6) reveal that over a year later he was still having trouble accommodating the authoritative First Folio readings. The passage is reproduced below, with Theobald’s annotations in italics:

\[ \text{† That monsters it, for} \]

\[ \text{sure th' offence } her \]

\[ \text{Must be of such unnatural degree,} \]

\[ \text{† ers it, e're As monstrous is; or your fore-voucht affection} \]

\[ \text{Falne } \text{Could not fall into taint; […]} \]

Theobald’s first emendation was straightforward: he restored ‘her offence’, a reading supported by the First Folio and both early Quartos, in place of ‘th’ offence’, a reading introduced by Pope to regularise the metre. The difficulties began in the next line but one, which in the First Folio reads ‘That monsters it: or your fore-voucht affection’. Theobald seems to have been determined to reinstate the First Folio variant ‘That monsters
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56 Nichols, II, p. 369.
57 Theobald’s Pope’s Shakespear, I, fol. 57.
it`; consequently, he deleted ‘Could not’ in the following line, a reading invented by Rowe in 1709 to support his adjectival emendation, ‘As monstrous is’. But having rejected Rowe’s revision of Shakespeare’s syntax, Theobald seems to have struggled to make sense of the First Folio text, and in particular the purpose of the conjunction or. Initially he opted to replace it with e’re, as he had proposed to Warburton; combining this conjectural change with the First Folio’s ‘monsters it’, he wrote ‘ers it, e’re’ in the margin of the copy to be joined to ‘As monst-’ in Pope’s text. This emendation does not remove the unauthorised adverb ‘As’, however, and Theobald’s apparent indifference to the word is typical of his concentration on lexical words to the detriment of function words. Later in Act 1, for example, the same tendency led Theobald to mistakenly quote the First and Second Quartos’ ‘with checkes as flatteries’ as ‘With Checks, like Flatt’ries’ in a footnote, and introduce the same error into his text.

---

59 Works (1709), V, p. 2475.
60 Lear (1608), sig. C3’.
61 Works (1733), V, p. 120, note 8, and p. 121.
Later, Theobald changed his mind. He crossed out ‘ers it, e’re’, and noted another conjecture above the text, this time employing the conjunction for together with the First Folio reading: ‘That monsters it, for’. It seems to have been at this point, still dissatisfied, that Theobald consulted the First or Second Quarto and discovered a variant, ‘Falne into taint,’ which aligned with the sense of his earlier emendation (‘That monsters it, for’) and was adopted.62 That this came late in Theobald’s work on the problem is confirmed by the fact that ‘fall’ is crossed out independently of, and undoubtedly after, ‘Could not’ in the printer’s copy. Relying first and foremost on his critical intuition to locate and correct the First Folio’s presumed error (its unintelligible conjunction), Theobald demonstrates
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62 Lear (1608), sig. B4v.
that consulting the early editions to take account of all the available variants was not his usual procedure.

In light of this, Jarvis’s assessment of Theobald’s editorial character, based on a collation of his text of Hamlet, stands in need of revision:

Theobald’s editorial theories and practices are in many respects still eclectic ones: as much material as possible from early Quartos and the First Folio is to be gathered and used to correct a text whose basis is Pope’s second edition of 1728[.] (p. 101)

Theobald’s methodological statements, as has been discussed, certainly imply his commitment to rooting out corruption in the received text by marshalling the surviving evidence of authoritative copies. However, rather than equipping himself with ‘as much material as possible’ to support the systematic correction of his copy-text, my findings reveal that Theobald sought the evidence of early editions on a limited and occasional basis, in response to either major disparities between his copy-text and a Quarto text or lines which roused his suspicion.

In fact, Jarvis’s description of an editor amassing a pool of variants from which to make critical selections is far more applicable to Pope than it is to Theobald. It has already been noted that according to my collation Pope introduced 130 First Quarto readings into his text of King Lear, a figure which almost doubles Theobald's total of seventy-two. In his study of Pope’s editorial practice, John A. Hart has observed that the Quarto readings adopted by Pope, unlike those inserted by Theobald, are mostly ‘of such a minor nature that they could only have been seen and adopted by one who was collating carefully and systematically’.63 Hart underestimates the textual importance of the First Quarto’s minor variants, but he presents a thoroughly substantiated picture of Pope’s eclectic practice. Pope collated the early editions available to him assiduously in order to
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maximise his editorial options and enable the freer exercise of his critical judgement as to which reading to adopt. This practice is nowhere more apparent than in Pope’s introduction of twenty-four Second and Third Quarto readings to his text of *King Lear*, and his wayward ingenuity in making use of others. Early in Act 3, for example, Pope restored a part of Kent’s speech giving intelligence of French military preparations from the First Quarto, but displaced the authoritative reading, ‘secret feet’ in some of our best Ports’, in favour of ‘secret sea’.

This conjecture, which appears to deviate in several aspects from the First Quarto reading, is in fact conservatively based on the Third Quarto’s ‘secret see’, from which it differs by only one letter. Unlike the First Quarto reading, however, the Third Quarto’s has no authority, being the second in a sequence of typographical errors initiated by the Second Quarto’s ‘secret fee’.

There is an instructive contrast between Pope’s use of two variants as stepping-stones to a conjectural emendation in the last example, and Theobald’s experiments with two conjectures before finding a First Quarto variant in Act 1. Unlike Pope, Theobald avoided a thorough collation of his copy-text in order to focus on those parts of it which he identified as most in need of editorial intervention, including the major variations between his copy-text and the Quarto texts. The essential characteristic of Theobald’s editorial practice is not selectiveness, supported by thorough exploration of individual variants, but specialism in the most obvious and interesting cases of corruption. Jarvis conflates Theobald’s localised activity and Pope’s wide-ranging eclecticism partly as a result of his emphasis on intellectual continuity in the Shakespearean editorial tradition before 1765. It is also probable that Theobald’s text of *Hamlet*, on which he staked his reputation eight

---

64 *Lear* (1608), sig. F3v.
65 *Works* (1728), III, p. 401.
67 *Lear* ([1619]), sig. E4v.
years before the publication of his edition, benefited from stricter comparison of the earlier texts. The case of King Lear, therefore, may reveal a more typical pattern of Theobald’s editorial practice, one which lends support to his self-presentation as an editorial specialist dedicated to ‘restoring to the Publick their greatest Poet in his Original Purity’. 68

‘Laborious Collation’

This analysis has shown that in marking up his copy-text Theobald relied chiefly on his critical intelligence and attention to points of major textual variance to identify errors and restore missing lines. My discovery that 145 of Pope’s unauthorised readings remain in Theobald’s text of King Lear, while more than 110 First Folio readings were not restored, has made clear that Theobald did not systematically collate his copy-text against any authoritative edition. But it does not necessarily follow that Theobald neglected the practice of collation altogether. In the Preface to his edition, Theobald declared that collation had been his first priority as an editor: ‘I have thought it my Duty, in the first place, by a diligent and laborious Collation to take in the Assistances of all the older Copies’. 69 Seary has identified twelve extant copies of Shakespearean works which may have been borrowed or owned by Theobald, and according to Seary’s descriptions half of these contain possible evidence of Theobald’s collation (pp. 233-36). The six copies in question are all Quartos, ranging from first to fifth editions, and on the title-pages of three of them Theobald himself made notes recording that he had collated the texts thoroughly.

Owing to a misprint, the title of the bibliographical table in the final pages of Theobald’s edition states that the books listed are those ‘Collected by the Editor’; an

68 Works (1733), I, p. xxxix.
69 Works (1733), I, p. xlii.
erratum at the end records that this should read ‘Collated’. Colin Franklin has observed that this is an uncannily revealing error, underlining Theobald’s status as the first Shakespearean editor to be an active collector of scholarly resources for his personal library. Seary’s account of the books surviving from Theobald’s library attests that Theobald was also an active collator, who worked to examine the textual relationships between the editions that he obtained. His title-page memoranda scrupulously record the bibliographic details of the editions which he collated. In his copy of the First Quarto (1600) of The Merchant of Venice Theobald wrote, ‘Carefully collated w:th the other Editions of the same Date, printed by J Roberts’; these ‘other Editions’ were presumably copies of the Second Quarto (1619), a falsely dated Pavier edition whose imprint (‘Printed by J. Roberts, 1600’) is identical to that of the First Quarto. In this case, as in several others, Seary does not specify whether the ‘signs of collation throughout’ Theobald’s copy take the form of marginal notes, tables of variants, or other cross-references (p. 235). It must also be noted that Theobald’s self-proclaimed care in performing his collations does not guarantee that he recorded every substantive variant; we have already seen that an inattention to function words affected his handling of some First Quarto variants in King Lear. But it is clear from the details of Seary’s bibliography that Theobald worked methodically to trace the multitude of textual differences between editions bearing identical titles and imprints.

There is little evidence, however, that Theobald’s habit of collation played any part in informing or regulating his editorial practice. Seary identifies his copy of the Third Quarto of King Lear (1655), now in the library of the University of Illinois at Urbana-

70 Works (1733), VII, sigs 2H8r, 2I4r.
Champaign, which has a signed note on its title-page: ‘Collated throughout exactly with the old Quto [sic] printed in 1608. L. T.’ (p. 236). My collation has uncovered two readings in Theobald’s text of *King Lear* which he introduced with the support of this edition and the Second Quarto only. The Third Quarto appears among the ‘EDITIONS of middle Authority’ in Theobald’s bibliographical table, indicating that he did not reject the 1655 text outright after studying its variations from the First (or possibly the Second) Quarto. But the two readings introduced to Theobald’s text with the support of the Third Quarto do not confirm that Theobald consulted the record of variants in his annotated copy of this edition during the preparation of his text. Furthermore, if Theobald’s other Quarto text or texts of *King Lear* were enriched in the same way with manuscript collations, it is difficult to believe that an editor making good use of these collations would adopt only 68 variants found in First Quarto, over half of which are clustered around obvious discrepancies between this and the First Folio text. Therefore, the evidence of *King Lear* persuasively suggests that while Theobald undertook collations to analyse the textual relationships between early editions, he did not work methodically to apply either the procedure or its results to his copy-text. Theobald’s practice of collation is more closely connected to the search for knowledge which drove his collecting than it is to the discerning application of that knowledge which defines his editorial practice.

Theobald’s Preface gives no clue as to why his ‘diligent and laborious Collation’ remained at best a peripheral source of alternative readings, primarily helping to resolve specific problems in his copy-text instead of remedying its pervasive inaccuracies. But Theobald’s motives can be conjecturally reconstructed by comparing his approach to the
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73 *Works* (1733), V, p. 170, and *Lear* (1655), sig. G2v (*she kick’d*); *Works* (1733), V, p. 183, and *Lear* (1655), sig. H2v (*these villains*).  
74 *Works* (1733), VII, sig. 2I3v.
relationship between textual research and critical editing with that of his exemplar, the classical scholar Richard Bentley. In the Preface to his *Shakespeare*, Theobald made admiring reference to the ‘Success’ and ‘Reputation’ that Bentley had achieved by rescuing ‘ancient Writers’ from corruption. However, Theobald did not mention ‘the Learned Dr. Bentley’ by name until he came to distance his own Shakespearean scholarship from the pre-eminent classicist’s edition of Milton’s *Paradise Lost* (1732), which he characterised as an exercise in taste rather than learning. Theobald evidently wished to emphasise that his attitude to Bentley was critical as well as approving, and the methodology of his edition illustrates this constructive difference in practice.

Bentley’s first published edition, a 1711 version of Horace, sparked controversy with its invasive and authoritarian brand of textual criticism. Kristine L. Haugen has shown that every stage of its development was designed to give space to Bentley’s conjectural method:

> before collating any manuscripts or older editions, Bentley filled the margins of a printed Horace with his conjectures in the evident hope that he might find his conjecture confirmed by a manuscript or anticipated by a venerated older critic. He also carefully signed and dated the book ['Richardi Bentleij Emendationes Horatij. Aprilis 2: 1703'] so that there could be no doubt of his conjecturing independently.[7]

Bentley’s conjectures attained a fixed form early in the production process, as the text of his edition was printed at the Cambridge University Press from 1703. This part of the edition (eventually representing roughly two-fifths of its bulk) was completed in 1706 or 1707, and only then did Bentley begin to prepare his prodigious endnotes. Haugen admits
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75 Works (1733), I, p. xxxix.
76 Q. Horatius Flaccus, ex Recensione & cum Notis atque Emendationibus Richardi Bentleii (Cambridge: [n. pub.], 1711).
that ‘it was entirely normal practice at the time for editors to write up their notes only after their texts had been printed’ (p. 138). The order of Bentley’s editorial tasks was thus unexceptional, but the extent of his editorial intervention at the first stage put him in the novel position of having to defend over 700 emendations which were already incorporated into his text. During the four years before his edition was finally published, Bentley’s study of manuscripts and their variants continued chiefly as a search for contexts and authorities to justify the emendations already embodied in his text. Though it is true that Bentley openly ‘changed his mind about several readings’ he had adopted, this represented only a minor breach of the practical separation which he enforced between the making of text and commentary (p. 138). This course of action allowed Bentley to give free rein not only to his powers of persuasion in writing the notes, but also to his critical instincts in introducing conjectures and variants to the text.

For Theobald, the editorial process was faster and lacked the strict segregation of tasks within which Bentley operated. But like Bentley, Theobald sought the freedom to judge and emend his copy-text on critical grounds, and consequently he avoided keeping the early copies that he had collated constantly in view. In this important respect, the two editors shared a vision. On Theobald’s side, there may be another strand of editorial logic at work in his reluctance to examine his copy-text and the early editions in parallel. Theobald reserved the last category in his bibliographical table, ‘EDITIONS of no Authority’, solely for Pope’s and Rowe’s eighteenth-century editions, isolating them ignominiously from the rest.\textsuperscript{78} This should not be seen simply as another way in which Theobald belittled his predecessors; in fact, the segregation of their editions reflects the methodological difference separating Theobald’s work with these recent editions from his study of the early copies. Whereas he gathered useful textual information from his

\textsuperscript{78} Works (1733), VII, sig. 213'.
seventeenth-century copies by collating them carefully, Theobald focused on restoring Shakespearean sense and authentic lines to his eighteenth-century copy-text, avoiding close scrutiny of its unauthoritative detail. It would be easy to slight Theobald’s classification of Pope’s and Rowe’s texts under ‘EDITIONS of no Authority’, given his adoption of the received text as the foundation of his own edition. However, as an earlier part of this study has argued, Theobald accepted the received text not as a base for improvements, but as a diagnostic case in which errors and their chains of causation could most clearly be identified.

**Matters of Fact**

Theobald once again adopted Bentley as his model for the presentation of his text and commentary. He decided to ‘follow the form of Bentley’s Amsterdam Horace [a revised edition of 1713], in subjoining the notes to the place controverted’, a strategy which not only made his commentary immediately accessible to readers, but also underlined his discerning and targeted approach to resolving textual corruption. It is notable that the frequency of Theobald’s footnotes to *King Lear* is broadly equivalent to the frequency of clusters of emendations in Theobald’s text of the play: *King Lear* has 64 footnotes in Theobald’s edition, and 55 pages of text which differ in more than one reading from Theobald’s copy-text. As Marcus Walsh has pointed out, ‘the sheer bulk of textual and explanatory notes’ in Theobald’s *Shakespeare* has scholarly precedents only in Bentley’s *Paradise Lost* and Patrick Hume’s critical notes on the same poem (1695). In his footnotes, Theobald discussed variant readings and bibliographical evidence in some detail, involving readers to an unparalleled degree in the principles and practice of textual
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79 Nichols, II, p. 621.
criticism. However, my analysis has found that Theobald’s footnotes are not exemplary in their standards of factual accuracy or textual research. Their occasional failings in these respects show that many elements of Theobald’s editorial approach to his copy-text also exerted an influence on the preparation of his commentary.

Theobald’s footnotes are not free of inaccurate information about the sources of variant readings. The broad theoretical distinction that Theobald made in his table of editions between authoritative texts of 1632 or earlier and unreliable later texts is evident not only in his sparse reference to the latter, but also in many of his factual errors. The absence of the Third and Fourth Folios from the vast majority of Theobald’s annotations indicates that he rarely consulted them (only the Third is listed in his bibliographical table, under ‘EDITIONS of middle Authority’).

Owing to the number of editions separating his copy-text from the later Folios, this gap in Theobald’s research did not generally leave him prone to error. Theobald’s habitual neglect of Rowe’s editions, on the other hand, did lead him into several false conclusions. In two footnotes to King Lear Theobald lays the blame for a supposedly inauthentic reading on Pope, when Pope simply followed Rowe. On another occasion, in a note on Act 3 of Othello, Theobald pours scorn on Pope’s claim to have ‘restor’d from the first Edition’ Iago’s line, ‘Dang’rous conceits are in their nature poisons’, positively stating that the line ‘is in the Editions put out by Mr. Rowe’. It is not, however, in the third edition on which Pope based his text. These footnotes illustrate Theobald’s lack of interest in the recent textual history of Shakespeare’s plays, a neglect which led him to make numerous factually inaccurate assumptions. His focus on

---

81 Works (1733), VII, sig. 212v.
82 Works (1733), V, p. 149, note 20; ‘Thy tender-hearted Nature’ is found in Works (1714), VII, p. 44. Works (1733), V, p. 193, note 49; ‘like a Cow-keeper’ is found in Works (1714), VII, p. 72.
83 Works (1733), VII, p. 439, note 36.
84 Works (1714), VII, p. 144.
pre-1633 editions appears to have been allied to an unanalytical approach to the origins of error in the received text.

It is clear, however, that Theobald did not examine even pre-1633 Quartos with scrupulous care. In two footnotes to Othello he claims to have made unprecedented changes to the punctuation and lineation of the text, apparently unaware that these changes are anticipated by both the First Quarto (1622) and the Second Quarto (1630). Two further footnotes to the same play make erroneous reference to the First Quarto, which has neither the punctuation mark nor the reading that Theobald cites. Once again, these errors are not simply a matter of inattention to detail, but symptoms of the priority of interpretative over bibliographical concerns in Theobald’s evaluation of his predecessors’ editorial practice. Theobald’s lack of diligence in consulting the Quartos leaves him prone to falsely accusing Pope, who made use of a thorough collation of Quarto variants, of introducing unauthorised readings. In Act 2 of Othello Theobald restores the Folios’ ‘when mountains melt on them’ in place of Pope’s emendation ‘when the huge mountains melt’, affirming that Pope’s alteration lacked ‘any Authority or Reason, but the smoothing the Versification’; Pope’s reading is in fact supported by the First Quarto. Theobald detects the interference of Pope’s taste again in Act 3 of King Lear, inferring that ‘this Gentleman’s nice Ear was offended at the Word in this place’ (the First Folio reading, ‘a power already footed’), and stating that the reading Pope substituted for it, ‘already

85 Works (1733), VII, pp. 396-97, note 17; there is a comma before ‘the young affects’ in William Shakespeare, The Tragoy of Othello, the Moore of Venice (London: Thomas Walkley, 1622), sig. C4v, and in William Shakespeare, The Tragoy of Othello, the Moore of Venice (London: Richard Hawkins, 1630), sig. C2v. Both of these Quartos were consulted in Early English Books Online <http://eebo.chadwyck.com> [accessed 11 March 2011]. For Theobald’s second mistaken footnote, see Works (1733), VII, p. 425, note 30; there is a line break after ‘I’ll set her on.’ in Othello (1622), sig. F4r, and in Othello (1630), sig. F1r.
86 Works (1733), VII, pp. 411, note 25; there is a full stop, not a comma, after ‘a fresh appetite’ in Othello (1622), sig. E2v. Works (1733), VII, p. 476, note 50; Othello (1622), sig. L3v, supports gnat, the reading of Theobald’s copy-text.
87 Works (1733), VII, p. 402, note 20.
88 Works (1728), VIII, p. 347; Othello (1622), sig. D2v.
landed’, has no authority; on the contrary, Pope found this reading in the First Quarto. The motives that Theobald attributes to Pope are fully corroborated by Pope’s overall practice, which invested heavily in improving Shakespeare’s style and metre. But on these and other occasions Theobald failed to build his critique of Pope’s aesthetic editing on a sound factual basis.

Jarvis has interrogated the ‘misleading’ statements in several of Theobald’s footnotes to Hamlet, where a failure to specify dates and provide reliable details of the sources of variant readings allows readers to confuse the run of post-1623 Quartos with the older editions (pp. 99-100). The errors in Theobald’s footnotes to King Lear and Othello may have been hasty assumptions cemented by his failure to verify information at its source. However, like the vague and inaccurate statements in his footnotes to Hamlet, these errors paint Theobald’s editorial practice as more consistent and accurate than it appears on closer analysis; they bring criticisms of Pope’s emendatory choices into favourable contrast with demonstrations of the logic and efficacy of Theobald’s methods. Furthermore, the inaccuracies of Theobald’s footnotes to King Lear reveal the same priorities in action that played a defining role in his preparation of the text. Theobald’s application to critically engaging problems is again attended by neglect of the bibliographical detail that surrounds them.

Theobald’s practice and his commentary on it supply grounds for the Scriblerian ridicule of ‘That accurate and punctual Man of Letters, the Restorer of Shakespeare’. Theobald is not a scholar obsessed with detail and correctness for their own sake, as The Dunciad’s satirical titles might suggest. However, he does fit the character in another
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90 Works (1728), III, p. 405; Lear (1608), sig. G1r.
way, as a specialist keen to demonstrate the real value of his pinpointed corrections, and an editor committed to helping general readers by adding a large quantity of grammatical punctuation to his text. It cannot be argued that Theobald’s sensitivity to Scriblerian mockery caused him to suppress a fascination with textual minutiae, thus explaining the inattention to detail which blights the accuracy of his text and commentary. This is because there is evidence in all of Theobald’s work on Shakespeare of confusion or concealment of certain levels of textual detail so as to concentrate on higher questions of error and meaning.

For example, Theobald’s comments in *Shakespeare Restored* give a variable impression of the need for expert editorial intervention to correct errors of punctuation and spelling in recent editions of Shakespeare. In the Appendix to *Shakespeare Restored* Theobald hoped, for reasons of space, that ‘I shall be excused from pointing out those innumerable literal Faults of the Press, which every Reader can correct, that does but throw his Eye over the Passages’ (p. 133). In the Introduction, however, Theobald had identified ‘the Faults in Pointing, and those meerly literal’ as symptoms of the degradation of Shakespeare’s texts after a century of unedited reproduction, and committed himself to ‘the Drudgery of Correction’ which they required (p. vi). Thus, in the Appendix to *Shakespeare Restored* Theobald concedes to readers’ common sense a province of editorial practice that he had reclaimed for expert attention in the Introduction. Furthermore, Theobald’s invitation to correct obvious defects in the punctuation of Pope’s first edition blurs into a licence allowing readers to reinterpret Shakespeare’s difficult syntax. Theobald thus creates some uncertainty in *Shakespeare Restored* about the usefulness of placing minute regulation of accidentals within a textual critic’s remit.

In his edition of Shakespeare, moreover, Theobald at times confused the relationship between his copy-text and authoritative editions in his quest to shed new light on
Shakespeare’s meaning. One of the unique Quarto passages which Pope incorporated into his text of *King Lear* was part of Edgar’s speech in Act 4 naming the five devils that possessed him. The passage appears as follows in Pope’s edition:

> Five fiends have been in poor Tom at once, *Hobbididen* Prince of dumbness, *Mahu* of stealing, *Mohu* of murder, *Flibbertigibbet* of moping, and *Mowing* who since possesses chamber-maids and waiting-women.\(^92\)

Theobald appended this note to the speech in his edition:

> *Five Fiends have been in poor Tom at once ;]* This Passage Mr. Pope first restor’d from the Old 4to; but miserably mangled, as it is there. I have set it right, as it came from our Author, by the Help of Bishop Harsenet’s Pamphlet, already quoted. We find there, all these Devils were in *Sarah* and *Friswood Williams*, Mrs. Peckham’s two Chambermaids; and particularly *Flibbertigibbet*, who made them *mop* and *mow* like Apes, says that Author. And to their suppos’d Possession, our Poet is here satirically alluding.\(^93\)

Theobald states that the problem here is Pope’s faithful reproduction of the speech ‘as it is’ in the First Quarto, leaving its ‘mangled’ condition untouched. This is untrue – Pope made numerous alterations to both substantive and accidental elements of the Quarto text. He changed the Quarto’s ‘*Stiberdigebit*’ to ‘*Flibbertigibbet*’, and substituted ‘moping, and *Mowing*’ for the Quarto’s nonsensical ‘*Mobing, & Mohing*’.\(^94\) However, Pope’s version of Edgar’s speech is mangled in an entirely new way as a result of his misinterpretation of the Quarto. Pope followed the Quarto text in italicising ‘*Mowing*’, believing this to be the name of a sixth devil, and he removed the name of one of the other devils (‘*Of lust, as Obidicut*’) to preserve Edgar’s total of five. Pope also omitted Edgar’s benediction, ‘so, blesse thee maister’, which he may have considered a feeble conclusion to the speech.

If Theobald looked at this portion of Edgar’s speech in the Second Quarto instead of the First, it is unlikely to have had any impact on his editorial choices; the differences
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\(^92\) *Works* (1728), III, p. 421.
\(^94\) *Lear* (1608), sig. H3\(^r\).
between the two texts at this point are purely accidental, and have no bearing on any of the readings discussed here.\textsuperscript{95} Theobald examined one or both of the Quarto texts closely enough to reinstate the mention of Obidicut, but he did not restore Edgar’s blessing to his text of the speech. Furthermore, Theobald added an unauthorised conjunction before the name of the last devil, ‘and Flibbertigibbet,’ to save readers from Pope’s confusion over their number. The smallest alteration that Theobald made to this speech was his removal of Pope’s italics from ‘mopping and mowing’, but this was in fact the most significant. Theobald’s note demonstrating Shakespeare’s debt to Samuel Harsnett’s Declaration of Egregious Popish Impostures (1603) hinges on this emendation; if, as Theobald conjectured, ‘Mowing’ was not the name of a devil but a symptom of demonic control, Shakespeare could be seen to have borrowed the language of Harsnett’s report on the effects of demonic possession.

Theobald’s footnote brings a highly significant piece of contextual evidence to bear on King Lear for the first time, revealing that Edgar’s antics as Poor Tom reflect satirically on the exorcisms performed by contemporary Jesuits. But the nature of the textual problem and the solution that Theobald achieved are severely misrepresented. Theobald’s copy-text does not contain a perfect reproduction of Edgar’s speech in the First Quarto, but a significantly altered version whose accuracy Theobald made limited efforts to improve. Theobald’s emendations, supported by Harsnett’s treatise, do not directly address the corruption of the Quarto texts but build on Pope’s version, adopting Pope’s successful corrections and making further emendations based on a reinterpretation of the speech. Theobald’s footnote acknowledges none of this, instead conforming to the principle that guided his preparation of the text here and throughout his edition: it shows that Theobald made little attempt to trace the history of the text objectively before making

\textsuperscript{95} Lear ([1619]), sig. H1\textsuperscript{v}. The Second Quarto has ‘dumbnesse’ in place of the First Quarto’s ‘dumbnes’, a line break after ‘Stiberdigebit of Mobing’ rather than ‘Stiberdigebit of / Mobing’, ‘And Mohing’ in place of ‘& Mohing’, and ‘master’ instead of ‘maister’.
intuitive judgements about the presence of error or the need for elucidation. His treatment of Edgar’s speech and his commentary on it are both underpinned not by a rigorous comparison of his copy-text with either of the Quartos, but by a literary discovery that enabled Theobald to assess the accuracy of his copy-text in terms of Shakespeare’s authorial intentions. For Theobald, the task of examining in detail the strengths and faults of Pope’s modernised text faded in importance as opportunities to penetrate to the design and meaning of the text ‘as it came from our Author’ presented themselves.

This is one of many occasions that prove Theobald’s capacity to be ‘simultaneously scholar and critic’, which Brian Vickers argues is one of his greatest strengths as a Shakespearean editor. However, current understanding of how the disciplines of textual and literary scholarship can cooperate is at some distance from Theobald’s grasp of the scope and interaction of his editorial principles. Theobald examined the early Quartos and Folios in order to recover authentic passages which did not appear in Pope’s editions, and to resolve doubts about the accuracy of specific lines in his copy-text. This second aspect of Theobald’s textual scholarship was effectively subordinate to his critical judgement, which he trusted not only to detect corruption in his copy-text, but also to find conjectural remedies when the evidence of the early editions proved unsatisfactory.

Theobald employed collation to examine the sources and authority of the early texts in his library, but in his editorial work he pursued these questions only insofar as they furthered his localised efforts to restore genuine Shakespearean readings. The supporting role that Theobald gave collation in his editorial practice led him to effectively appropriate everything in his copy-text that his critical instincts did not challenge. While this undeniably produced a less than accurate edition, it is also a testament to the ambition
that shaped Theobald’s approach to Shakespeare. His text shows that he was unwilling to employ careful collations to engage methodically in the process of revising the received text. Instead, Theobald set out to retrieve Shakespeare’s original text, confident in the specialised effectiveness of his knowledge.

This study of Theobald’s editing has reinforced Jarvis’s view that ‘his attitude towards the received text…was an ambiguous one’ (p. 95), and brought a new dimension of this ambiguity to light. Theobald gave his critical intuition a leading role in removing un-Shakespearean errors from his copy-text. But he also valued close analysis of the evidence of various early copies as a means of solving specific difficulties and making helpful discoveries. This combination of approaches gave Theobald greater freedom of movement in reaching editorial decisions, and represents an eighteenth-century editor’s legitimate response to the mercurial problems of Shakespeare’s texts. It can now be seen that Theobald accepted the received text on rational grounds, and decided not to subject it to the systematic analysis that he reserved for authoritative editions. Theobald’s conjectures and his critical commentary are justly celebrated, but in the preparation of his text he sacrificed the demands of accuracy in order to demonstrate the brilliance of his judgement.
CHAPTER THREE

COMPOSITE BOOKS AND THE CULTURE OF THE ANTHOLOGY IN THE SEVENTEENTH AND EIGHTEENTH CENTURIES

During the handpress era, generations of readers and collectors chose to customise the physical forms and contextual associations of their books by compiling them into bound collections, or Sammelbände. The ubiquity of this practice is partly explained by the economies of book production and ownership. Though by no means consistent throughout the period, the proportion of books sold unbound remained high, and the comparatively high cost of bindings provided a strong incentive to combine texts. But composite bindings offered more than just monetary savings: they invited readers and collectors to assemble their books into useful and meaningful compilations, answering to their practical needs and intellectual habits. It is owing to these functions that Sammelbände have much to contribute to our understanding of literary history. They enabled texts to gain new literary and social meanings, as contemporary readers and later collectors bound them into unique compilations; they also encouraged compilers to participate in or challenge the formation of literary canons. Scholars including Seth Lerer, Alexandra Gillespie and Jeffrey Todd Knight have recently begun to explore the role of Sammelbände in shaping literary culture.¹ However, their attention has focused on compilations from the earliest era of print to the first part of the seventeenth century. Bound collections from the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries are routinely

categorised by these scholars as *tract books*, a term that both overlooks the heterogeneity of their contents and understates the critical intelligence of their compilers. This chapter argues that many are better understood as *anthologies*, part of a long and vibrant tradition of literary collecting. It explores the neglected later history of the custom-made anthology through case studies taken from the Thistlethwayte collection. Focusing on the contrasting approaches of two compilers represented in the collection, including Thistlethwayte himself, the chapter will reveal how their rich and highly individual anthologies redefined the literary past.

Over twelve hundred titles in the Fellows’ Library have been identified as belonging to the Thistlethwayte collection, and of these more than four hundred are bound into composite books, or *Sammelbände*. Such bindings account for more than a third of the items in the collection, and most embody the tastes and values of an assortment of collectors from the early seventeenth century to the first decades of the next. Thistlethwayte bought more than half of the composite books in his collection second-hand, acquiring a huge variety ranging from topical compilations to thematic anthologies, and from specimens of continental printing to eighteenth-century publishers’ assortments. His collection contains just one group of second-hand *Sammelbände* that can be traced to a single compiler, and this is in more than one sense an exceptional case.

The compiler is Richard Triplett (1671-1720), a graduate of Oxford University in the 1690s, and a man whose relatively obscure background and provincial career in the church stand in contrast to Thistlethwayte’s wealthier circumstances and public life. Nevertheless, Triplett’s compilations contain an extraordinary concentration of rare books and little-regarded texts; they also display an anthologistic intelligence that responds both to the interconnections between texts and to the concerns of Triplett’s social world. Thistlethwayte acquired and consulted these books, but in his own practice as a compiler
he pursued altogether different habits and interests. His compilations, unlike Triplett’s, predominantly collect literature in English, and find meaning in the juxtapositions, instead of the continuities, between texts. The differences between these two compilers are partly a matter of individual tastes and preferences, but they must also be seen in a larger cultural context. This study of the Sammelbände created by Triplett and Thistlethwayte will trace the changing social and cultural influences on the enduring practice of compilation.

*Tract Volumes or Anthologies? Rewriting the History of Composite Books*

Volumes bound in the handpress period commonly exceed modern notions of the complete, self-enclosed book. They often contain multiple titles, separately printed and combined according to the desires of a reader or collector into a unique compilation. Revisionist scholarship has emphasised that throughout the handpress period ‘a significant proportion of books were normally stocked and sold ready bound’, usually in individual covers. However, it remains the case that large quantities of books, including most small-format and slim items, were sold in sheets or stitched as a temporary measure. New books sold unbound, as well as those removed from earlier bindings for re-sale, were most often assembled into compilations. Knight explains that ‘because […] handmade bindings were vastly more expensive than the printed sheets of the texts themselves, it was financially necessary to gather multiple works of normal length into single bound volumes to ensure their preservation’ (p. 4). Scholars have adopted the neutral German term Sammelband to describe these compilations, in recognition of the range of formats, subjects and compiling habits represented in their construction.

---

Compilations of separate bibliographic items have a long history of giving material form both to texts in transmission and to changing literary values. In the medieval period, some manuscripts were assembled from individual booklets: these were copied and often offered for sale separately before being gathered together by a patron or reader. In the earliest era of print, as scholars have highlighted, this flexible conception of the book continued to direct the marketing and reading of English texts. Gillespie argues that ‘the producers of the [printed] books in early Sammelbände were engaged in a dynamic process’ of creation and reception, occasionally assembling Sammelbände in trade bindings, and routinely tailoring individual editions to appeal to the compiling impulses of consumers (p. 210). In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, as the trade expanded and diversified, booksellers and owners found new ways of profiting from the customisable potential of books. Barbara Benedict points out that in an attempt to refresh and unload their stock, ‘[b]ooksellers fairly often compiled their own volumes from unbound sheets of pamphlets in their shops’; they also ordered volume title pages to be printed for readers wishing to collect and bind up sequences of texts issued separately.\(^3\) At the book auctions held from 1676 onwards, unbound books and pamphlets were sold in bundles organised by format and subject, encouraging purchasers to bind them into more permanent configurations (Benedict, p. 19). Collectors and readers, moreover, continued to make their own choices regarding the contents and arrangement of Sammelbände. They brought together new and old books, separate editions and extracted texts, to form compilations that reveal much about their individual priorities and idiosyncrasies.

The proliferation of Sammelbände in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries can clearly be seen in the Thistletonwayte collection, in which more than one third of the books survive in composite volumes assembled by collectors across both centuries.

Sammelbände made up a large part of many library bequests in this era, including that of the actor and theatre magnate David Garrick, a contemporary of Thistlethwayte’s, to the British Museum on his death in 1779. Garrick, ‘an avid collector who assembled a wide-ranging library of dramatic texts’, bequeathed a collection dominated by composite books, many of which he had himself constructed (Knight, p. 58). Garrick’s books were subject to an aggressive institutional programme of dismantling and rebinding in the mid-nineteenth century, but in smaller libraries many collections escaped such treatment. For example, Charles Otway, a Fellow of St John’s College, Cambridge, bequeathed to the college on his death in 1721 a collection of several thousand topical and literary pamphlets, most of which remain in bindings that he constructed without any discernible logic or consistency. Where seventeenth- and eighteenth-century assemblies have been dismantled, scholars can often employ the surviving evidence of catalogues, contents pages and ownership marks in order to piece them together. By contrast, late fifteenth- and sixteenth-century Sammelbände are a much more elusive presence in modern libraries. As Gillespie notes, ‘[t]he components of these early composite volumes were too “enchanting” for modern collectors to resist, and they were very often rebound separately’ (p. 193). The fine bindings commissioned by modern collectors and librarians enshrine the literary value and bibliographical rarity of early printed texts, but they disguise or erase any evidence of the compiling habits of early readers.

Despite the difficulties involved in their identification and reconstruction, early Sammelbände have elicited a strong current of scholarly interest. The foundational study in this field is Paul Needham’s account of the fifteenth-century Rosenwald Sammelband, and of other compilations known to contain Caxton editions, in The Printer and the

---

4 For an example of Otway’s compiling, see Knight, p. 61.
Exploring the connotations of familiar bibliographical terms, Needham makes a case for the distinctiveness of early compiling practices:

[Books containing multiple items] have at various times and in various contexts been referred to as tract, pamphlet, or composite volumes. Such phrases suggest, to my ears, the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, when sermons or poems, commonly of pamphlet length, were commonly so bound. They have a slightly anachronistic ring when applied to fifteenth- and early sixteenth-century volumes, which often contained [...] quite substantial editions, such as in later times would have been sold and bound as separate units. The German word for such volumes is Sammelband, and despite its rather outlandish sound, it has this advantage, that it does not, like tract volume, imply that only slight works would be bound together in this way. (p. 17)

Needham’s distinction of terms also outlines a transformation in print culture and compiling habits during the handpress period. By the seventeenth century, Needham indicates, producers and readers were no longer compiling ‘substantial editions’ into Sammelbände; instead they began to gather a growing crop of slight and ephemeral items into tract volumes. This narrative has been endorsed by scholars including Knight and Gillespie, and goes some way towards explaining the comparative critical neglect of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century compiling practices.

Needham’s juxtaposition of substantial early Sammelbände against later pamphlet volumes may have helped to focus critical attention on the earlier period. The representative seventeenth- and eighteenth-century compilation is, in Needham’s account, a tract volume; its components are items ‘of pamphlet length’, commonly in a small format. Compilations of this kind encompass genres including sermons, political and religious tracts, parliamentary proceedings and ballads, as well as poetry and drama. They are, as Needham indicates, less likely to contain substantial literary texts – such as long poems and authorial collections – than early Sammelbände, which can incorporate quarto volumes.
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editions of the major works of medieval English poetry. This account has drawn attention
to early *Sammelbände* as important sites for the formation of literary canons, but has
perhaps discouraged closer investigation of the critical selections of later compilers.

Subsequent scholars have outlined another dimension to the contrast between early
*Sammelbände* and later compilations. Knight claims that late seventeenth- and eighteenth-
century compilers were driven chiefly by a ‘desire to preserve’ their books in durable and
economical composite volumes (p. 65). Some chose simply to combine books of the same
size or items bought from the same shop; others, such as the Oxford antiquary Anthony
Wood, designed compilations to serve their intellectual needs. Wood, an indefatigable
collector, invested in books and manuscripts as resources for his research into the history
of Oxford and its university. In the fifteen years before his death in 1695, Wood ordered
bindings for 295 bundles of printed material; Nicolas Kiessling observes of his compiling
that he ‘arranged by subject, ordered chronologically, and bound his books so that he
would have a more efficient working library’.  

Wood, like many late seventeenth- and eighteenth-century collectors, used composite
bindings to bring stability and order to his library. Scholars have established a contrast
between this methodical approach and the characteristic habits of earlier compilers.
Knight has described the readiness of Renaissance readers to engage with books as ‘fluid,
adaptable objects’: rather than combining texts according to schemes of classification or
estimates of value, they had them bound into flexible configurations reflecting their
individual tastes and reading habits (p. 4). The *Sammelbände* they created, often
combining extracted texts with complete editions and manuscript leaves with printed
material, have proved most interesting to scholars. Knight, Needham and others have been

---

careful to distinguish contemporary bindings of medieval and Renaissance texts – their chief objects of study – from compilations assembled much later, according to different rationales, by collectors. In doing so, these scholars have made the case that the personal compilations of early readers are more challenging – and therefore more interesting – as objects of literary history than the systematic bindings of Wood and his eighteenth-century successors.

In a culture keen to explore the ‘mutable and flexible’ potential of literary texts, one of the most important sources of new textual forms and meanings is the anthology. Derived from a Greek compound meaning ‘a collection of flowers’, the term *anthology* is commonly understood to describe a historical selection of canonical texts (Benedict, p. 3). This definition reflects the vernacular term’s relatively recent popularisation: the first English literary collection to be marketed as an *Anthology* appeared in 1793, and the term has come to be associated with the formation of a literary canon in the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. But the most basic meaning of *anthology*, as articulated by Lerer, is a collection guided not by novelty or practicality but ‘by a critical intelligence’, and in this sense critics have applied the term to collections assembled long before the eighteenth century (p. 1255). In the late medieval period, anthologies constituted flexible formats – some created by scribes, others constructed from printed products – in which texts could gain new thematic and social meanings. In a study of medieval anthology culture, Lerer argues that ‘the anthologistic impulse controlled much of the dissemination, marketing and critical reception of vernacular English writing’ in manuscript and in the early decades of print (p. 1254).

---

7 The first literary collection published in England to be given the title of *Anthology* was *The English Anthology*, ed. by Joseph Ritson, 3 vols (London: T. and J. Egerton, 1793-1794).
Tracing the early modern and eighteenth-century history of the anthology has, however, been made difficult by the often broad and indiscriminate use of the term by scholars. William St Clair, for example, has observed that the latter part of the sixteenth century produced ‘a flurry of printed literary anthologies’. But his appendix of titles includes both anthologies – pre-eminent among which is Richard Tottel’s *Songs and Sonnettes* of 1557 – and printed commonplace-books. The commonplace-book, a collection of striking quotations arranged under subject headings, emerged as a humanist intellectual tool in the early sixteenth century. It evolved, as Ann Moss has shown, from the medieval practice of transcribing memorable extracts gleaned from ancient texts into *florilegia*, or ‘flower gatherings’, themselves a form of anthology. But despite its ancestry, the Renaissance commonplace-book differs from the anthology in both structure and function: while the latter is an intelligent arrangement of texts, the former is a ‘mechanism’ for storing and reproducing moral and rhetorical *exempla* (Moss, p. 256). St Clair is not alone in conflating the anthology with another, distinct form of literary collection. In a study of collections published during the long eighteenth century, Benedict argues that the anthology forms part of the same genre as the miscellany, as both ‘share means of material production, processes of compilation, audiences, and forms’ (p. 4). This approach suppresses a useful distinction between anthologies formed on principles of critical selection, and miscellanies bringing new texts together for the first time. It also underlines Benedict’s focus on the cultural commerce of published collections: her study, *Making the Modern Reader*, investigates the strategies employed by editors and producers to fashion the readers of their collections into adept consumers of culture. However, Benedict overlooks the readiness of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century readers to fashion their

---

own collections, binding printed editions together in ways that support their own modes of reading and reify individual canons of valued texts. The contribution of these custom-made Sammelbände to the history of the anthology is yet to be examined.

The Thistlethwayte collection provides a unique opportunity to remedy the omission of custom-made anthologies from recent scholarship. Not only does the collection include a range of Sammelbände assembled during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, but it also contains a record of the compiling activities of two collectors, separated by at least a generation and by a gulf in social opportunity. One is Thistlethwayte himself; the other is Richard Triplett, a fellow undergraduate collector and Oxford alumnus. The Fellows’ Library holds thirty-nine Sammelbände that can be identified, with varying degrees of certainty, as creations of Thistlethwayte.10 In addition, there are thirteen composite books from Triplett’s collection, the majority of which are highly likely to have been bound up by Triplett himself. These compilations expose the general instability of generic definitions based on published collections, such as the following distinction made by Michael Suarez between anthologies and miscellanies:

Miscellanies are usually compilations of relatively recent texts designed to suit contemporary tastes; anthologies, in contrast, are generally selections of canonical texts which have a more established history and a greater claim to cultural importance.11

Triplett and Thistlethwayte allowed their individual preferences to determine both the form and content of their compilations, and in this sense every one of their collections can be said to have been ‘designed to suit contemporary tastes’. The majority, however, cannot properly be called miscellanies, as the novel combination of recent texts is not a

---

10 Appendix 5 indexes the contents and describes the bindings of a selection of Thistlethwayte’s Sammelbände discussed in this chapter. All thirteen of Triplett’s Sammelbände are similarly described in Appendix 4.

key principle of their organisation. In fact, there is a preponderance of older texts – specifically those published at least ten years before their incorporation into composite bindings – in the Sammelbände assembled by both Triplett and Thistlethwayte. But Suarez’s definition of the anthology also proves unsuitable, as the texts in these compilations often do not possess the established cultural currency that Suarez considers a focus of anthologicistic collecting. With these difficulties in mind, the term anthology is used throughout this chapter in the sense outlined by Lerer. The anthologies discussed here are distinguished from haphazard collections and tract volumes – collections guided by consistency and categorisation – on grounds that they imply a critical approach to the texts they contain. Their combinations of texts are each guided by a central idea, which not only highlights new meanings in the works themselves, but also resonates with the social and cultural environments in which Triplett and Thistlethwayte lived.

Triplett’s compilations form the largest group of Sammelbände traceable to any second-hand source in the Winchester collection. The size and distinctiveness of this group make it a valuable case-study of the role of the anthology in shaping both compilations and cultures in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. Like the medieval anthologies brought to light by Lerer and Gillespie, Triplett’s compilations present new perspectives on literary history and provide unique clues to the character and interests of an otherwise obscure reader. Later in this chapter, a study of one of the most outstanding of Triplett’s Sammelbände will explore his highly topical configuration of the literary history of the late Elizabethan and early Stuart periods. The following section, meanwhile, will give the first detailed account of Triplett’s life and the fortunes of his library.
Richard Triplett: A Life in Books

No aspect of Triplett’s life is better documented, or more intimately linked to his identity as a collector, than his affiliation with the University of Oxford. Triplett, a native of Oxfordshire, matriculated from Trinity College in 1687, aged sixteen. He entered the college as a servitor – the lowest rank of membership – and earned relief from the costs of food and accommodation by performing menial duties in hall and chapel. His was a difficult and often demeaning role in college life, but as Clare Hopkins points out, it was ‘a vital means of access to the University for the sons of poor men’. With strict demands on his limited funds, Triplett nevertheless managed to lay the foundations of a personal library. The Thistlethwayte collection contains two of the items that he acquired as an undergraduate. One is a 1621 edition of the poetry of Julius Caesar Scaliger, the classical scholar and critic whose literary theory was recommended for study in seventeenth-century Oxford. Triplett bought this edition for three shillings, according to his note on the front free endpaper (Fig. 7), at the third sale of stock belonging to the Oxford bookseller Richard Davis on 25 June 1688 (the note states ‘ex auctione tertii Davisianâ Ano. D. 1688’). This purchase from a major local auction locates Triplett within a large book-buying community, and indicates the academic colouring of his literary interests.

Triplett’s experience of the academy as a venue for literary culture can also be glimpsed in his second identifiable purchase as a young student. This is a Cambridge University miscellany of congratulatory verse addressed to Charles I; on its title page is the cropped inscription, ‘Sum e Libr. R. Triplett 168[?].’ Part of a long tradition of poetic offerings from both universities on state occasions, this collection represents the literary culture of Cambridge University as a prestigious corporate endeavour. Triplett collected many more academic miscellanies, and the genre may have helped to motivate and contextualise his own participation in the literary life of Oxford University. Evidence of this participation is limited to Triplett’s brief and enigmatic entry in Anthony Wood’s *Athenæ Oxonienses*, which affirms that ‘He hath wrote a Comedy, not yet printed’. Wood notes that the play is unavailable in print, but does not comment on its stage

---


17 Anthony Wood, *Athenæ Oxonienses: An Exact History of all the Writers and Bishops who have had their Education in the University of Oxford*, 2nd edn, 2 vols (London: R. Knaplock and others, 1721), II, p. 1080.
history, indicating perhaps that as a specimen of academic drama it had more realistic prospects of publication than theatrical production. However, it would be unwise to read too much into Wood’s biographical snippet: as will shortly be explained, Triplett’s inclusion in *Athenae Oxonienses* might be attributable not to his literary achievements, but to a reputation gained in altogether different circumstances.

In 1687 Triplett arrived at a university in crisis, as James II pressed ahead with his campaign to establish a powerful Catholic community at the centre of a resolutely Anglican institution. The following year, as news reached Oxford of plans for a Dutch invasion, ‘political apathy prevailed over military duty’ to the Catholic James, and what political zeal did emerge sustained a small movement of men towards the advancing army of William of Orange.\(^\text{18}\) Though it is not known whether Triplett played an active part in events, it is clear that during these years he witnessed a landmark struggle in the political conscience of Oxford: while loyalty to King James had evaporated by the autumn of 1688, allegiance to the new monarch tested the most sacred convictions of the university’s members.

In 1690, however, Triplett was facing his own crisis. On 4 July, according to Wood, he ‘killed by chance one Joseph Chevrington Bible Clerk of Merton’ (II, p. 1080). Chevrington’s bible-clerkship brought with it a range of duties in hall and chapel, but it also established Chevrington in a social position slightly higher than Triplett’s in the collegiate hierarchy. Wood records that after the incident Triplett ‘held up his hand at the Assizes’, a statement that may hint at the corporal nature of his punishment: as J. M. Beattie observes, in this period ‘prisoners convicted of manslaughter were granted clergy [a legal privilege available to literate men and women], burnt in the hand, and

The University accounts for 1689-90 confirm that Triplett was found guilty of a felony – almost certainly manslaughter – and his goods forfeit, a penalty that brought the University the meagre sum of two shillings and sixpence: ‘de bonis Ricardi Triplett, felonis, 2s 6d’.

Though the distribution of assets occasionally provoked dispute between the respective authorities, it was not unusual for the University to receive such a token amount from the City following the confiscation of one of its members’ goods. The City may have collected a much larger sum from Triplett’s forfeit, but there is convincing evidence that the authorities did not deprive Triplett of his library. It is significant, first of all, that the Cambridge miscellany described above – one of two purchases signed and dated by Triplett before 1690 – forms part of a larger compilation of academic miscellanies. Triplett assembled all six volumes of this compilation himself, and it is likely that he had them bound as a complete set following his acquisition of the latest title, published in 1694. The inclusion in this compilation of the Cambridge miscellany clearly indicates that Triplett’s judicial penalty did not prevent him from completing a collection he had started some years before.

Furthermore, the Thistlethwayte collection is not the only eighteenth-century library benefaction to contain books that belonged to Triplett both before and after his conviction. The large bequest of Richard Warner, an Oxford contemporary of Thistlethwayte, to Wadham College includes an Elzevir edition of the letters of Cicero, inscribed by Triplett with his name, college and the date ‘1688’.

---

21 For information regarding a legal dispute between the University and the City over felons’ goods, see *Life and Times*, II, pp. 128-29.
the book in 1736, two years after obtaining his BA from Wadham, but apparently before he left Oxford (his inscription reiterates his connection to the college). By this time Warner already had a Triplett book in his library: in 1734 he had obtained a copy of the first edition of Rymer’s *Tragedies of the Last Age Consider’d and Examin’d* (1678) that had formerly belonged to the Trinity College student.²⁴ Thistlethwayte entered Wadham in 1735 and followed the example of Warner: his gift of books to Winchester College includes a total of twenty obtained from Triplett’s collection.²⁵ He acquired at least seven of these – the six volumes of university miscellanies and a duodecimo compilation of continental poetry – during his undergraduate years, as his ownership inscription in each collection testifies (‘E Libris Alex Thistlethwayte e Coll Wadh.’).

Thistlethwayte and Warner shared the spoils of Triplett’s library with at least one other Oxford collector. In 1745 St John’s College library received second choice of the books of Nathaniel Crynes, a former fellow and collector based in Oxford. Its selection included two books that Triplett had once owned: a copy of Caspar Ens’ *Mauritiados* (1612), on the Dutch victories under Maurice of Nassau, and a poetic *Sammelband* that Triplett had bought ready-bound from a mid-seventeenth-century compiler.²⁶ Crynes, like Thistlethwayte and Warner, was an active collector in 1730s Oxford; his books support the conclusion that a significant part of Triplett’s library, unscathed by his penalty of 1690, became available to his former university community at this time.

²⁴ Thomas Rymer, *The Tragedies of the Last Age Consider’d and Examin’d by the Practice of the Ancients, and by the Common Sense of All Ages* (London: Richard Tonson, 1678). Wadham College Library, shelf-mark C 2.10.
²⁵ Nineteen of these books contain a signature or a table of contents in Triplett’s hand, confirming his ownership. The one remaining book – an edition of the letters and poems of Justus Lipsius – lacks both of these attributes, but more than likely belonged to Triplett. Its identifying feature is a distinctive vellum and marbled paper binding found on several of Triplett’s books. Justus Lipsius, *Epistolarum (Quæ in Centurijs non extant) Decades XIX. Quibus accedunt Poematia eiusdem* (Harderwijk: Wilhelm Verbruggen, 1621). Winchester College Fellows’ Library, Book No. 6801.
Triplett graduated BA in 1691, but it was six years before he obtained his MA from St Mary Hall. The gap between Triplett’s degrees may testify to the impact of financial struggles, or of his undergraduate felony, on his progress towards ordination; conversely, it may mark a period in which he pursued other prospects, perhaps seeking employment as a tutor or personal secretary. Whatever his activities in the interim, Triplett’s eventual fulfilment of the qualifications for the MA degree was an uncommon achievement for a man of his status: G. V. Bennett has calculated that less than one in four of those entered as servitors or battelers between 1690 and 1719 managed to obtain an MA, after staying on as graduates to complete the necessary term of residence and academic ceremonies. In 1702 Triplett was ordained priest and installed as vicar of Highworth in Wiltshire. His appointment came just before the last dateable addition to his library: in 1703 Triplett’s name appeared in the largely clerical and academic subscription list for the Opera Omnia of George Bull, theologian and future bishop of St David’s. It is reasonable to conjecture that in addition to theological works such as this one, Triplett also collected sermons and popular religious pamphlets. However, the remnants of his library which this study has traced are all literary and historical works, now in the collections of Thistlethwayte, Warner and Crynes. It is possible that this later generation of gentlemen collectors had less interest in the sermons and pamphlets from a clergyman’s library, and chose instead to invest in the continental books and exceptional Sammelbände that made up the secular part of Triplett’s collection. Alternatively, the dispersal of Triplett’s books – at first among his family, and subsequently through booksellers – may

have separated the secular from the religious titles, and led to the disappearance of the latter from record.

Triplett died in his parish of Highworth in 1720. There is no record of his will, but it is probable that his library passed to his son Richard. The younger Triplett followed his father into church employment, becoming curate of a Wiltshire parish in 1726. But there is no record of his advancement to higher clerical office, and if he died prematurely this might explain the sale of his father’s books after 1730.\(^{30}\) Giles Mandelbrote has observed that ‘[c]lergymen’s libraries formed one of the staples of the growing secondhand trade in books’ from the late seventeenth century onwards, and Triplett played a part in this trend.\(^{31}\) However, it is notable that the elements of his library surviving in Oxford and Winchester collections are those that reflect not his clerical occupation, but his academic and literary background. This is more likely, as has been indicated, to be a consequence of the manner in which Triplett’s books were dispersed after his death than the result of any pronounced secular bias in his collection. It is very likely, therefore, that the thirteen Sammelbände acquired by Thistlethwayte afford a partial picture of Triplett’s collecting interests, shaped to some extent by Thistlethwayte’s own preferences. However, these books are Triplett’s creations, and a closer look at their contents and construction will show how they were designed by Triplett to explore his attachment to Oxford University and its culture.


History and Community in Richard Triplett’s Composite Books

The material condition of Triplett’s *Sammelbände* shines a light on the economical habits of their compiler. Like many late seventeenth- and eighteenth-century collectors, Triplett seems to have favoured cheap marbled paper bindings for his composite books (Fig. 8). However, his bindings have a more improvised, temporary feel than most: rough pieces of marbled paper are pasted on to the centre of each board, while at the edges strips of vellum mask some but seldom all of the areas left exposed, as well as covering the spine. Of the thirteen composite books that Triplett assembled, five are still in this unusual binding, and four probably originated in this state prior to their rebinding in modern vellum.32

Beneath these untidy covers, however, Triplett’s compilations have an altogether different complexion: orderly in their arrangement, they are also far-reaching in their historical and thematic scope. Triplett bought most, if not all, of the contents of his surviving *Sammelbände* second-hand. Of the 89 books found in his thirteen compilations, only seventeen (roughly a fifth) were published during his lifetime; the number published in or after 1687, when Triplett began his university career, is just four. The latest title bound into any of Triplett’s compilations is dated 1694, making it possible that Triplett assembled all thirteen volumes during his time in Oxford. The oldest titles date from the penultimate decade of the sixteenth century, showing that Triplett’s collecting interests ranged across more than a century of bibliographical production.

32 See Appendix 4 for details.
Triplett’s Sammelbände contain versions of some of the most influential works of European literature, such as Boethius’s sixth-century dialogue *De Consolatione Philosophiae*, Chaucer’s *Troilus and Criseyde*, Friedrich Dedekind’s ironic manual of rudeness *Grobianus et Grobiana* (first published in 1552) and Guillaume de Salluste Du
Bartas’ biblical epic *La Sepmaine, ou Création du Monde* (first published in 1578).\(^{33}\) Besides these famous works, however, Triplett had an eye for the unusual, and his compilations preserve exceptional groupings of scarce and little-known texts from late Elizabethan England. One such grouping includes the only books from Triplett’s collection to have attracted scholarly attention thus far. These books form part of a composite volume labelled ‘Poemata’, containing ten works in Latin verse;\(^{34}\) one of these works supplied Tucker Brooke with the copy-text for his reproduction of a long-overlooked sequence of nine Protestant odes.\(^{35}\) *In Catilinarias Proditiones […] Odae 9* (1586) is an expanded series of odes by William Gager, a scholar of Christ Church, Oxford; the poems respond to the recent unmasking of the Babington plot against Queen Elizabeth and urge resistance to the threat from Spain. Both this edition and an earlier printing of six odes from Gager’s sequence (also 1586) were published in Oxford by the first university printer, Joseph Barnes, whose press had issued its earliest productions only the year before. The octavo pamphlets containing Gager’s poems – the original comprising a single sheet, the second expanded with an additional leaf – have suffered the fate of numerous slight, ephemeral editions, and survive today in only a few copies each.\(^{36}\) Triplett’s ‘Poemata’ compilation is unique, as Brooke points out, in bringing together both pamphlets (p. 72).
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33 Editions of Boethius are items 2 and 3 in Triplett’s *Sammelband* labelled ‘Miscellanea’ (Winchester College Fellows’ Library, Book No. 2289); a Latin translation of Chaucer’s *Troilus and Criseyde* is item 1 in the same *Sammelband*. Du Bartas and Dedekind are items 1 and 2 respectively in the *Sammelband* beginning with Du Bartas (Fellows’ Library, Book No. 8616). The book numbers given in connection with *Sammelbände* belong properly to the first item in each volume; to reflect the physical integrity of the compilations, and to avoid confusion, no other book numbers are given.  
34 The contents of this *Sammelband*, labelled ‘Poemata’ (Winchester College Fellows’ Library, Book No. 2144), are listed in Appendix 4.  
36 In addition to those in Winchester College Fellows’ Library, ESTC (online at <http://estc.bl.uk>) lists a copy of the six-ode edition (ESTC No. S115921) in the British Library and copies of the nine-ode edition (ESTC No. S121876) at Westminster Abbey and the Huntington Library.
However, the compilation includes three further products of Barnes’s press that Brooke does not discuss. This larger group of octavo pamphlets appeared in 1585, following the execution on 2 March of the government spy and Catholic conspirator William Parry. Anticipating Gager’s compositions in the same vein, these pamphlets mount a polemical response to recent revelations of treason. Like Gager’s odes, moreover, they carry the stamp of Oxford learning not only in their practised Latin but also in the relatively new imprint of Barnes’s press. One of these pamphlets – a poetic denunciation of Parry by the President of Magdalen College, Lawrence Humphrey – is known only from Triplett’s copy.\(^{37}\) The others – namely *Pareus* and *In Guil. Parry Proditorem Odae et Epigrammata* – are both anonymous editions, and copies are recorded in just three libraries.\(^{38}\) Triplett’s ‘Poemata’ compilation is again unique in gathering up all three of these pamphlets, alongside both editions of Gager’s odes. However, it is not only the extreme rarity of the contents that sets Triplett’s compilation apart. It is also notable that the five pamphlets collected by Triplett occupy a special niche in book history: they form an almost complete set of the anti-conspiratorial literature published by Barnes in his first two years as an Oxford printer.\(^{39}\) Furthermore, the pamphlets foreground themes of royal legitimacy and foreign conflict that continue to resonate in the second part of Triplett’s compilation. This is a sequence of seventeenth-century editions, among them a collection of anagrams celebrating the Restoration and a poem heralding the resumption of Anglo-Dutch hostilities in 1672.\(^ {40}\) The presence of these later texts in the ‘Poemata’ compilation is a
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\(^{37}\) Lawrence Humphrey, *Guilielmus Parraeus Proditore* (Oxford: Joseph Barnes, [n.d.]). ESTC’s partly edited record for this book (No. S93085) names Winchester College Fellows’ Library as the only collection in which a copy can be found.

\(^{38}\) In addition to those in Winchester College Fellows’ Library, ESTC lists a copy of *Pareus* (ESTC No. S121871) in the Huntington Library and copies of *In Guil. Parry Proditorem* (ESTC No. S121874) in the Huntington Library and the Bodleian Library.

\(^{39}\) The only pamphlet missing from this set is *Anglia Querens* (Oxford: Joseph Barnes, 1586), an anonymous work on the Throckmorton plot of 1583 and the treasonous activities of Parry. ESTC’s record for this book is No. S122558.

\(^{40}\) The works mentioned are, respectively, Richard Neve, *Nox & Aurora Britannica* (London: J. Martin and others, 1661) and Gulielmus Ferrarius, *De Bello Batavico, Libri Duo* (London: William Cademan, 1672).
result of Triplett’s reluctance to create a tract volume, characterised by the comparable size, identical imprints and shared polemical intent of the Oxford pamphlets. Instead, by combining these books with an assortment of larger, thematically congenial works, Triplett created an anthology of poetry addressing the security and confidence of the English state.

Triplett’s organisational habits point directly to the ideas of history and community that shape his anthologies. One of the most obvious, and significant, of these habits is chronological ordering: Triplett arranged the contents of all but one of his surviving compilations in this manner. Such a practice could be seen simply as a logical approach to arranging printed texts for binding. However, for Triplett it functioned as part of his profound interest in the forms of history. One of the clearest demonstrations of this interest is provided by a compilation of eleven texts that once again places the University of Oxford at the centre of its historical perspectives. The first item in this compilation is *Notitia Oxoniensis Academiae* (1675), the enlarged second edition of the historical account of the University composed by William Fulman. A sequence of five poems follows, emerging from and extending Fulman’s antiquarian interests in local history and topography. This sequence includes the first undated printing of the philosopher Thomas Hobbes’s *De Mirabilibus Pecci*, a travelogue poem on the attractions of the Peak District; a Latin translation of Sir John Denham’s popular topographical poem *Coopers Hill*; and the clergyman Simon Ford’s *Carmen Funebre*, on the disastrous fire in Northampton in 1675. Stretching the geographical horizons of the collection beyond Oxford, this sequence of poems at the same time fashions an imagined community of interest with its roots in the university, as all of the poems are compositions by Oxford alumni.

---

41 *Sammelband* labelled ‘Notitia Oxoniensis’; Winchester College Fellows’ Library, Book No. 3938.
Community associations play an even greater role in structuring the second half of Triplett’s compilation. Four of the five texts in this half were written or translated by young Oxford authors, and published in the city between 1681 and 1692. The majority, moreover, have strong connections to the Tory politics of this turbulent decade. The first of these texts is *Exercitationes Philologicae Tres* (1681), a set of academic dissertations by the Exeter College graduate John Northleigh, published before he began his career as a Tory propagandist and supporter of James II. This is followed by two competing Latin versions of John Dryden’s *Absalom and Achitophel*, a satire targeting Whig schemes to exclude James II from the succession, both published in Oxford in 1682. Triplett, on his contents page for the volume, correctly identified the anonymous translators of Dryden’s work as William Coward, a physician and controversial theologian, and Francis Atterbury, Tory Bishop of Rochester. The final text in the compilation presents a contrasting Oxonian response to the political upheavals of the late seventeenth century. *In Gallos Pugna Navali* (1692) is a poem extolling William III as victor of the recent naval battles of Barfleur and La Hogue; its author, Edmund Chishull, was a student of Corpus Christi College at the time of its publication and an Oxford contemporary of Triplett.

Incorporating as its starting-point Fulman’s antiquarian history of the university, Triplett created an anthology of Oxford literature that closes by invoking the cultural climate of his own student years. The two halves of the anthology encapsulate alternative conceptions of the university’s history: one sees this history embodied in the city, its buildings and heritage, while the other finds it in the experiences and allegiances of those participating in Oxford life. By combining these perspectives, Triplett connects the university’s past to its present, and creates a historical context for the academic culture in

which he himself participated. Like so many of Triplett’s collections, this anthology demonstrates both his interest in the history of Oxford University and his attachment to the community that inherits and continues its traditions.

_Court and Culture in Richard Triplett’s Anthology of English Poetry, 1594-1637_

Eleven of Triplett’s thirteen surviving _Sammelbände_ bring together works either wholly or partly in Latin, the language of humanist learning and the academic traditions of the English universities. Two are devoted to English texts, a proportion that may reflect Triplett’s larger investment in learned literary works during the course of his collecting career. But Triplett’s English compilations are no less characteristic or resonant than their Latin counterparts. One is a loose assortment of seventeenth-century poetic collections, opening with _Two Centuries of Epigrammes_ (1610) by John Heath, and progressing in chronological sequence to end with _Wit at a Venture_ (1674), a miscellany of amorous songs and poems.43 Triplett’s second gathering of English literature is thematically tighter and bibliographically exceptional – a compilation of poems and masques dating from the last years of Elizabethan rule to the threshold of the English Civil War.44 The majority of its titles are very likely to have been either rare or obscure by the time Triplett gathered them together, and most represent authors who remain at best on the periphery of modern critical study. However, despite the relative obscurity of its contents, this compilation is arguably the most topical and challenging of any that survives from Triplett’s library. As the following discussion will show, its reconception of the literary history of the early seventeenth century holds enormous potential for reflection on the altered political and cultural landscape in which Triplett found himself after 1688.

43 _Sammelband_ labelled ‘Heath Etc’; Winchester College Fellows’ Library, Book No. 4809.
44 _Sammelband_ labelled ‘Miscellaneous Poems’; Winchester College Fellows’ Library, Book No. 2259.
The compilation yields no clues as to the date of its assembly, but the most probable date for this as for the rest of Triplett’s surviving Sammelbände is in the decade before 1697, when Triplett’s periods of residence in Oxford brought him into contact both with an academic culture of collecting and with the city’s book trade. The collection has...
undergone a nineteenth-century rebinding, but it retains the handwritten contents page (Fig. 9) that Triplett prepared as follows:

In this Volume are contained

2. Ovid’s banquet of Sense. by the Same. [1595]
3. Three Pastoral Elegies. by Willm. Bas. [1602]
4. The Owle. by Mich. Drayton Esq; [1604]
5. Christ’s Victory & Triumph in Heaven & Earth &c by Geo. Fletcher. [recte Giles Fletcher; 1610]
6. A wife. written by S’r. Tho. Overburie. wth several characters. [‘The third Impression’, 1614]
9. Albion’s Triumph. by Aurel. Tounshend. [‘1631’, i.e. 1632]
10. Cupid & Psyche. by Shackerley Marmion. [1637]

Like the anthology of Oxford pamphlets and state poems described above, this compilation opens with a remarkable assortment of late Elizabethan texts. The first items are the earliest publications of George Chapman – *The Shadow of Night*, a pair of allegorical hymns, and *Ouid’s Banquet of Sense*, an amatory miscellany whose opening two poems are securely ascribed to Chapman. Though not exceptionally rare, these copies together afford a valuable picture of the enigmatic authorial presentation, strenuous poetic style and philosophical concerns that characterised Chapman’s poems in the short period before he became a dramatist and Homeric translator. Similarly, the third item in Triplett’s compilation, *Three Pastoral Elegies*, is one of the earliest publications of the rural poet William Basse, the second of two poems by this self-proclaimed Spenserian disciple to appear in print in 1602. The *Elegies* is also the rarest item in the compilation, known to survive in only one other copy housed at the Huntington Library.45

45 The Huntington Library catalogue (online at <http://catalog.huntington.org>) records that this copy – Call No. 60299 – was acquired from the Britwell Court library in 1919. Unlike the Winchester College Fellows’
These editions form a distinguished group within the *Sammelband* as bibliographical artefacts; however, as anthologised texts they are tightly woven into the compilation’s literary fabric. First, they epitomise its generic diversity: the chronological sequence of poems moves from philosophical meditations (Chapman’s *Shadow of Night*) to a Neoplatonic epyllion (*Ouids Banquet*) to a pastoral narrative of amorous disappointment (*Basse’s Elegies*). The generic affinities within this group of texts will be explored at greater length below; for the present, they show how the compiling choices made by Triplett generate novel interactions between texts belonging to diverse generic traditions. Secondly, the three Elizabethan titles in the compilation announce Triplett’s interest in texts on the fringes of the literary tradition. Chapman is one of a number of authors represented in the collection by one of their lesser-known works. In the case of Michael Drayton, author of the Ovidian collection *Englands Heroicall Epistles* (1597) and the topographical masterwork *Poly-Olbion* (1612), this is *The Owle*, a bird fable satirising the Jacobean ruling elite. For Samuel Daniel, whose prose *Collection of the History of England* (1618) appeared in its fifth folio reprint in 1685, the title anthologised by Triplett is *The Vision of the Twelve Goddesses*, a Jacobean masque extracted from the first and only folio edition of Daniel’s poems, published in 1623. Among the less familiar authors present in the compilation, Basse is joined by the satirist Robert Anton, author of two published works, and Giles Fletcher the younger, poet and clergyman. Triplett’s misidentification of Fletcher on his manuscript contents page as ‘Geo. Fletcher’ reflects confusion in the biographical record. In his *Lives of the Most Famous English Poets* (1687), William Winstanley mentions a ‘Giles Fletcher, who wrote a worthy Poem, entituled, Christs Victory’ alongside his suspiciously identical (and in fact non-existent) brother ‘George Fletcher, the Author of a Poem, entituled, Christs Victory and Triumph

Library copy of Basse’s *Elegies*, the Huntington copy is individually bound and retains its uncut edges and blank first leaf.
over and after Death’. This survey of Triplett’s compilation is sufficient to show that it does not depend on the recognised cultural value of canonical texts to give it shape or relevance. Instead, it creates its own flexible pattern of associations between obscurer literary artefacts, enabling each one to participate in the creation of new and current meanings.

This chapter has already stated that the anthologistic potential of any compilation is rooted in the idea that gives it coherence. In the case of Triplett’s English *Sammelband*, the governing idea is that of the court as a touchstone of the times and a centre of cultural production. Two of the texts included document court masques. Daniel’s *Vision* was performed by Queen Anne and her ladies in 1604, during the first festive season of the Jacobean reign, and Aurelian Townshend’s *Albions Triumph* was one of the entertainments performed at the Caroline court in 1632, celebrating the success of the seven-year union of Charles and Henrietta Maria. Two more texts selected by Triplett have close connections to the Stuart royal courts. Sir Thomas Overbury’s *A Wife* was written while its author enjoyed considerable influence at the Jacobean court owing to his intimacy with Robert Carr, a favourite of the king. Twenty-five years later, in 1637, the dramatist Shackerley Marmion dedicated his poem *The Legend of Cupid and Psyche* to Prince Charles Lewis of the Rhine, a nephew of Charles I and a popular advocate of the palatine cause at the English court. In other instances, to be featured later in this discussion, the idea of the court is present in the texts themselves as a target of satire or a locus of romantic aspiration. It is important to recognise that in establishing the court as the focal point of this anthology, Triplett again reveals his distinctly social perspective on literary history: several of his anthologies, as has been shown, explore the contribution of an elite community (usually his own, the University of Oxford) to events and their cultural

---

impact. To properly understand the resonances that this theme could generate in Triplett’s society, it is necessary to place his collection in the context of a broader culture of the anthology.

The final years of the seventeenth century saw the emergence of a hugely successful genre of printed anthology, which promised its readers unprecedented insight into the struggles of the court and its critics over four momentous decades. The first published collection of *Poems on Affairs of State* appeared in 1689, a slender quarto book containing twelve poems. In 1697, a much-expanded anthology presented a chiefly satirical history of politics and court affairs ‘From The Time of Oliver Cromwell, to the Abdication of K. James the Second’. These collections made available in print an archive of scribal satire that had circulated through social channels and professional enterprises in the decades following the Restoration. Though the printed texts ‘were frequently shortened and bowdlerised’, as Harold Love points out, the anthologies ‘constituted an extraordinary publishing success’: the collection of 1697 went into a fourth edition within five years, and by 1707 readers could obtain a four-volume set containing 671 poems. These reprints and enlargements guaranteed the continuing topicality of the anthology. The Preface of 1697 set out the collection’s topical stance, presenting its contents as the poetic vanguard of a Whig campaign for liberty that was still being fought on the battlefields of Europe:

> when all Europe is engag’d to destroy that tyrannick Power, the mismanagement of those Times, and the selfish evil Designs of a corrupt Court had given Rise to, it cannot be thought unseasonable to publish so just an

---

Account of the true source [sic] of all our present Mischief[s]; which will be evidently found in the following Poems[.].\textsuperscript{50}

The territorial ambitions of France continued to draw the lines of European conflict until the War of the Spanish Succession came to an end in 1714. However, the enduring interest of the collection lay not in its justification of Britain’s continental wars, but in its teleological history of Whiggism from the opposition of the 1660s to the triumph of 1688. For generations of readers, the anthology offered ‘a just and secret History’ of the struggle against a corrupt and authoritarian Stuart regime, unfolding in the words of the ‘great Men’ who were its protagonists.\textsuperscript{51}

In its scrutiny of the late Elizabethan and Stuart courts, Triplett’s anthology has a good deal in common with both the oppositional stance of the \textit{Poems on Affairs of State} tradition and the Whig verdict on Jacobean rule. However, it would be a mistake to conclude that Triplett’s anthology simply mirrors the satirical thrust of the contemporary \textit{Poems on Affairs of State} collections, or betrays Whig sympathies on his part. Characteristically, the two-part structure of the anthology precludes such a straightforward reading: its closing section allows the Stuart court to counter criticisms raised earlier and project an image of refinement. The following discussion will examine the two parts of the anthology in greater detail, placing Triplett’s balanced approach to interrogating the value of elite culture in the context of his social prospects, and uncovering a fresh perspective on the literary politics of the early seventeenth century.

The 1697 \textit{Poems on Affairs of State} begins its historical survey at the height of the Cromwellian regime, with Edmund Waller’s ‘Panegyrick to my Lord Protector’, and ends in the turbulent 1680s. The second volume of 1703 advertises a longer historical span, extending its chronicle of scurrility and opposition into ‘the Reign of K. James the First’

\textsuperscript{50} \textit{Poems on Affairs of State} (1697), sig. A3v.
\textsuperscript{51} \textit{Poems on Affairs of State} (1697), sigs A3v, A2v.
and forward to the present day.\textsuperscript{52} This supplementary collection in fact includes only one poem purporting to survive from the time of James I – ‘A Copy of Verses written in the Year 1623’, attributed in the table of contents to George Wither – but the Whig history of the Jacobean period had already been promulgated through reprints of other controversial texts. In 1689, following the downfall of James II, the leading Whig publisher Richard Baldwin reprinted \textit{The Court and Character of K. James}, an aggressively anti-Jacobean tract first published under the Commonwealth and doubtfully attributed to the courtier Sir Anthony Weldon.\textsuperscript{53} Three years later, Baldwin renewed his attack on the Jacobean legacy by reviving another secret history of the early Stuart court: this was \textit{Truth brought to Light: or, the History of the First 14 years of King James I}, first published in 1651 by the radical Protestant bookseller Michael Sparke.

Both of these texts are intent on exposing an emblematic case of Jacobean wickedness and divine retribution – the alleged murder of Sir Thomas Overbury. Through his close relationship with the Scot Robert Carr, a favourite of James I, Overbury prospered as an agent of business and patronage at the Jacobean court. However, by 1613 he had come to disapprove of the growing romantic attachment between Carr and Frances Howard, countess of Essex and daughter of a powerful, conservative family. Overbury’s opposition to this relationship led ultimately to his incarceration in the Tower of London, where he died just ten days before a church commission nullified the countess of Essex’s marriage. Carr and Howard were married in an extravagant court celebration on 26 December 1613, but within eighteen months their new alliance had been brought down by allegations that Overbury had been poisoned in the Tower at the instigation of the offended countess. Carr

\textsuperscript{52} \textit{Poems on Affairs of State: From the Reign of K. James the First, to this Present Year 1703} (London: [n. pub.], 1703).

\textsuperscript{53} Joseph Marshall and Sean Kelsey present a persuasive case against this attribution, which is nonetheless accepted by many scholars, in their biography of Weldon. Joseph Marshall and Sean Kelsey, ‘Weldon, Sir Anthony (bap. 1583, d. 1648)’, in \textit{Oxford Dictionary of National Biography} \url{<http://www.oxforddnb.com>} [accessed 6 October 2012].
and Howard were convicted of murder in 1616, but they were spared death and allowed to rebuild circumscribed lives after six years’ imprisonment in the Tower. In *Court and Character*, the introductory ‘Epistle to the Reader’ declares that by failing to punish these aristocratic murderers, James I brought ‘the Justice of God […] upon himself and [his] Posterity’.54 *Truth brought to Light* carries a portrait of Overbury as its frontispiece, and its engraved title page has an image of Overbury’s coffin, sprouting a tree laden with revelatory books and manuscripts, as its central device. In the aftermath of Charles I’s execution, and again following the deposition of his grandson James II, Overbury became a central character in the story of Stuart corruption told by the triumphant party.55 In Triplett’s anthology, the outlines of Overbury’s role as a martyr to Jacobean iniquity remain strong.

Early in 1614, around four months after the death of Overbury, Lawrence Lisle published *A Wife*, a poem that had earned favourable notice in manuscript and remains the only one to be ascribed securely to the courtier. Continuing interest in the drama of Frances Howard’s divorce and second marriage to Overbury’s associate, together with the ever-expanding miscellany of ‘witty Characters, and conceited Newes’ that Lisle appended to the poem, ensured that *A Wife* ran to a ‘fift Impression’ in 1614; a copy of the ‘third Impression’ has a central place in Triplett’s anthology.56 By the end of 1616, the year in which Carr and his wife were tried for Overbury’s murder, *A Wife* had reached its ‘ninth impression’ and numerous poets had responded to the scandal by attacking the court in

print.\textsuperscript{57} Triplett’s anthology includes one of the lesser-known satires published during this year of crisis: \textit{The Philosophers Satyrs}, by the Cambridge scholar Robert Anton, follows Overbury’s poem in the \textit{Sammelband} and ranges among its principal targets the lust and duplicity of women. Each of the seven poems in Anton’s cycle corresponds to one of the seven classical planets, and Anton casts himself as a learned observer of nature and the heavens, striving to ‘applie / The worlds abuses to their misterie’.\textsuperscript{58} The abuses of the court – its pride in costly dress and its dearth of martial spirit – are laid bare in the ‘Satyr of Iupiter’, dedicated to the young heir apparent Prince Charles. \textit{The Philosophers Satyrs} voices a dominant mood of disillusion with the court at the denouement of the Overbury murder case; moreover, its visions of degeneracy are foreshadowed in Triplett’s anthology by Drayton’s \textit{The Owle}, a poetic protest against courtly vices fuelled by the disappointments of the regime change of 1603. Clustered at the centre of the compilation, these texts may have appeared to Triplett to offer testimony in support of the Whig verdict on James I and his regime.

However, the preceding sequence of Elizabethan texts suggests that the erosion of courtly values may have begun earlier, and may have owed less to the upheavals and scandals of politics, than the Whig interpretation allows. These three texts share an interest in the court chiefly as an arena promising personal fulfilment, rather than one of political collusion and competition. Basse’s \textit{Three Pastoral Elegies} narrates the romantic fortunes of the young courtier Anander, ‘[t]he only glory of his time’, as he enlists the help of a shepherd to press his suit to a lady-in-waiting.\textsuperscript{59} In the central poem of the three, Anander’s beloved Muridella leads a party of pleasure to the pastoral realm cloaked and

\textsuperscript{57} The ‘ninth impression’ of \textit{A Wife} has the imprint, ‘LONDON, Printed by Edward Griffin for Laurence L’isle, […] 1616.’; its ESTC record is No. S113539.

\textsuperscript{58} Robert Anton, \textit{The Philosophers Satyrs} (London: Roger Jackson, 1616), p. 75.

wreathed as a ‘young Apollon’, her costume and conduct exercising a disruptive influence over the traditionally masculine spheres of chivalry and artistic expression (Basse, sig. D2’). Unable to gain Muridella’s affection, Anander is provoked to abandon the ‘wanton Court’ and live as a shepherd (Basse, sig. F2’). In consigning him to this fate, the Elegies could be read as criticising the advance of theatricality at the late Elizabethan court, at the expense of traditional chivalry. Similarly, the setting of Chapman’s erotic narrative Ouid’s Banquet of Sence holds the potential for topical reflection. The poem depicts a clandestine encounter between the Roman poet and Corynna, the daughter of Augustus, in ‘a Garden of the Emperors Court’. Ovid embarks on a sensual exploration that reconciles Neoplatonic ideals to the physical experience of love; however, the reader is aware that this story of amorous inspiration is a prelude to Ovid’s banishment from the court, the consequence of an undisclosed transgression popularly assumed to have been sexual in nature. Howard Erskine-Hill has argued that poets of the 1590s developed a ‘dual awareness of an Augustan standard, and of a contemporary reality so different as to arouse only contempt, anger and fear’. Chapman, however, keeps the fact of Ovid’s imperial penalty unacknowledged on the margins of his poem, and thus unsettles the dichotomy of Augustan freedom and Elizabethan injustice that many of his contemporaries upheld.

Both of these poems imagine courts that foster aspirations to love and enlightenment, but mysteriously cast out their brightest aspirants. Emerging early in the anthology, this narrative pattern offers a suggestive new angle on the story of Overbury. Far from appearing as a victim of court intrigue and malice, Overbury can be seen in this context as a more genuinely tragic figure – a poet and a judicious student of manners and morals, dispatched by the court perhaps because of his exceptional insight. It is notable that

Overbury sustained into the eighteenth century a solid reputation as a poet, coloured by the collection of prose texts from anonymous contributors that Lisle included in later editions of *A Wife*. This growing miscellany made a crucial contribution, as McIver has shown, to popularising the satirical genre of character portraits (pp. 34-40). The genre’s association with Overbury no doubt explains the appearance of Overbury’s name in the ‘School of Donne’ that Alexander Pope sketched out as part of his projected history of English poetry. Understanding Overbury as an astute poet at odds with his courtly environment supports a rewarding reading of the first half of Triplett’s anthology. Instead of treating its satires as evidence of the cyclical failings of James I and James II, this approach interprets the broader sequence of Elizabethan and Jacobean texts as testament to the failure of the court both before and after 1603 to nurture and inspire poets. One of the decisive weaknesses of the court in this period, Triplett may have concluded from his anthology, was the loss of its traditional cultural authority.

This development, and the group of poets associated with it, has been the subject of valuable investigation by modern critics. In a useful historicist account, David Norbrook explains that ‘before James had been long on the English throne there had emerged a group of poets who were alienated from the court and sometimes used the traditional symbolism of Protestant pastoral to voice their discontent’. Though by no means an organised movement, these poets were united in their resistance to the perceived luxury and pacifism of the court of James I (Drayton and Samuel Daniel were successful, however, in gaining patronage from Queen Anne and Prince Henry). They also found common ground in their emulation of Spenser, the great Elizabethan poet of pastoral ideals, earning them in modern times the label of ‘Spenserians’. The group, as Norbrook

---

defines it, included Drayton, Daniel and the Fletchers (all represented in Triplett’s anthology, the Fletcher family by the younger Giles) alongside the Inns of Court poets William Browne and George Wither.

In selecting texts for his anthology that probe the hidden affairs and cultural blind-spots of courts, Triplett not only included some of the leading Spenserian poets, but also highlighted the connections of several less prominent figures to the group. Anton, for example, dedicated *The Philosophers Satyrs* to the Earl of Pembroke, a patron of Daniel and Browne, and an established figure in the anti-Spanish faction at court. Basse, a lifelong adherent of Spenserian pastoral, is thought to have befriended the more political inheritors of the genre, Browne and Wither, contributing a commendatory poem (signed ‘W. B.’) to the second book of Browne’s *Britannia’s Pastorals* (1616). Lastly, the younger Giles Fletcher is not often mentioned in connection with the Spenserian group, despite his family pedigree and poetic influences. However, in the context created by Triplett’s anthology, his religious masterwork *Christ’s Victorie, and Triumph in Heaven, and Earth* (1614) can be seen as a reproach to the Jacobean court for failing to sponsor the revival of Protestant poetry hoped for and anticipated by many in 1603. Fletcher, Basse and Anton are a heterogeneous trio of poets, and their affinities with the Spenserians underline both the flexible identity of the group and the breadth of its associations during the 1610s. Triplett is unlikely to have known of these affinities, but owing to his interest in the cultural decline of the court in the early seventeenth century, his anthology offers an open and original perspective on the Spenserian phenomenon.

---


Thus far, the array of genres in Triplett’s collection has distinguished it from the satirical Poems on Affairs of State tradition, but the two anthologies have also established an important parallel: both can be interpreted as reconstructions of a cultural opposition to a corrupt and unpopular regime. However, in Triplett’s anthology this is only part of the story. The final three texts in the collection present the Stuart court as it strove to imagine itself, a sphere in which high ideals were personified by courtiers and celebrated by poets. One of these texts, though it appears late in the chronological sequence of the anthology, belongs historically to the first twelve months of Jacobean rule. Triplett’s copy of the masque The Vision of the Twelve Goddesses is extracted, with its divisional title page, from the posthumous 1623 edition of Daniel’s Workes. However, the masque’s performance took place at Hampton Court on 8 January 1604, providing the first Twelfth Night entertainment of the reign of James I, and the first in a sometimes controversial series of theatrical commissions for Daniel from the new royal family. Daniel’s great critic and successor as a presiding genius of the Stuart court masque, Ben Jonson, fell out of favour in 1631, and his collaborative role alongside Inigo Jones was temporarily taken by Aurelian Townshend, the co-creator of the second Twelfth Night masque in Triplett’s anthology, Albions Triumph. Performed in 1632, as the Caroline court celebrated Britain’s peace and the monarchy’s dynastic success, Townshend’s masque presents Henrietta Maria as the goddess Alba, destined to achieve a pseudo-Platonic union with Charles, the heroic Albanactus. They form a couple ‘whose mindes within, / And Bodyes make but Hymens Twin’. The cult of ‘Love and Chastity’ that surrounded Henrietta Maria is also reflected in the anthology’s final text, The Legend of Cupid and Psyche by the dramatist

66 Aurelian Townshend, Albions Triumph. Personated in a Maske at Court. By the Kings Maiestie and his Lords (London: Robert Allot, 1631 [i.e. 1632]), p. 21.
and poet Shackerley Marmion.\textsuperscript{67} Embracing the same source and hermeneutic method as Thomas Heywood in his earlier play \textit{Loves Maistresse} – subtitled ‘The Queens Masque’ following two court performances in 1634 – Marmion weds the Apuleian story of Cupid and Psyche to a Christian allegory of the soul’s struggle for redemption.

Triplett’s selections for the final part of his anthology bypass the dominant Jonsonian corpus of Stuart masques, but their curiously unrepresentative angle on literary history matters less than their contribution to the intertextual associations of the anthology. It is notable that each of these three texts can be seen to echo and respond to thematic and stylistic elements in the preceding poems. The combination of sensuous classicism and Christian allegory in \textit{The Legend of Cupid and Psyche} has its clearest precedent in Fletcher’s \textit{Christs Victorie}, a poem that harmonises its sensuous qualities more ambitiously with the varying generic conventions of its four parts. In \textit{Albions Triumph}, the Augustan parallel interrogated by Chapman in \textit{Ouids Banquet of Sence} is spectacularly dramatised. Charles first appears as ‘\textit{Albanactus} triumphing, attended like a Roman Emperor’; a subsequent dialogue and anti-masque sequence set in ‘an Amphitheater’ at his capital, Albipolis, justifies the separation of elite culture from mass spectacle on the grounds that the former cultivates true understanding of the spiritual drama of statecraft, whereas the latter offers mere diversion.\textsuperscript{68} Lastly, the ladies’ masque \textit{The Vision of the Twelve Goddesses}, in which Queen Anne and her noblewomen embodied a pantheon of classical deities, recalls the depiction of elite female theatricality in Basse’s \textit{Three Pastoral Elegies}. Since these texts are separated by only two years (though by several intervening


\textsuperscript{68}Townshend, p. 8. This interpretation is indebted to Todd Wayne Butler’s discussion of the political vision of \textit{Albions Triumph} in \textit{Imagination and Politics in Seventeenth-Century England} (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008), pp. 64-70.
items in the anthology), the juxtaposition of their perceptions of imagined and actual female performances is especially suggestive.

The second part of the anthology thus presents a mirror image of the first, reiterating tropes and themes initially suggestive of deficiencies in elite culture as part of its closing celebration of courtly values. While the first part of the anthology could be read as a Whig history of the decline of Stuart court culture, the second part could convey a Tory admiration for the Stuarts’ princely patronage of the arts before the Civil War. In a study of the partisan cultural landscape of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, Abigail Williams has shown that Tory men of letters propagated a myth of the Restoration as a golden age of artistic patronage.\(^\text{69}\) The closing part of Triplett’s anthology may reflect an analogous desire to rediscover a lost period of Stuart magnificence.

Several of Triplett’s anthologies organise themselves into two juxtaposed sections, but only his English Sammelband holds two directly competing positions in balance. This may appear unusual; however, inclusive habits of collecting, characterised by orderly arrangement of distinct and contrary texts, were undoubtedly familiar to Triplett in his intellectual life. During his student years, it is highly probable that Triplett made use of a more or less organised commonplace-book, picking assorted quotations from his reading material and collecting them under headings of his choice. In the late seventeenth century, almost two centuries after its first appearance, the commonplace-book continued to serve readers as a storehouse of useful information. By this time, however, its humanist methodology of abundance and exemplarity had all but lost its relevance in a changing intellectual climate (Moss, p. 275). Reviewing its decline, Moss argues that the commonplace-book’s ‘open-ended acceptance of variety and self-contradiction in its

assembled quotations was a potential irritant to a political culture centred on uniformity’ (p. 276). Triplett’s anthology demonstrates the same ‘open-ended acceptance’ of competing perspectives, perhaps influenced by his practice as a commonplacing reader. However, this arguably makes his anthology more, not less, open to constructive engagement with the fractured politics of the late seventeenth century. In the first age of party, as conflict between Tories and Whigs became entrenched, Triplett’s anthology allowed the cultural histories advanced by the two sides to meet and interact.

In addition to rewarding historical curiosity, the anthology’s rival depictions of the court supplied Triplett with a context for appraising developments in his post-Revolution world. Triplett was one of a class of Oxford graduates whose careers were marked by economic insecurity and hard-bitten Toryism: as Bennett explains, poor students such as Triplett endured ‘penury and domestic drudgery’ in their university lives, before joining the lower ranks of the clergy ‘to propagate to their flocks the conservative teaching which they had imbibed at Oxford’. Thus, it is hardly likely that Triplett appreciated the satires in the first part of his anthology as early affirmations of the Whig spirit of liberty and plain speaking. In fact, he may have felt that the activities of the grasping, secularised Jacobean court represented in the satires found their truest parallel in the Whig treatment of the church and university during William III’s reign. Bennett has observed that the political isolation of Oxford and the economic weakening of the church under Williamite rule fostered ‘a sense of disappointment and betrayal’ within the university community in the 1690s. Conversely, the splendid political theatre of the early Stuart courts glimpsed in the second part of Triplett’s anthology may have seemed increasingly remote from contemporary reality. R. O. Bucholz has shown that William and Mary presided over a

70 Bennett, ‘University, Society and Church’, V, p. 377.
reformed court, which channelled its energies into private forms of artistic cultivation such as patronage of court musicians, painters and gardeners.\textsuperscript{72} This represented ‘a conscious rejection of the most public and least respectable aspects of Stuart court life’, including drawing rooms, plays at court and royal attendance at the theatre. Triplett was reputedly a dramatist himself; he was also a collector with a strong interest in poetic expressions of political loyalty by university men. For him, the decline of the Williamite court as a venue of culture may have posed a worrying threat to the traditionally public interaction between art and authority.

There is little doubt that Triplett’s political loyalties – however they influenced his responses to the texts in his anthology – were formed and tested by his social experiences as a member of Oxford University and of the clergy. But no evidence has been found that Triplett’s sphere of first-hand experience extended to the court, and the absence of any social attachment on his part may help to explain the balance of political perspectives in his English anthology. In his many \textit{Sammelbände} dominated by Oxford and Cambridge authors, Triplett celebrated the literary history of the academic community to which he belonged. In his anthology of texts from and about the court, Triplett laid open the rival literary histories of this elite society, showing an outsider’s awareness of the ways in which conflicting factions sought to appropriate its heritage. For Triplett, collecting the past and considering its relevance in the present were inseparable. By consequence, his anthologies are remarkable not only for their interest in less familiar seventeenth-century texts, but also as unique documents of the social and intellectual life of a little-known collector.

\textsuperscript{72} R. O. Bucholz, \textit{The Augustan Court: Queen Anne and the Decline of Court Culture} (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2003), pp. 32-34.
The *Sammelbände* that Thistlethwayte created form a much larger group in the Fellows’ Library collection than those assembled by Triplett, but this group is also less clearly defined. One of the difficulties of determining the exact number of extant *Sammelbände* that Thistlethwayte compiled arises from the fact that Thistlethwayte rarely provided a handwritten table of contents. For Triplett, this was a habit: ten of the thirteen compilations that he assembled include a table of contents in his hand on a front flyleaf. By contrast, most of the handwritten contents pages in Thistlethwayte’s *Sammelbände* were supplied not by Thistlethwayte himself, but by a Winchester College librarian. This unidentified assistant produced a catalogue of the two substantial donations that the Fellows’ Library received in 1762.\(^73\) These were a collection of four hundred editions of the classics and works of theology given by Philip Barton, a Fellow of the College, and ‘a large and valuable collection of Books in the Mathematics’ from the Oxford scholar Robert Shipman.\(^74\) Following the acquisition of the Thistlethwayte collection in 1767, this cataloguer’s skills were again called upon to prepare tables of contents for fifteen of the *Sammelbände* that Thistlethwayte had bound up; his large, rapid hand and tendency to abbreviate can be distinguished from Thistlethwayte’s slightly more elaborate and fluent hand.

While the manuscript evidence of Thistlethwayte’s activity as a compiler is patchy, the material evidence of his bindings provides a much more coherent picture. Twenty-one of his *Sammelbände* are half bound in leather (less often, vellum) and Dutch marbled paper, often with edges stained red and with details of the first constituent item gilt-stamped on the spine. The cheap materials employed in these bindings recall the rough and ready

---

\(^73\) ‘Dr Barton’s Benefaction of Books to the College Library at Winchester, 1762; Dr Shipman’s Benefaction of Books to the College Library at Winchester, 1762’; Winchester College Fellows’ Library, MS No. 204.

\(^74\) Blakiston, ‘Winchester College Library’, pp. 32-33.
style preferred by Triplett; however, their neatness and careful labelling leave no doubt that Thistlethwayte intended them to be permanent. In addition to this group of twenty-one compilations, a further thirteen Sammelbände surviving in modern and variant bindings can be associated with Thistlethwayte’s compiling. These include eleven collections potentially assembled by Thistlethwayte, all lacking an original binding or a pattern of annotations that might identify them positively; and finally, two uncharacteristic, yet unmistakeable, examples of Thistlethwayte’s compiling, which contain handwritten tables of contents and distinctive red crayon marking. One of the latter two will be examined later in this chapter, and all thirty-four Sammelbände will be taken into account in the general discussions to follow.75

Thistlethwayte’s compilations, like Triplett’s, are strong in seventeenth-century poetry in Latin and English. They include a compilation of ‘poems on affairs of state’ published in the turbulent six-year period before the death of Charles II in 1685, and a folio collection of poems produced by the English universities and German scholars to commemorate royal births, deaths and nuptials from 1688 to 1734.76 It is clear that Thistlethwayte and Triplett shared interests in academic literary traditions, in literature inspired by political conflict, and in the multifarious literary and iconic forms of seventeenth-century poetry (the more common forms in their Sammelbände are elegies, collections of epigrams and emblem books). However, these shared literary interests are in some sense a distraction from the deeper disparities between Thistlethwayte, a gentleman collector, and Triplett, a learned collector barely his contemporary. The collecting activities of these individuals were guided by fundamentally different values

75 Appendix 5 provides listings of the contents and notes on the bindings of six of Thistlethwayte’s Sammelbände, including all those directly referred to in this section.
76 These Sammelbände are ‘Miscellany Poems’ (Winchester College Fellows’ Library, Book No. 7047) and a volume beginning with University of Oxford (Fellows’ Library, Book No. 7427).
and principles, and one of the best ways to observe and characterise these differences is to compare the chronological span of the editions that they bound into their Sammelbände.

It has already been noted that the contents of Triplett’s Sammelbände span little more than a century, with the oldest editions dating from 1585. In contrast, among the contents of Thistlethwayte’s compilations, the earliest publication has been dated to 1508.77 It would be wrong to conclude from this that Triplett had little interest in older sixteenth-century texts: an edition of Dedekind’s Grobianus et Grobiana (first published in 1552) included in one of his Sammelbände has already been mentioned, and Triplett also owned singly bound editions of works by Scaliger (Poetices, first published in 1561, and Poemata, first published between 1533 and 1547). However, these editions are reprints, published in Holland and Germany at least twenty years after the first printings. Dutch and German books predominate among the continental editions surviving from Triplett’s library, accounting for nine out of a total of eleven. Their prevalence once again highlights the academic context of Triplett’s collecting: affordable editions of texts in the classical languages, imported chiefly from Holland, were one of the staple elements of a seventeenth-century student’s library.78

While Triplett looked to the market in late sixteenth- and seventeenth-century scholarly editions to meet his needs, Thistlethwayte adopted a different approach to building a classical library. His Sammelbände include a total of twenty editions of ancient authors and neo-Latin works published before 1585. Older than any of the copies in Triplett’s Sammelbände, these books also have their origins in a much wider variety of cities across Europe. However, the publishing activities of one city – early sixteenth-century Paris –

are more thoroughly represented than any other. Thistlethwayte’s *Sammelbände* contain a total of eight Parisian editions, and the four oldest are preserved in a single binding.\(^79\) One of the books in this compilation is the edition of 1508 mentioned above, *Nature Verborum cum Interrogationibus*, a treatise on Latin grammar by the French theologian Petrus Mamorís. The 1508 edition of this treatise was not the first, but the fifth, to be published in Paris; in this case, as in numerous others, Thistlethwayte seems to have shared a general disinclination among mid-eighteenth-century collectors to ‘collect[e] *editiones principes* for their own sake’.\(^80\) However, Thistlethwayte did choose to preserve his edition of Mamorís’s treatise in a binding dedicated to early Parisian printings: the rest of the items in this *Sammelband* were produced by publishers in Paris between 1508 and 1518. These include a pedagogical treatise by Giovanni Battista Guarini, an Italian professor of literature, and a second work on Latin grammar by the Italian humanist Giovanni Sulpizio.\(^81\) By bringing these texts together, Thistlethwayte created an anthology of humanist teaching manuals, demonstrating an interest not simply in Parisian printing, but also in the tradition of learning that it propagated. His compilations of books in the learned languages, rather than reflecting a somewhat homogeneous market in scholarly editions, instead reveal an interest in the quality printing and intellectual currents of sixteenth-century Europe.

The books in Thistlethwayte’s *Sammelbände* and those that Triplett bound collectively yield a similarly revealing contrast at the opposite extreme of their chronological range. Triplett’s surviving *Sammelbände* contain no eighteenth-century editions, a fact that may reflect the continuing emphasis of his collecting on practicality and community: as a vicar

---

\(^79\) *Sammelband* labelled ‘Grammatice Sulpitiana 1513’; Winchester College Fellows’ Library, Book No. 9368.


between 1702 and his death in 1720, most of the new and recent books that Triplett bought during this period may have supported the needs and dignity of his profession, and it is this spiritual part of Triplett’s collection that appears not to have found its way into modern libraries. In contrast, the surviving Sammelbände assembled by Thistlethwayte contain more than a hundred items published between 1700 and 1745, almost all of which are editions of English poetic texts. It is likely that contemporary vernacular literature played just as important a role in Thistlethwayte’s cultural formation at Oxford as Latin texts and university authors had done for Triplett. On 25 June 1735, aged seventeen, Thistlethwayte entered Wadham College as a gentleman-commoner, one of an elite rank of students who generally stayed for no more than eighteen months and left Oxford without a degree.82 During their time at the university, as Bennett explains, ‘they read the classics with a tutor and looked to acquire independence and the social graces in the other Oxford world of country sports, clubs, coffee-houses and fashionable tailors’.83 It was in this world of cultured sociability, beyond the academic routine and clerical structure of college life, that Thistlethwayte was free to cultivate his literary taste and appetite for variety. His experiences here, it seems certain, helped to shape the omnivorous and flexible habits of collecting that reveal themselves in his English Sammelbände.

Only one of the eighteenth-century English books that Thistlethwayte bound into his Sammelbände carries evidence of the year in which it was purchased. This is a copy of the second edition of An Epistle to His Grace the Duke of Chandos (1720), by the Whig poet and government servant Leonard Welsted; on its title page is a somewhat careless note consigning it – perhaps as part of a bundle of poetry pamphlets – to ‘M’ Thistlewhite.

83 Bennett, ‘University, Society and Church’, V, p. 377.
Thistlethwayte bought this pamphlet in 1735 or 1736, one of the second-hand acquisitions making up the majority of editions in his English *Sammelbände*. Even in his collections of eighteenth-century vernacular poetry, two-thirds of the items included were published before 1734; it is highly unlikely that even the newest of these were acquired first-hand by Thistlethwayte at the age of fifteen. Thus, much of Thistlethwayte’s compiling, like Triplett’s, was focused on creating new bindings and new contexts for titles that were not just part of contemporary culture, but also part of an emerging tradition.

Thistlethwayte’s handling of this poetic tradition, as has been indicated, was underpinned by a distinctive approach to compiling. First, unlike Triplett, Thistlethwayte made few attempts to structure his *Sammelbände* in logical fashion. Of the thirty-four compilations that he assembled (or potentially assembled), just three are organised chronologically; most contain an apparently random sequence of items. Secondly, there is no dominant genre among Thistlethwayte’s extant compilations. While Triplett’s surviving *Sammelbände* concentrate on harnessing the potential of the anthology, Thistlethwayte’s compilations reveal an equal interest in a more expansive form, the miscellany. Exactly half of his collections are best described as miscellanies; although Suarez restricts the term to assemblies of the latest texts, it is applied here to compilations matching the *OED* definition of *miscellany*, as a gathering of ‘literary compositions of various kinds’.

The custom-made miscellany had clear practical advantages for Thistlethwayte: it offered both the convenience of combining disparate editions of the same size, and the potential to accommodate a large quantity of relatively slight items (in some cases, twice the number of titles in a typical Triplett *Sammelband*). It would be

---

84 Leonard Welsted, *An Epistle to His Grace the Duke of Chandos* (London: W. Chetwood, 1720); this book is part of Thistlethwayte’s *Sammelband* beginning with South (Winchester College Fellows’ Library, Book No. 9109), the contents of which are listed in Appendix 5.

wrong to assume, however, that Thistlethwayte’s miscellanies reflect merely practical concerns; on the contrary, the sheer variety of texts in these collections can be key to unlocking their interpretative potential.

For example, Welsted’s *Epistle* forms part of a substantial collection of twenty-eight folio pamphlets, published between 1700 and 1737 and bound in chronological order. Seven of the earliest items in this collection, including Welsted’s *Epistle*, form a sequence of gratulatory poems addressed to Whig patrons and heroes. This sequence opens with Richard Blackmore’s *Advice to the Poets* (1706), reflecting on the art of panegyric in the wake of Marlborough’s continental campaigns, and includes editions of the laureate verse of Laurence Eusden. However, the tone of the compilation changes abruptly with its ninth title: a copy of the anonymous scatological satire *A Sequel to the Dunciad* (1729), in which Thistlethwayte diligently supplied most of the names and profanities that had been censored. This pamphlet ushers in a striking mixture of satires, verse epistles and other poems from the 1730s. Pope’s *First Epistle of the Second Book of Horace, Imitated* (1737) is among them, and this Horatian satire is accompanied by numerous poems inspired by Pope’s original satires as well as by his popular philosophical poem *An Essay on Man*.

Intermingled with these works, moreover, is an assortment of less conventionally literary texts, ranging from a parliamentary bulletin of 1733 (included in this poetic collection as it contains a ballad, ‘Britannia Excisa’, against the Walpole government’s excise scheme) to the pornographic poem *Little Merlin’s Cave* by Edward Ward. In its indiscriminate gathering of high literature, low entertainment and topical texts, the latter part of Thistlethwayte’s collection seems to celebrate the diversity of tastes catered for by the culture of the 1730s. In contrast to the 1720s, the collection suggests, the following

---

86 South, etc; Winchester College Fellows’ Library, Book No. 9109.
decade was a period of cultural disillusion with Whig government and patronage, and of increasing artistic self-awareness and creative energy. The impact of this cultural change is reflected not only in the poems that Thistlethwayte chose to combine, but also in the sudden transformation of his *Sammelband* from a coherent poetic sequence into a motley and surprising miscellany.

This compilation, for which Thistlethwayte acquired at least one title while at Wadham, is an enthusiastic response to the dissolution of generic boundaries and critical hierarchies in the literary culture that Thistlethwayte encountered as an undergraduate. In one of his anthologies, Thistlethwayte went further in exploring his own critical role as a reader and collector in this changing culture. Like his large miscellany, this anthology comprises texts from the first four decades of the eighteenth century.\(^8^7\) It survives in an unusual binding, combining a cloth spine and Spanish marbled boards, but it is unquestionably one of Thistlethwayte’s creations, as the table of contents on the front endpaper is in his hand and signals his principles of selection (Fig. 10). This contents page reads as follows:

**Contents of this Volume**

1. Remarks on Spencers Poems [by John Jortin] Printed 1734
2. Εἰκών Σωκρατική, a Portraiture of Socrates Extracted from Plato in Blank Verse by Sam. Catherall B. A. and fellow of Oreal College Printed 1717 good
3. The Æconomy of Love, a Poetical Essay [by John Armstrong] Printed 1736 (excellent)
4. [3] a Pipe of Tobacco in imitation of six several authors [by Isaac Hawkins Browne] Printed 1736 (very good)
5. [4] The Oxford Oyster Women a Poem to wch is prefix’d a Hymn to ye Moon w th a Poem on Sedition, all in Blank Verse [n. d.] (good)

---

\(^8^7\) *Sammelband* labelled ‘J. Jortin and others’; Winchester College Fellows’ Library, Book No. 5561.
6 [5] The Deists Creed, wth y\textsuperscript{e} Freethinkers annext by a Gentleman of Trinity College Cambridge Printed 1731 (very good)

7 [6] Protestant Popery or y\textsuperscript{e} Convocation a Poem in five Cantos [by Nicholas Amhurst] Printed 1718 (good)


9 [8] The Mousetrap, a Poem from y\textsuperscript{e} Latin Original [i.e. Muscipula] in Miltons Stile (good) Printed 1715


11 [10] Miscellanies consisting of Original Pieces in Prose & Verse by Dean Swift Printed 1734 (very good)

The third title in this list, \textit{The Economy of Love}, is a much-reprinted and notably explicit poem advising ‘how / Best to improve the genial joy’ of sex, composed in blank verse by the physician John Armstrong.\textsuperscript{38} No doubt because Thistlethwayte thought it ‘excellent’ (the most admiring critical verdict recorded on his contents page), he removed it from the collection, probably to give it a more portable and convenient individual binding. There is evidence in another of Thistlethwayte’s \textit{Sammelbände} that he cut three items out following the collection’s original assembly; this indicates that, however carefully he had constructed them, Thistlethwayte was ready to adapt all his creations to his changing tastes and needs.

The remaining titles in the anthology are a diverse selection, lacking a common genre or subject to unite them. They include a series of dialogues in blank verse adapted from Thistlethwayte’s contents list on the front endpaper of ‘J. Jortin and others’, Book No. 5561. By permission of the Warden and Fellows of Winchester College.

**Figure 10.** Thistlethwayte’s contents list on the front endpaper of ‘J. Jortin and others’, Book No. 5561. By permission of the Warden and Fellows of Winchester College.
the writings of Plato (item 2); a heroicomic poem in Latin (item 9); several burlesque imitations of contemporary and classic English poets (items 3, 4 and 8); and two works tackling religious matters (items 5 and 6). However, the anthologic potential of this collection lies in its underlying theme and structural pattern, drawing its diverse texts into productive interaction. Structurally, this collection of ten items is best characterised as a series of five pairings. Each pairing juxtaposes texts (almost always adjacent to one other in the Sammelband) which exhibit the same motives or generic tools for recontextualising recent or classic literary works. Thus, the critic John Jortin’s Remarks on the accuracy and intertextuality of Spenser’s poems are followed by Samuel Catherall’s Portraiture of Socrates in four dialogues; both are attempts to discover from authoritative texts the true style and character of a respected author.

The next pair is formed of Isaac Hawkins Browne’s set of six tobacco-themed parodies, A Pipe of Tobacco, and The Oxford Oyster Women, an imitation of Milton in the burlesque tradition of John Philips’s The Splendid Shilling. Both of these texts find bathetic inspiration for their imitations of modern authors. The central pair is at first glance an incongruous one: it includes an anonymous poem, The Deist’s Creed, placing nature and reason at the centre of spiritual experience, and Protestant Popery, a poem by the satirist Nicholas Amhurst attacking High Church politics. These poems have specific religious contexts, and do not engage as directly with the literary tradition as other poems and translations in the anthology; however, the central theme of textual (mis)appropriation is no less pertinent to this pairing, as the interpretation of scripture is at the heart of church affairs, and contemporaries understood deism to be a rejection of scriptural authority.

In the latter part of the compilation, the popular Latin poem Muscipula and its anonymous English translation form another pairing. Muscipula, written by the Oxford graduate Edward Holdsworth, clothes its comic fable about the Welsh national character
in elegant Latin, and the English translation refreshes the mock-heroic design by adopting ‘Milton’s Stile’. The anthology’s final pairing connects two authorial miscellanies, the seventh and last items in its present sequence. The polite lyrics of the *York Miscellany* have little besides their title to give them local resonance; in contrast, the contents of the Swiftian *Miscellanies* have specific Irish contexts, but appear repackaged in a London printing with a false imprint.\(^{89}\) The transplantation of texts from one context to another can in fact be seen as the shared dynamic of all the pairings in the *Sammelband*: each one illustrates the ongoing adaptation of new and authoritative texts through activities as diverse as parody, critical revaluation and religious debate.

In the first three decades of the eighteenth century, as Benedict explains, producers of published anthologies appealed to new audiences by recontextualising poems and extracts from popular authors and redefining the standards of fashionable culture. In this commercial sphere, ‘the role of the editor became increasingly significant as a mediator bridging original and new contexts for poetry’, and the ideal reader was characterised as a discerning consumer, seeking to reinforce their literary and social values (Benedict, p. 127). In creating his custom-made anthology, Thistlethwayte performed both of these roles. His manuscript table of contents records his critical judgements on ten of the eleven titles originally included; these verdicts range from ‘excellent’ to the faint praise of ‘pretty well’, showing that Thistlethwayte recognised and appreciated the varying literary quality of the texts he read. Furthermore, in constructing this *Sammelband*, Thistlethwayte initially combined four texts from the decade of his birth with seven from the 1730s,

---

bringing new and old into a finely configured collection. Thus, as reader and editor, Thistlethwayte was able not only to exercise his taste in poetry, but also to reflect on the textual transformations and cultural revaluations that had shaped the poetic tradition and informed his choices. At a time of growing interest in the meaning and value of individual taste, Thistlethwayte’s anthology is a powerful response by one collector to the culture that had shaped his.

This chapter has revealed the contrasting ways in which two collectors turned the practical expedient of binding multiple texts together into an interpretative act, forming new literary histories in the shape of their own cultural experience. It has shown that Triplett, who endured the life of a poor scholar to become a clergyman, created anthologies that explore the ways in which social and political loyalties shaped the production and reception of seventeenth-century texts. In contrast, Thistlethwayte, a man of privilege, created anthologies which foreground the diverse processes of textual transformation in early eighteenth-century literary culture, indicating that these were driven as much by individual taste as by social forces. During a period in which published collections evolved into ‘vehicles of cultural competition’ between participants in an increasingly diverse literary culture, both Triplett and Thistlethwayte constructed custom-made anthologies that reappropriated the themes and functions of commercially produced collections (Benedict, p. 89). In doing so, they defined the parameters of their own reading in ways which resonated with their social experience. The narrowness of Triplett’s social prospects is likely to have nurtured his sensitivity to the social meanings of literary texts, while for Thistlethwayte the importance of taste was intimately linked to his cultural values as a gentleman. The role of Thistlethwayte’s privileged upbringing and
social milieu in forming his habits as a collector is explored further in the next chapter, which examines the growth and intellectual range of Thistlethwayte’s library.
CHAPTER FOUR

THE LIBRARY OF ALEXANDER THISTLETHWAYTE

The dispersal of Alexander Thistlethwayte’s library through donation and sale has created two perspectives on his career as a collector. The first is based on the posthumous sale catalogue of his library, which offers an overview of the quantity and variety of books making up Thistlethwayte’s collection at the time of his death in 1771. Less than a year later, the London bookseller Benjamin White issued *A Catalogue of the Library of Alexander Thistlethwayte, Esq; Late Knight of the Shire for the County of Hants* (1772). Though White listed books from ‘Various other valuable COLLECTIONS’ alongside those which had formerly belonged to Thistlethwayte, his fixed price catalogue remains a moderately reliable record of most of the titles that Thistlethwayte owned. With over 6300 lots, it is clear from the contents page alone that Thistlethwayte collected books in at least six languages, and in most of the major branches of human and scientific knowledge.¹ In the present chapter, White’s catalogue serves as an important source of information about the range of useful and collectible books in Thistlethwayte’s library. It shows that Thistlethwayte collected with a breadth of interest sustained by his many social roles and responsibilities, as well as with a sophisticated taste for the fine Renaissance books treasured by mid-eighteenth-century collectors.

However, library research based on sale catalogues has its limitations. Printed catalogues have enabled scholars to analyse the contents of libraries that have long since been dispersed, with some studies uncovering patterns in the ownership of individual titles.

and the coverage of subject areas across a range of collections. \(^2\) But without the physical evidence provided by the books themselves – evidence of how they were acquired, managed and read by their owners – there is little scope to investigate the growth of a collection or a collector’s relationship with their books. In Thistlethwayte’s case, the substantial donations that he made to learned institutions – roughly one thousand volumes to Winchester College in 1767, followed by a larger and more diverse collection of 1500 books to Wadham College, Oxford, in 1771 – supply the archival substance that White’s sale catalogue lacks. The present chapter gathers evidence from both of Thistlethwayte’s donated collections to investigate the impact of his upbringing and social milieu as a country gentleman on the character of his library. It opens with a biographical account that outlines the growth of Thistlethwayte’s library in the context of his changing fortunes, first as heir to the family estates and later as a Hampshire magnate and MP. Thistlethwayte came into his Hampshire property unexpectedly, as a result of the premature death of his younger brother Francis Whithed in 1751. Despite their kinship, the brothers’ separate inheritances drew them apart from a young age, and the second part of the chapter examines the role of books in helping both young men to grasp their social opportunities during their formative years. By the end of his life, as White’s sale catalogue shows, Thistlethwayte had amassed a notably large library, with considerable investment in fine European printing and foreign language works. The closing section of the chapter reveals that Thistlethwayte bought many of his foreign books locally; his largest known acquisition from a local collection forms the basis for a detailed study of a Huguenot refugee family and their participation in international communities of knowledge.

\(^2\) For one such study of a sample of seventeenth-century libraries, based on five sale catalogues dating between 1680 and 1698, see David Pearson, ‘Patterns of Book Ownership in Late Seventeenth-Century England’, \textit{The Library}, 7\textsuperscript{th} ser., 11 (2010), 139-67.
Alexander Thistlethwayte was born in 1717 or 1718, the first of three sons of Alexander Thistlethwayte (1686/7–1739/1740) and Mary Whithed. The Thistlethwaytes had held the neighbouring manors of West and Middle Winterslow, seven miles north of Salisbury, since the sixteenth century, and two of the collector’s ancestors and namesakes had represented Wiltshire constituencies in the Commons. Alexander Thistlethwayte (1611–1670) sat for Downton from 1645 until 1648, when he was expelled during the military-backed purge of conservative members resistant to proceedings against Charles I. His eldest son, also Alexander (1636–1716), represented Salisbury from 1679 to 1681, playing an active role in support of exclusion. Alexander’s marriage in 1655 to the heiress Catherine Chaldecot, of East Whiteway in Dorset, brought him a lucrative collection of landholdings on the Isle of Purbeck. Three decades later, his son Francis (1657/8–1739) married another Dorset heiress, Mary Pelham, acquiring an estate at Compton Valence within twenty-five miles of the Purbeck properties.

The Thistlethwaytes of Winterslow had for generations sent their sons to be educated at Winchester College; Francis was educated there, and his three sons, including Alexander Thistlethwayte’s father, attended the school between 1701 and 1707. With the next generation, however, this tradition appears to have been suspended. The College has no record of admitting Alexander Thistlethwayte, nor do his younger brothers Francis (1719–1751) and Robert (1720/1–1767) appear in the registers. It is not until the admission of Alexander Thistlethwayte’s nephew and heir Robert (1755–1802) in 1767

---

4 For a family tree illustrating Alexander Thistlethwayte’s ancestry, see Appendix 6.
5 Foster, 1500-1714, IV, p. 1469.
that another descendant of this branch of the family is named on the school’s lists.\(^7\) Therefore, in 1767, when Thistlethwayte made his remarkable donation to the Fellows’ Library, he was honouring his family’s current and historic association with the College – an association which, ironically, does not seem to have shaped his own education.

If Thistlethwayte spent any time in formal schooling, it is more likely to have been as a contemporary of his brother Francis at Eton College. A list of expenses drawn up on behalf of Francis shows that he attended Eton from June 1734 to February 1736, and that on one occasion, on 28 February 1735, his elder brother Alexander took ‘a chaise to Eaton’.\(^8\) The second son of Alexander Thistlethwayte senior, Francis’s fortunes were transformed in 1734 when he inherited the Hampshire estates of his first cousin twice removed, the county MP Richard Norton (c.1666–1732).\(^9\) Norton’s estates had been claimed by Francis’s maternal uncle Richard Whithed in 1733, but Whithed did not live long; on his death the following year the Norton estates, together with Whithed’s own possessions in Hampshire and Wiltshire, passed to his nephew, on the condition that Francis adopt the Whithed family name by Act of Parliament.\(^10\) Chief of the Norton properties had been the Southwick estate, lying north of Portsmouth and close to the southern edge of the New Forest. The estate was centred on Southwick Park, an important country seat which under former owners had received visits from Charles I and George I.\(^11\) A view of this seat, surveying the large seventeenth-century house and ornamental garden à la française, was engraved by Johannes Kip for the popular collection

---

\(^7\) The published register of scholars from the school’s foundation, *Winchester Scholars: A List of the Wardens, Fellows and Scholars of Saint Mary College of Winchester*, ed. by T. F. Kirby (London: Henry Frowde, 1888), is supplemented by manuscript lists of commoners before 1836 in the College Archives.

\(^8\) ‘An Acct. of Mr Francis Whithed’s Expenses Since ye Death of his Uncle’. HRO, 5M50/2096/39.


Britannia Illustrata: Or Views of Several of the Queens Palaces as also of the Principal Seats of the Nobility and Gentry of Great Britain (1707). Following a legal challenge, Francis’s inheritance was firmly settled only in 1739, but he attended Eton in the expectation of taking on a large estate and a stake in Hampshire politics on reaching his majority. Though Francis’s personal accounts confirm his attendance, the records of Eton College contain no trace of him.\(^\text{12}\) It is therefore possible that his elder brother Alexander – who is similarly absent from the Eton register – also spent time at the school, perhaps taking advantage of Francis’s investment in building relationships with the fellows. Francis’s accounts record the following payment on 2 July 1734: ‘paid D\(^\text{r}\) George [William George, headmaster of the school] and M\(^\text{r}\) Ewer [John Ewer, assistant master] 5 Gu\(^\text{s}\) each – 10, 10, 0’, significantly more than the two guineas customarily paid to the headmaster on entering the school and the semi-annual charge of four guineas for the tutor.\(^\text{13}\) Whatever the truth of this, it is more than likely that Francis’s Eton education held at least one boon for his brother Alexander. A bookseller’s bill recording Francis’s purchases during his time as a pupil has survived, and as will appear later in this chapter, it indicates that some of Francis’s school books may eventually have found their way into Alexander Thistlethwayte’s library.

Alexander Thistlethwayte’s earliest recorded educational affiliation is to Lincoln’s Inn, where he was admitted on 22 November 1734.\(^\text{14}\) In the early eighteenth century, as David Lemmings has shown, the Inns of Court had not given up their traditional function ‘as academies for the liberal education of socially elevated young men’, and Thistlethwayte was one of a large proportion of sons of the elite in the student body whose activities were more likely to contribute to their social refinement than their qualifications for a career at

\(^{12}\) The published *Eton College Register, 1698-1752*, ed. by R. A. Austen-Leigh (Eton: Spottiswoode, Ballantyne & Co., 1927) incorporates all surviving archival information about past pupils of the school.

\(^{13}\) HRO, 5M50/2096/39. For details of fees at Eton, see *Eton College Register*, p. xxiv.

the bar.\textsuperscript{15} Thistlethwayte seems to have forged a lasting connection with his society, mentioning in a letter of 21 February 1759 that he had gone ‘on Business to Lincolns Inn’ after failing to obtain an audience with the duke of Newcastle at Newcastle House.\textsuperscript{16} However, it is notable that there is no testimony to this connection in his books: no ownership inscriptions in which Thistlethwayte notes his attachment to Lincoln’s Inn have been found. This may reflect the informality of study at the Inns or, more likely, the possibility that Thistlethwayte did not go into residence there. In contrast, thirty-nine books have been examined in the Fellows’ Library whose inscriptions note their owner’s membership of Wadham College, Oxford, where Thistlethwayte matriculated just seven months after his admission to Lincoln’s Inn (a typical inscription reads, ‘E Libris Alex. Thistlethwayte è Coll. Wadh.’). Thistlethwayte, like most men of his status, did not take a bachelor’s degree and probably stayed in Oxford for no more than eighteen months; however, his books reveal that he valued his part in collegiate life and invested seriously in the literary learning which, for the more privileged students, was its focus.

The next phase of Thistlethwayte’s life, from his coming of age to his establishing a family of his own, is sparsely documented. In late 1739 or early 1740, Thistlethwayte’s father died, and as a result he succeeded to the family estates not long after his twenty-first birthday.\footnote{Both Foster – Joseph Foster, \textit{Alumni Oxonienses: The Members of the University of Oxford, 1715-1886}, 4 vols (London: Joseph Foster, 1887-88), IV, p. 1470 – and House of Commons – Newman, ‘Thistlethwayte, Alexander’, III, p. 521 – state that Thistlethwayte’s father died in 1728. However, the will of Alexander Thistlethwayte senior (TNA: PRO, PROB 11/700/500) was made on 5 November 1739, and proved on 13 February 1740.} Little more than a year later, in 1741, he married Sarah Randoll,\footnote{Newman names Thistlethwayte’s wife as Catherine Randoll in ‘Thistlethwayte, Alexander’, III, p. 521. However, Sarah is named together with her husband in estate papers belonging to the Fox family of Wiltshire; Chippenham, Wiltshire and Swindon History Centre, 11/72 and 11/79.} the daughter of a Salisbury publican, Edward Randoll (among Francis’s papers is a bill from ‘E Randoll’ charging £1.10.5 for food and drink, fire, horses and servants, settled on 23

\textbf{Figure 11.} Thomas Hudson, \textit{The Thistlethwayte Family}, c.1758. Oil on canvas. Yale Center for British Art, Paul Mellon Fund.
May 1734). In their near-life-size family portrait (Fig. 11), a major work by the portraitist Thomas Hudson, the couple are shown with their daughters Catharine and Anne in an outdoor setting, the portly Thistlethwayte gazing serenely into the landscape as Sarah and her daughters turn from their basket of flowers to fix their eyes on the viewer. Joyce Boundy observes that in the figures of Thistlethwayte and his wife Hudson closely replicates the poses, costumes and cast of countenance of sitters in his earlier paintings, artfully transforming the Thistlethwaytes into models of the studied elegance of his style of portraiture. Boundy dates the painting to around 1758, when Hudson’s dominance of society portraiture in the middle decades of the century was on the wane. For Thistlethwayte, on the other hand, the 1750s were a prosperous period, which saw his family transplanted to a new estate and station.

The cause of this upheaval was the premature death of Francis Whithed, Thistlethwayte’s younger brother, on 30 March 1751. Francis had followed his elder sibling to Wadham College in 1736, before departing for a lengthy sojourn in Italy as the companion and sponsor of his less wealthy cousin, the future architect and Hampshire estate owner John Chute. Spending the winter in Florence in 1740, the pair met and formed lasting friendships with fellow Etonians Horace Walpole and Thomas Gray, the poet accompanying them to Venice for the festival of the Ascension in the following spring. Chute and Whithed, known affectionately to their friends as ‘the Chuteheds’, remained in Florence for the next five years, and during their stay Francis had a daughter with his Florentine mistress Angiola Lucchi. In 1746 he returned to England, taking

---

19 HRO, 5M50/2094/38.
21 Letter of Thomas Gray to Horace Walpole, 8 February 1747. Horace Walpole’s Correspondence, ed. by Lewis, XIV, p. 18.
possession of his estates and becoming MP for Hampshire in the following year.\textsuperscript{23} But he remained a ‘deaf and sickly’ young man,\textsuperscript{24} and he made his will on 30 August 1748, leaving his large estates in Portsdown Hundred, along with all the ‘Plate Furniture and Pictures’ at Southwick House, to his elder brother.\textsuperscript{25} Walpole believed that in making this bequest he ‘had forgiven all [Thistlethwayte’s] beastliness’, and the callousness of Francis’s surviving brothers is a theme to which Walpole would return more than once in his correspondence.\textsuperscript{26} But whatever the state of the brothers’ relationship, there is no doubt that Francis’s legacy was a landmark in Thistlethwayte’s life. Within six weeks of Francis’s death, Thistlethwayte had taken his brother’s seat in the House of Commons, the beginning of a decade of parliamentary service.\textsuperscript{27} He also installed his family at Southwick Park, where it is very likely that at least some of Francis’s books were left behind with the other household heirlooms.

These were not the only books to come into Thistlethwayte’s hands through family inheritance. The signature of a Giles Thistlethwayte appears on the last printed page of a pocket edition of Aesop’s \textit{Fabulæ} (1628), given by Alexander Thistlethwayte to Wadham College.\textsuperscript{28} Moreover, one of the books that Thistlethwayte gave to Winchester – a copy of Joannes Ravisius Textor’s \textit{Epitheta} (1636), an early sixteenth-century collection of Latin epithets to be used in composition – has the name of Francis Thistlethwayte (apparently spelt ‘Thisth-thayt-‘, and perhaps intended as a trial signature) inscribed on its title page, the only inscription by a relative which has been found in the Fellows’ Library.

\textsuperscript{25} Will of Francis Whithed, proved 15 April 1751. TNA: PRO PROB 11/787/261.
\textsuperscript{26} Letter of Horace Walpole to Horace Mann, 1 April 1751. \textit{Horace Walpole’s Correspondence}, XX, p. 238.
\textsuperscript{28} Aesop, \textit{Fabulæ} (Geneva: Jean de Tournes, 1628). Wadham College library, shelf-mark E.38.9.
Given its age and its owner’s use of the Thistlethwayte family name, this book is more likely to have belonged to Thistlethwayte’s grandfather or uncle than to his younger brother Francis Whithed. Thus, any books that Thistlethwayte inherited from Francis are either unrepresented or untraceable in his donations to both Wadham and Winchester. Their presence in his library, however, cannot be discounted, owing to the bookseller’s bills which are preserved among Francis’s papers. It is possible, as a later discussion will outline, to match almost half of the titles listed on these bills with items in the sale catalogue of Alexander Thistlethwayte’s library, plausibly tracing the provenance of these books from Francis’s initial purchase to the auction of 1772. Francis’s books potentially represented one of the largest second-hand elements within Alexander Thistlethwayte’s collection, a reminder that his library, like its representation in White’s catalogue, needs to be considered not simply as the creation of an individual, but equally as the convergence of smaller, interrelated collections.

Just as Thistlethwayte incorporated his brother’s books into a larger collection, he may also have installed them in a new physical setting. When the traveller and churchman Richard Pococke visited Southwick in September 1754, he found ‘a good old house which the present proprietor is improveing [sic] with great expence and laying out the ground in the Park style’. The exact nature of these improvements is not known, but it is possible that one of the changes superintended by Thistlethwayte was the addition or remodelling of a library. The library room as an architectural space ‘seems to have first become a normal feature of the great house in the 1720s and 1730s’, according to John Newman. By the middle of the century, many country house plans designed the library as one of a

suite of reception rooms, a place comfortable and spacious enough to accommodate social gatherings as well as private reading.\textsuperscript{32} Incorporating a fashionable library room into the renovated Southwick House would have created a semi-public space in which to showcase Thistlethwayte’s collections; in addition to printed books, these might have included manuscripts, music, historic artefacts and contemporary artworks, though no record of any collections of this kind has been found. However grand this library was, its books would not have served as mere furnishings, put on display to signal the cultural sophistication of their owner. Thistlethwayte’s books reveal little investment in fine bindings that might adorn the shelves. Housed in an architectural library, the impression they might have given is less one of elegant curatorship than of the scale and variety of Thistlethwayte’s bibliographical interests.

By the mid-1750s Thistlethwayte probably owned several thousand printed volumes, ranging from folio collections of fine prints and maps to small-format editions of sermons. However, this collection of printed books should not be considered synonymous with a single library room at Southwick. Thistlethwayte may have kept some books in a more private suite of rooms at his country seat; he may also have established a library in the Knightsbridge town house where he seems to have resided during parliamentary sessions throughout at least the second half of the 1750s.\textsuperscript{33} This was not a permanent metropolitan base: in 1761 Thistlethwayte was directing messages to ‘my House in Abingdon Street


\textsuperscript{33} Four letters sent by Thistlethwayte to the duke of Newcastle between 1755 and 1759 are subscribed ‘Knightsbridge’. London, British Library, Additional MS 32861, fol. 280\textsuperscript{f}; British Library, Additional MS 32863, fol. 424\textsuperscript{f}; British Library, Additional MS 32864, fol. 516\textsuperscript{f}; British Library, Additional MS 32890, fol. 517\textsuperscript{f}. 181
Westminster’. Nevertheless, it is more than likely that a reader and bibliophile such as Thistlethwayte would have kept books at hand in the city as well as in the country.

In 1754, as Southwick Park underwent its costly programme of improvements, Thistlethwayte retained his seat in the Commons at the general election. In an appraisal of the new Parliament the government election manager Thomas Hay, Viscount Dupplin classed Thistlethwayte as a dissident Whig, one of forty-two members of an opposition faction led by John Russell, duke of Bedford. Thistlethwayte therefore seems to stand with his great-grandfather in a tradition of Whig opposition whose origins can be traced to the Exclusion Parliaments of 1679 to 1681. However, the impression given by his surviving correspondence is not one of an active parliamentarian, much less an opponent of the Newcastle ministry, but rather of a frustrated client and aspirant patron. Thistlethwayte’s occasional correspondence with the prime minister Thomas Pelham-Holles, duke of Newcastle, forms the only extant record of his dealings as an MP. In late 1755 Thistlethwayte wrote to Newcastle urging him to grant a petition delivered ‘by Mr Randoll of the Pay-Office in behalf of the Bearer his Brother’, one of Thistlethwayte’s relatives by marriage. The following spring Thistlethwayte began what was to be a long and trying campaign to gain ‘some Thing for my Friend George Powlett’, a member of an influential Hampshire family headed by the duke of Bolton. Like Powlett, Thistlethwayte had kinship ties to power, and he urged Newcastle, his distant cousin, to recognise and reward ‘the inviolate attachment I have to your Grace’. Newcastle’s favour, however, proved elusive. Thistlethwayte solicited a pension of £300 per annum

34 Letter of Alexander Thistlethwayte to the duke of Newcastle, subscribed ‘March 24th 1761’. London, British Library, Additional MS 32921, fol. 41r.
35 Letter of Alexander Thistlethwayte to the duke of Newcastle, subscribed ‘Decr. 11th 1755’. Additional MS 32861, fol. 280r.
37 Letter of Alexander Thistlethwayte to the duke of Newcastle, subscribed ‘March 21st 1756’. Additional MS 32863, fol. 424r.
and later a place in the Stamp Office for Powlett, but there is no evidence that his campaign succeeded, and it is likely that the affair forced Thistlethwayte to abandon any claims he had made about his special interest with the prime minister.

But while Thistlethwayte courted Newcastle in private, it was his allegiance to the parliamentary opposition and his uncompromising behaviour in local politics that coloured his public profile. Even after his death, Thistlethwayte’s name was associated with an attitude of knowing bitterness towards the authoritarianism and greed of the governing class. In February and March 1784, several British periodicals, including the Gentleman’s Magazine, published a stanzaic poem attributed to ‘the late ALEXANDER THISTLETHWAYTE, Esq. Knight of the Shire for Hants’.38 The poem is not dated, but its title explains the circumstances of its conception on 29 May – the anniversary of the Restoration of the Stuart monarchy – in an unknown year. Inspired by ‘meeting a Man loaded with Sacks and an Oak Bough in his Hat’, the poem brushes aside the man’s token of political loyalty to deplore the harshness of everyday life for the labouring majority:

Poor fellow! what hast thou to do
With King or Restoration?
’Twill make no difference to you,
Whoever rules the nation.

Still must thy neck support the load,
Still earn thy bread with toil;
Still must thou pace the self-same road,
And great ones share the spoil.

The ass may carry brooms or men,
Just at his master’s will:

38 Alexander Thistlethwayte(?), ‘Stanzas’, Gentleman’s Magazine, 54 (1784), 201, in Periodicals Archive Online <https://pao.chadwyck.co.uk> [accessed 10 July 2013]. All references to the text are to the version in the Gentleman’s Magazine. Early in 1784, this poem also appeared in the Universal Magazine, 74 (1784), 106; the Scots Magazine, 46 (1784), 96; and the Hibernian Magazine, Mar. 1784 (volumes not numbered), 158. It was later reprinted with the attribution to Thistlethwayte in Selection of Poems, ed. by Charles Snart, 2 vols (Newark: M. Hage, 1807-8), I, p. 252, and in the same collection republished as Elegant Extracts, in Verse, ed. by R. Snart, 2 vols (Newark: M. Hage, 1813), I, p. 252.
But let him change, and change again,
His lot’s a burthen still.

Still ministers will tyrannise,
And courtiers still be knaves;
Walpoles on Walpoles shall arise,
And keep thy grandsons slaves.

Still governments have been the same,
The same shall ever be:
Ev’n kings are nothing but a name,
And so is liberty.

The poem is an accomplished formal composition; the stridency of the ballad stanza is enhanced by the rhyming of both long and short lines (abab) and by the repetition of ‘Still’. Thematically, the poem is an indictment of the exploitation ingrained in the political system, though there is little sympathy for its compliant victims (in the third stanza, the labouring man is implicitly compared to an ‘ass’). Prefaced in the Gentleman’s Magazine with the comment, ‘not unapplicable to the present blessed State of the Nation’, the poem asserts that successive Whig governments have betrayed the principles of ‘liberty’ that they professed to uphold.

This short poem, however, has an international history which casts doubt on the attribution to Thistlethwayte. In 1781, three years before its first British publication, the poem appeared in the Massachusetts Spy with an almost identical account of the circumstances of its composition and without an authorial attribution. In the Massachusetts newspaper, subtitled the ‘American Oracle of Liberty’ from 1775, the poem’s challenge to oppressive governments and to the death of popular freedoms resonated with the Patriot politics of a state which had achieved the first American

---

39 The poem is indexed in Gillian B. Anderson’s inventory of political verse in colonial American newspapers, Freedom’s Voice in Poetry and Song (Wilmington, DE: Scholarly Resources, 1977), p. 111. Anderson’s index does not reproduce the full text of the poem, but the first line and the circumstantial details in the title match those in the British versions.
victories of the Revolutionary War and instituted its own constitution in 1780. It is possible that in attributing the poem to Thistlethwayte in 1784, British periodicals sought to obscure the American origins of the poem, reclaiming it as the product of homegrown cynicism rather than revolutionary politics; Thistlethwayte, a long-dead member of a faded political generation, may have provided a convenient authorial fiction.

In late 1759 an election was held to choose a counterpart for Thistlethwayte as Hampshire’s second parliamentary representative, and Thistlethwayte refused to support Newcastle’s candidate, the eventual winner Henry Legge. But it was not only Thistlethwayte’s resistance to the political manoeuvrings of the dominant interests that helped to marginalise him at this time. On 13 November 1759 the Irish peer Lord Clanricarde reported to Newcastle that ‘M’ Thistlethwayte […] had last week another stroke of the palsey and can’t live’. Thistlethwayte’s sickness proved persistent rather than fatal, but it seems to have cemented the expectation that he would not contest the general election in the spring of 1761. In late March, however, he issued a printed handbill and placed advertisements in the London newspapers appealing for the electoral support of ‘the Gentlemen, Clergy, and Freeholders of the County of SOUTHAMPTON’. Legge, now a rival candidate, wrote indignantly to Newcastle, protesting, ‘[w]hat is meant by this sudden revival of a pretension that seem’d so entirely drop’d & layd a side by a person very near dead in fact, or from what quarter it comes I cannot guess’. Thistlethwayte, for his part, assured Newcastle that his incentive to stand had been the ‘Gentlemen of the County of Southampton insisting upon my Representing them once


more, and not admitting Ill Health or any other Excuse’. 43 Thistlethwayte may have been able to count on solid support as an incumbent and a longer-established Hampshire estate owner than his rival Legge, but this public-spirited stance could not sustain a challenge to the mutually supportive canvassing efforts of the government-backed Legge and Simeon Stuart, a court candidate. On the day of the election Thistlethwayte did not appear, and Legge and Stuart were returned unopposed.

In the wake of his political disappointment, Thistlethwayte suffered a more personal loss. On 4 June, less than two months after the election, he wrote a tender letter to an unnamed correspondent sharing the news that his wife had died. The bereavement seems to have prompted Thistlethwayte to renounce his own interests in favour of securing his legacy. In his letter, he discloses that he has ‘given Winterslow to my Dear daughters without Reservation of a single Penny to myself’. 44 Thistlethwayte may have hoped that the settlement and eventual sale of the old family manor would secure his daughters’ marital prospects; in the event, the young women had mixed fortunes. The younger, Anne (1748–1817), married Thomas Somers Cocks, a London banker and nephew of the late Lord Chancellor Hardwicke, in 1768. 45 However, it was not until 1784 that Thistlethwayte’s elder daughter Catharine (b. 1743), then in her forties, married a Berkshire physician, Thomas Milbourne. 46

Having relinquished his interest in Winterslow, Thistlethwayte still faced uncertainty over the financial prospects of the Southwick estate, which his youngest brother Robert stood to inherit. In a postscript to his letter of 1761, Thistlethwayte reaffirms his loyalty

43 Letter of Alexander Thistlethwayte to the duke of Newcastle, subscribed ‘March 24th 1761’. Additional MS 32921, fol. 41.
44 Letter of Alexander Thistlethwayte to unnamed correspondent, 4 June 1761. HRO, 5M50/2212.
to his successor: ‘I have too much Affection for [Robert] & his Family to permit me to do any thing that can affect them in any shape, as well as too much for myself to enter again upon [the metropolitan ‘High Life’ which] I always did & shall esteem a scene of Nonsense’.\(^47\) Thistlethwayte did not return to public life in the capital, but it appears that he was nevertheless forced to work hard to maintain his financial stability. On 20 December 1764, in a letter to Horace Mann, the British diplomatic representative in Florence, Horace Walpole insisted that living abroad had caused Mann to lose ‘all trace of idea of a country squire; such is the eldest Thistlethwaite, and a bankrupt to boot’.\(^48\) Walpole had been a friend of Thistlethwayte’s brother Francis Whithed, and deplored what he saw as the cold-hearted intransigence of Francis’s surviving siblings in withholding the annuity due to his mistress and daughter in Florence. The grounds of Walpole’s animosity were personal, but his characterisation of Alexander Thistlethwayte as ‘a bankrupt’ may have had a seed of truth. Though no personal financial records or estate accounts belonging to Thistlethwayte have survived, a letter of 1766 to his brother Robert reveals that Thistlethwayte had incurred a substantial debt to the Wiltshire nobleman William Bouverie, earl of Radnor, and wished ‘to continue the Loan of his Money seven years longer, as we may not otherwise so easily procure so large a sum’.\(^49\) Though this is hardly evidence of the financial prostration alleged by Walpole, the letter does indicate that the estate which Thistlethwayte passed to his successor was bound up with debt.

By the end of 1767 Robert Thistlethwayte was dead and his son, now Alexander Thistlethwayte’s heir, was beginning his education at Winchester College. This seems to have spurred Thistlethwayte to revive one of the public roles he had played in the 1750s –

\(^47\) Letter of Alexander Thistlethwayte to unnamed correspondent, 4 June 1761. HRO, 5M50/2212.
\(^48\) Letter of Horace Walpole to Horace Mann, 20 December 1764. *Horace Walpole’s Correspondence*, XXII, p.268.
\(^49\) Letter of Alexander Thistlethwayte to Robert Thistlethwayte, 31 July 1766. HRO 5M50/2222.
that of patron of a learned society. In 1757, during his second term in the Commons, Thistlethwayte had been elected to a Fellowship of the Royal Society, becoming one of a growing number of elite patrons whose subscriptions helped to support an active scientific community.\(^{50}\) From this role as a facilitating observer, Thistlethwayte progressed to become a major benefactor in the last years of his life, making two donations to educational institutions. In 1767, his gift of roughly one thousand volumes to Winchester College honoured the school’s renewed role in educating the next generation of the Thistlethwayte family – a role which the school was fulfilling, for the first time in sixty years, with the young Robert Thistlethwayte. In 1771, a larger donation of around 1500 books reiterated Alexander Thistlethwayte’s attachment to his alma mater, Wadham College, almost a decade after Oxford University had given a retrospective nod to Thistlethwayte’s parliamentary career by granting him the honorary degree of Doctor of Civil Law. Both of these lifetime gifts were, in all probability, thoughtfully planned and negotiated by Thistlethwayte, and the ways in which the Winchester benefaction in particular engaged with the intellectual culture of its recipient institution will be examined in the closing chapter of this thesis. For now, it must be emphasised that, for Thistlethwayte, the philanthropic impulse to augment and diversify the collections of learned institutions was most likely reinforced by two concerns. First, mindful of the indebtedness of his estate, Thistlethwayte may have foreseen that his heir would dispose of the library to raise money; any prior indications he might have had were confirmed when his legacy of more than six thousand books was sold following his death on 15 October 1771. With the dispersal of his entire collection as private property a realistic prospect, Thistlethwayte had a strong motive to leave legacies to institutions which would preserve his books as communal assets. Secondly, Thistlethwayte chose to leave sizable

portions of his library in the keeping of scholarly communities to which he or members of his family had belonged. In choosing to enrich the cultural collections of these institutions, Thistlethwayte was also laying claim to a place in their communal memory, and trusting that his books would be more highly valued by their members owing to the institutional affinity of the donor.

*Books and Society in the Early Lives of Alexander Thistlethwayte and Francis Whithed*

Alexander Thistlethwayte’s legacy today lies in the hands of educational institutions: owing to his generosity as a donor, Winchester College and his alma mater, Wadham College, hold collections which were conceived and curated by Thistlethwayte himself. Thistlethwayte’s library also has its origins in an educational context: as a boy, and later as a student at Wadham, Thistlethwayte began to acquire books to support his studies and feed his cultural interests, and many of these can be identified in his donated collections. However, Thistlethwayte’s was not the only educational career to leave its mark on his library. A significant number of the books bought by his younger brother Francis Whithed at Eton and Oxford can be traced to Thistlethwayte’s library from their initial purchase, through the bookseller’s bills that survive among Francis’s papers. Francis’s early book-buying career provides an essential counterpoint to his elder brother’s, illuminating the social influences on Alexander Thistlethwayte’s emerging identity as a collector. Before he reached sixteen, Francis inherited the wealthy estates of a distant cousin, lifting his financial and social prospects above those of his elder brother. Though both young men attended Wadham College at almost the same time, it is clear from the available evidence that their diverging social paths corresponded to contrasting forms of cultural engagement during their university years. The following analysis will reconstruct
the separate collections amassed by the brothers throughout their years in education, exploring the ways in which books provided a foundation for their intellectual development and for their performance of social roles. It will be argued that Francis’s student library of ancient and modern classics gave him the cultural literacy he needed to discover new social horizons abroad; in contrast, Alexander Thistlethwayte’s books helped to synthesise his social and cultural roles at home.

Before the age of seventeen, as has already been observed, there is no record of Alexander Thistlethwayte in formal education. However, one item has been found which bears traces of his earlier studies, a book now preserved as part of the collection donated by Thistlethwayte to Wadham College. This is an edition of selected speeches of Cicero, carrying an ownership inscription on its front endpaper in the meticulous hand of a fourteen- or fifteen-year-old Thistlethwayte: ‘Alexander Thistlethwayte Liber ejus Anno Domini 1732/3 February yᵉ 15ᵗʰ.’. The text bears the marks of attentive reading, with literal corrections to a number of words and English glosses occasionally provided in the margins. This reading, moreover, was not unsupervised. On the rear pastedown is another inscription in the casual hand of Thistlethwayte’s father, written in the same year as his son’s more formal and visible claim to ownership: ‘Thistlethwayte Sen’. His Book 1733’. In inserting his own name into the book, the elder Thistlethwayte may have intended to record his purchase of the volume, or to signal that the book did not belong exclusively to his son but instead formed part of the family library at Winterslow. Whatever his motive, Thistlethwayte senior’s inscription is an important reminder that a large part of his son’s early education seems to have been undertaken and overseen at home.

---

The same is not true of the family’s second son. In June 1734, at roughly the same age as his brother Alexander had been when laying claim to Cicero’s speeches, Francis began his education at Eton, becoming the first member of the Thistlethwayte family to attend the school. Under the headship of William George, whose tenure had begun in 1728, Eton had been strengthening its connections with the Whig establishment and securing its scholarly prestige. Its inexorable rise to become ‘England’s leading school’ in the middle of the century made it an ideal destination for a young man who was suddenly poised to become one of the landowning elite.\(^{52}\) In the early 1730s, Francis had stood to inherit estates chiefly in the Thorngate Hundred of Hampshire from his maternal uncle Richard Whithed.\(^ {53}\) However, Francis’s prospects blossomed quickly and unpredictably following the death of Richard Whithed’s cousin once removed, the former Hampshire MP Richard Norton, on 10 December 1732. Norton’s estates in Portsdown Hundred, estimated to be worth a princely £6,000 a year, were successfully claimed by Richard Whithed in 1733, overturning Norton’s extraordinary will which sought to convey them in trust to Parliament for charitable uses.\(^ {54}\) Just one year later, Richard Whithed himself died, leaving his property in trust for his teenaged nephew, on the condition that Francis assume the Whithed family name. Within two years, Francis’s fortunes had risen from those of a well-provided younger son to those of a future county magnate, and his trustees had been authorised ‘to lay out and expend for [his] education and maintenance such yearly sumes […] as they in their discretion shall think proper’.\(^ {55}\) Funded by his recent inheritance, Francis’s Eton education thus represented a sudden and pioneering step towards fulfilling his new social expectations.


\(^{53}\) A family tree outlining Francis’s Whithed and Norton ancestry can be found in Appendix 6.

\(^{54}\) Watson and McGrath, ‘Norton, Richard (c.1666–1732)’, IV, pp. 1051-52.

\(^{55}\) Will of Richard Whithed, proved 18 March 1734. TNA: PRO PROB 11/664/188.
For Francis and his family, books became conspicuous assets in the unfamiliar social environment of Eton College. Early in 1735 Thistlethwayte senior received a bundle of settled bills and receipts from one of his son’s trustees, the attorney Thomas Puckridge, providing him with a record of the expenses that Francis had incurred during his first six months at Eton. On 28 January Thistlethwayte senior wrote to Puckridge acknowledging the package, and confessed, ‘I guess’t pretty near the expenses of Franks att Eton, excepting the booksellers bill, w’ch I did not think would have been soe much’.56 This bill, which was settled with the Eton printer and bookseller Joseph Pote on 22 January 1735, survives together with the other receipts in the Hampshire Record Office.57 Covering the three-month period from September to December 1734, Pote’s bill is a detailed itemisation of eighteen books and assorted stationery items, such as quires of paper and sticks of wax, amounting to a total value of £11. 0s. 9d. Thistlethwayte senior was understandably shocked at the cost: according to an estimate of Christopher Hollis, £11. 0s. 9d. is more than one third of the amount that a well-to-do parent could expect to spend in this period for half a year’s education at Eton.58 Hollis remarks that Pote ‘had a reputation among the boys for being a sharp business man’, and it is possible that his close economic relationship with the school as founder of the Eton Press enabled him to charge inflated prices for the second-hand books he sold (p. 139). However, Pote’s bill ultimately reveals less about his own alleged commercial greed than it does about his customer’s experience as a newcomer to Eton. Francis’s extraordinary expenditure on books underlines both his relative unfamiliarity with the customs of the school and his desire to demonstrate a firm commitment to its scholarly values.

56 Letter of Alexander Thistlethwayte senior to Thomas Puckridge, 28 January 1735. HRO, 5M50/2094/12.
57 Bill of Joseph Pote, charged to Francis Whithed, and settled on 22 January 1735. HRO, 5M50/2094/2.
Encompassing classics, history, geography and English literature, Francis’s purchases represent a comprehensive investment in Eton’s educational programme. The titles and prices of the books are reproduced in Table 1 as they appear on the bill which Francis received from Pote, with the omission of stationery items and the addition of numbering for ease of reference. The publication details of these books, so far as they can be ascertained, are provided in Appendix 7.

Table 1. Books bought by Francis Whithed from Joseph Pote, Eton bookseller, 1734-1735.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Price (£ s. d.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sep. 3d</td>
<td>Littletons Dictionary 4º C</td>
<td>1 2 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Schrevelius Lexicon C</td>
<td>0 7 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Johnson’s Greek Epigrams interl’d</td>
<td>0 3 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Greek Grammar</td>
<td>0 1 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>[Sep.] 10</td>
<td>Ovidii Epistolæ Delph. C</td>
<td>0 4 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>[Sep.] 24</td>
<td>Æsop: Fab. Gr. &amp; Lat interleav’d</td>
<td>0 2 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Horatius Delphini C</td>
<td>0 6 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tullii Orationes Delph. C</td>
<td>0 6 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>Virgilius cum fig: Delph. C</td>
<td>0 7 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cluvesii Geographia 4º C</td>
<td>0 16 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dionysius Gr. &amp; Lat. G. Hill best.</td>
<td>0 12 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wells.’ Maps of Geography</td>
<td>0 18 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wells.’ Geography C</td>
<td>0 4 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>[Sep.] 30</td>
<td>Martialis Epigrammatum Delectus</td>
<td>0 3 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Oct. 4</td>
<td>Eutropius Havercampi C Lº</td>
<td>0 8 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Nov. 6</td>
<td>Spectators 8 Voll.’ C GB</td>
<td>1 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>Drydens Virgil 3 Voll.’ w. th Cutts C Lº</td>
<td>0 12 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>[Nov.] 22</td>
<td>Garths Ovid Metam &amp; phores 2 Volls.’ C GB</td>
<td>0 7 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total (books only)</td>
<td></td>
<td>8 4 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total charged (including stationery items)</td>
<td></td>
<td>11 0 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

59 The table also reproduces a number of abbreviations which are likely to give details of the condition of the books that Francis bought. Two-thirds of the items are listed with the letter ‘C’, which may stand for the Latin word compactus, meaning ‘bound’. Two further abbreviations used on the bill are ‘Lº’, which may stand for ‘lettered’ on the spine, and ‘GB’, which may signify ‘gilt back’, with decorative gold tooling on the spine.
The four staples of the Latin curriculum – Cicero (8), Ovid (5), Horace (7) and Virgil (9) – are each represented among Francis’s purchases as Delphin editions (identified on Pote’s bill as ‘Delph.’ or ‘Delphini’). The ‘Delphin Classics’ series was a widespread and enduring brand in pedagogical publishing. It began as a state-sponsored collection of Latin texts, edited under the supervision of the governor and the assistant tutor of the Dauphin Louis, son of Louis XIV, between 1674 and 1691. The editions were advertised as In (or Ad) Usum Serenissimi Delphini (‘for the use of the Most Serene Dauphin’), and came equipped with complete prose paraphrases and contextual notes to aid the student in developing linguistic competency and knowledge of classical culture. Stronger in their paratexts than as specimens of philological scholarship, the ‘Delphin Classics’ editions were ‘meant to complete a gentleman’s education’, and were reprinted in London throughout the eighteenth century. Their success in bringing the Latin classics to English gentlemen can be gauged by their strong presence on Francis’s bill: it is reasonable to assume that they provided not only Francis but also a large proportion of his Etonian contemporaries with the foundations of their Latin learning. Similarly, one of Alexander Thistlethwayte’s educational texts – the edition of Cicero’s speeches described earlier – belongs to the Delphin series, and it is notable that no fewer than twenty Delphin titles are listed in White’s sale catalogue of his library.

Francis’s Delphin editions may point to schoolboys’ continuing reliance on an older generation of well-packaged pedagogical texts, but his bill also affords evidence of recent innovation in the Eton curriculum and its materials. The canonical Latin authors are joined among Francis’s purchases by a more recent fixture of grammar school reading – the Roman historian Eutropius, ‘who first came into regular use in schools in the

eighteenth century’, as M. L. Clarke observes (p. 51). Francis’s edition of Eutropius (15), published in Leiden in 1729 and edited by the Dutch scholar Sigebert Havercamp, is a recent scholarly import, reflecting its author’s less established place on the curriculum. Unlike the ‘Delphin’ editions, it embodies current textual scholarship, and is the newest datable publication on Pote’s bill.

In Greek, Francis’s purchases are those of a beginner. Besides linguistic reference books, the primary literary texts which Francis acquired from Pote early in his school career are a collection of epigrams (3), edited in 1699 for use at Eton by the assistant master Thomas Johnson, and Aesop’s fables (6), ‘which was used in the early stages’ of Greek tuition at the school (Clarke, p. 52). Francis bought interleaved copies of both texts, apparently anticipating intensive use. Beyond the routine classical curriculum, Francis invested heavily in materials for his more occasional studies. Three of the costlier items on his bill are geographical works, including *A New Sett of Maps* designed for students by the Oxford educationalist Edward Wells (12), and Philipp Clüver’s foundational seventeenth-century geography, *Introductionis in Universam Geographiam* (10). In addition to supporting Francis’s reading of texts from classical Europe, these geographical resources may have provided knowledge and inspiration for his Grand Tour, an eight-year sojourn in France and Italy on which he embarked after leaving Oxford in the late 1730s. The second area of extracurricular reading which appears among Francis’s purchases is English literature. In 1766, when assistant master Thomas James wrote an account of the Eton regime, he detailed the reading that tutors recommended to Fifth and Sixth Form boys as ‘necessary towards making a complete scholar’; the texts recorded by James include ‘*Spectator*, […] Milton, Pope’ (Hollis, p. 151). Thirty years before, Francis bought a complete archive of the *Spectator* (16) and two distinguished English translations of Latin classics, embracing the school’s directions to broaden the application
of its classical tenets. Thus, Francis’s bill from the Eton bookseller shows that during his first half year at the school he assembled an exemplary collection of schoolbooks, making plain his aspirations to the intellectual breadth and taste which the curriculum sought to nurture.

The Eton bill is also invaluable in enabling us to trace the bibliographical legacy which Francis left to his elder brother – a legacy whose apparent dispersal in 1772 helps us to understand Alexander Thistlethwayte’s intentions as a library benefactor. Seven of the eighteen titles listed on Francis’s bill are also offered in White’s sale catalogue of Alexander Thistlethwayte’s library, most at less than one third of the prices paid by Francis almost four decades earlier.61 There is a strong probability that the books advertised for sale by White in 1772 are those which Francis bought as a schoolboy, and that they passed into Alexander Thistlethwayte’s hands together with the prime share of his brother’s property on the latter’s death in 1751. It appears that Thistlethwayte kept these books in his own library until the end of his life, choosing not to include them in his donation to Winchester College. This may seem a surprising oversight on the part of a school benefactor, as these books have a clear pedagogical purpose (they include two ‘Delphin Classics’ titles, two linguistic reference works and two geographical learning aids produced by Edward Wells), and carry a family heritage of schoolboy use. However, their omission from the Winchester gift is in fact a reliable indication that Thistlethwayte did not intend his benefaction to support or directly reflect the educational programme of the school. It has already been pointed out that there are no fewer than twenty Delphin titles in White’s sale catalogue of Alexander Thistlethwayte’s library, including two whose provenance can plausibly be traced to Francis’s dealings with the Eton bookseller; in contrast, the Winchester catalogue of Thistlethwayte’s benefaction does not record a

61 For details of these titles and the corresponding lots in White’s catalogue, see Appendix 7.
single edition from the widely used Delphin series. The absence of schoolbooks from Thistlethwayte’s gift indicates that the rationale behind it was not to engage with the school’s educational culture, but rather to endow the school with collections embodying the literary heritage on which its core curriculum was based.

The education of the young Alexander Thistlethwayte and his brother broke with family tradition in distinctly different ways, as is now evident: instead of following his forbears to Winchester College, Alexander was apparently tutored at home, while Francis’s grand inheritance propelled him to Eton, on its way to becoming ‘England’s leading school’. On reaching the age of seventeen, however, the brothers’ paths converged on Wadham College, where their uncle Robert Thistlethwayte (1690-1744) was Warden.\(^{62}\) Alexander matriculated on 23 June 1735, and may already have completed his stay when his brother entered the college in February 1737.\(^{63}\) During their time at Wadham, the brothers enjoyed the dual privileges of close kinship to the Warden and gentleman-commoner status. For them, Oxford offered advanced tuition in the classics, largely free from the normal academic discipline to which lower-ranking students were subject, as well as an initiation into the culture and sports of the leisured elite. However, even within this privileged stratum of academic life, a student’s cultural activities could be shaped and defined by his social position, as well as by his individual tastes and enthusiasms. This was the case for both Alexander Thistlethwayte and his brother, as the records of their undergraduate book-buying attest.

Francis began his undergraduate life in the spring of 1737 as he did his education at Eton, by furnishing himself with a growing collection of books. He had boxes of books brought from Norman Court, his house on the western edge of Hampshire, to his rooms in

---


\(^{63}\) Registers of Wadham College, II, pp. 48, 50.
He also opened an account with the Oxford bookseller Richard Clements, from whom a bill detailing Francis’s purchases over the twelve months following his arrival in Oxford has survived. The details of these purchases are reproduced from Clements’ bill in Table 2, and further bibliographical information is provided in Appendix 8.

Table 2. Books bought by Francis Whithed from Richard Clements, Oxford bookseller, 1737-1738.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Price (£ s. d.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>March 3. [1737]</td>
<td>Paterculus, Delph. 8o.</td>
<td>0 4 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>[Mar.] 7</td>
<td>Watts’s Logic 8o. let.</td>
<td>0 4 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wallis Logica 8o. let.</td>
<td>0 3 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Aug. 8th 20.</td>
<td>Chaucer’s Works by Urry, fol. G.†</td>
<td>1 8 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hesiodus, Var. 4o. G.†</td>
<td>0 16 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pope’s Works, 6 Vol. 8o. G.†</td>
<td>0 18 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Swift’s and Pope’s Works 6 Vol. 12o. let.</td>
<td>0 16 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gulliver’s Travels 2 Vol. 12o. let.</td>
<td>0 5 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>Milton’s Paradise Lost &amp; Regained, 2 Vol. 8o. let.</td>
<td>0 11 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>Addison’s Miscell. Works 3 Vol. 12o. let.</td>
<td>0 9 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>– Travels 12o. let.</td>
<td>0 3 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>– Freeholder 12o. let.</td>
<td>0 3 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tatler, 4 Vol. 12o. let.</td>
<td>0 3 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>[Aug.] 23</td>
<td>Ben. Johnson’s Plays 12o. let.</td>
<td>0 3 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>[Aug.] 29</td>
<td>Intelligencer 12o. let.</td>
<td>0 2 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>[Nov.] 23</td>
<td>Medulla Hist. Angl. 8o. let.</td>
<td>0 6 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Jan. 28 [1738]</td>
<td>Maittaire Dialecti Ling. Græc. 8o. G.†</td>
<td>0 6 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>[Feb. 3]</td>
<td>2 Pietas Oxon. in Obit. Carolinæ fol.</td>
<td>0 10 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>[Feb.] 6</td>
<td>Pietas Cantabr. in Fun. Carolinæ fol.</td>
<td>0 4 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>[Feb.] 9</td>
<td>Pietas Oxon. in Obit. Carolinæ, fol. (a 3d.)</td>
<td>0 5 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total (books only)</strong></td>
<td><strong>8 0 0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total charged (including stationery items)</strong></td>
<td><strong>8 13 4</strong></td>
<td><strong>7 13 10</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

64 An inventory of ‘Things sent from Tutherly [West Tytherley] to Oxford’ contains a list of these books. HRO, 5M50/2096/20.
65 Bill of Richard Clements, for Francis Whithed, 1737-1738. HRO, 5M50/2096/19.
66 Table 2, like Table 1, reproduces abbreviations which seem to indicate the condition of the books sold. Here, ‘let.’ may signify that the volume (or volumes) was lettered on the spine, and ‘G.’ may be an abbreviated form of ‘gilt’, indicating that the edges of the volume(s) were gilt or that the binding was decorated with gold tooling.
Clements’ bill seems not to have been settled by the time Francis left England on his Grand Tour at the end of the 1730s. The bookseller’s later negotiation of the payment may explain the rejected totals on this copy of the bill, and the similar crossing out of the three final items (for the sake of clarity, this has not been reproduced here).

Unlike its Eton precursor, this bill does not record the groundwork of Francis’s scholarship, but rather reveals the growing importance of taste in forming his library. It is true that two of the earliest purchases recorded on the bill – John Wallis’s late seventeenth-century logical textbook (3) and its successor, Isaac Watts’s Logick of 1726 (2) – show Francis gathering materials to tackle one element of the university curriculum. However, Francis’s bill does not reflect the breadth of the educational programme open to him at Oxford. It lists no standard texts in divinity or ethics, no classical authors besides the Greek poet Hesiod (5) and the Roman historian Velleius Paterculus (1). Instead, it reveals that in the summer of 1737 – Francis’s first as an undergraduate – he invested in a personal canon of English texts. His selection includes several classics of poetry and drama: a two-volume set of Paradise Lost and Paradise Regained (9), Ben Jonson’s plays (14) and the latest edition of Chaucer (4), commissioned and edited by scholars connected to Christ Church, Oxford, and gradually sold during the 1720s and 1730s to benefit the college building fund.67 Francis’s purchases also encompass more recent authors and literary forms. A nine-volume collection of the Whig Joseph Addison’s Works, travel writing and periodical journalism (10–13) is interestingly juxtaposed with a similar set of texts by the Tory satirist Jonathan Swift, including Gulliver’s Travels (8) and The Intelligencer (15), a Dublin paper produced by Swift and his friend Thomas Sheridan in 1728. Francis’s purchases in the middle of 1737 furnished his library with the best of modern literary culture, but he did not lose sight of the academic culture to which he

belonged. Early in 1738 he seems to have obtained multiple copies (18–20) of the newly printed Oxford and Cambridge tributes to Queen Caroline, who had died on 20 November 1737. Though he may not have kept them, these miscellanies are a reminder of the verse-making traditions which continued to shape the university’s communal identity and help undergraduates like Francis to form their taste.

Having adhered closely to the school’s intellectual programme in his Eton purchases, Francis invested heavily in assembling his own programme of reading as an Oxford undergraduate. In doing so, he continued to demonstrate a selective and largely practical approach to books, buying sets of related works and favouring recent, smartly printed editions. Half of the books that he is known to have purchased as an undergraduate can be identified as publications of the 1730s, if the correspondence of some of the items on Clements’ bill with lots in the sale catalogue of Alexander Thistlethwayte’s library is accepted. Francis gained a grounding in the best English authors, taking advantage of his freedom from the rigours of studying for a degree to obtain a collection of vernacular literature that is both chronologically wide-ranging and politically balanced. In Oxford, therefore, Francis’s books defined him not as merely a casual reader but rather as a man of taste.

This is a role whose social and cultural meanings evolved profoundly for Francis during what was in theory the third and last phase of his education – the Grand Tour. Francis’s travels in France and Italy kept him away from England throughout the best part of his twenties, and brought him into a cultured, strongly homosocial circle of Englishmen abroad which has been the subject of detailed scholarly reconstruction. George Rousseau has discussed the social and sexual dynamics of the Casa Manetti, the Florentine villa where Francis and his travelling companion John Chute remained for six years as guests of the British envoy Horace Mann, sharing the house from late 1739 until 1741 with
Horace Walpole and Thomas Gray. During the years of Francis’s residence, according to Rousseau, Mann presided over ‘a hothouse culture’ in which the circle’s neoclassical appreciation of art and antiquities was coloured by homoeroticism (p. 185). Francis also appears to have taken advantage of the more normative erotic freedoms of Italian life, and it was members of his old Florentine circle who took up the cause of his Italian mistress and daughter when payment of their annuities stalled in the 1750s. Florence thus gave Francis a more fluid social identity than he could enjoy in England, and this was inseparable from his cultural experience. In contrast to Oxford, where Francis’s social privileges are reflected in the predominance of English books among his purchases, the Italian city gave Francis a uniquely intimate and experimental perspective on classical culture.

Eleven of the twenty titles on Francis’s Oxford bill can also be found in White’s sale catalogue of Alexander Thistlethwayte’s library, making a convincing case that at least part of Francis’s student collection eventually passed into his brother’s hands.\(^6\) There is no equivalent record of Alexander Thistlethwayte’s dealings with Oxford booksellers, in the form of bills, accounts or personal notes in his books. However, it is possible to identify some of the books that Thistlethwayte bought as a student through his inscriptions. It has already been stated that thirty-nine books have come to light in the Winchester collection bearing Thistlethwayte’s undergraduate inscription, ‘E Libris Alex. Thistlethwayte è Coll. Wadh.’, and a further five have been discovered in the library of Wadham College. In four cases, the inscriptions are dated to 1735 or 1736, corroborating the assumption that Thistlethwayte stayed at Wadham for around eighteen months after matriculating in June 1735. Taken together, this assortment of forty-four books is unlikely to comprise all of the additions to Thistlethwayte’s undergraduate library. The

\(^6\) For details of the books listed on Clements’ bill and in White’s catalogue, see Appendix 8.
Winchester collection includes several standard university texts, such as the *Institutiones* of Justinian (in a 1710 edition) and Samuel von Pufendorf’s philosophical digest *De Officio Hominis et Civis* (first published in 1673); although these are without college inscriptions, it is more than likely that Thistlethwayte obtained them as resources for the study of jurisprudence.\(^6^9\) It is not possible, therefore, to build a complete picture of Alexander Thistlethwayte’s undergraduate book-buying, but the books which have been traced reveal a collector whose habits were both eclectic and conservative.\(^7^0\)

While his brother invested in a canon of texts that reflected his discrimination as a reader, Alexander Thistlethwayte formed a collection whose miscellaneous contents revealed him to be a consumer and custodian of European literary culture. One of his chief interests as an undergraduate seems to have been the neo-Latin poetry of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Europe; among the books that he acquired are a Plantin edition of the sacred and secular poems of Benedictus Arias Montanus, a Spanish biblical scholar (1527–1598) who had a distinguished association with the Plantin Press, and a London reprint of *Pia Hilaria*, a pedagogical collection of Latin poems by the Belgian Jesuit Angelin Gazet (1568–1653). Both of these books were published in the period between 1580 and 1700, and in fact more than three quarters of the eighty-five titles known to have been in Thistlethwayte’s undergraduate library also belong to this era. The weight of Thistlethwayte’s early investment in books was thus concentrated not on new titles and reliable reprints, but instead on collecting the literary heritage of the previous century. Sometimes this meant buying up the bibliographical legacy of a former member of Thistlethwayte’s university community, one who had also worked to conserve the literary past. This was the case when Thistlethwayte purchased books from the collection of the

---


\(^7^0\) Appendix 9 lists the forty-four books in which Thistlethwayte’s Wadham inscription has been found.
clergyman and Trinity College alumnus Richard Triplett (1671–1720). The previous chapter noted the strong probability that Thistlethwayte acquired all twenty-three during his time in Oxford, even though only seven Sammelbände bear his Wadham inscription. Six of these composite volumes contain an extensive archive of university miscellanies, gathering examples of this commemorative genre from its birth in 1587 to 1694 – a span that neatly mirrors the central focus of Thistlethwayte’s undergraduate collecting. Thistlethwayte recognised the significance of this compilation as a social register as well as a literary anthology, making occasional notes next to the names of contributors to record their later roles and publications. The present chapter has already described Thistlethwayte’s collecting as ‘conservative’, and this example is testament to the active sense in which this should be understood. Thistlethwayte’s investment in Triplett’s legacy shows that he was not just preoccupied by the past but also keen to take on the responsibility of preserving and recontextualising its cultural products.

The earliest publications which Thistlethwayte is known to have obtained as a student reveal a bibliophilic dimension to his interest in the printed products of early modern culture. They were gifted to him by Joseph Mede of Salisbury (b.1688/89), Thistlethwayte’s friend and kinsman (‘Amici et Cognati Mei’) according to the acknowledgement he wrote on the front endpaper of the volume. Mede’s gift was a Sammelband containing two incunables – editions of Virgil’s Bucolica and Georgica produced by the Dutch scholastic printer Richard Pafraet in the 1490s – and an edition of the Problemata Aristotelis printed in 1501. The combination of the Problemata, a popular collection of answers to natural and medical questions, with Virgil’s poetry of rural nature and man’s relationship to it has literary resonances, which lend the Sammelband a level of coherence beyond that gained from the near-contemporaneity of its

publications. Presenting the volume to Thistlethwayte, Mede appears to have recognised and encouraged in his younger friend an appreciation of specimens of early and fine printing, and several of Thistlethwayte’s other acquisitions reflect this; among them are two publications of the Plantin firm in Antwerp, and the sole Aldine edition of Venetiæ (1583), Germain Audebert’s poetic tribute to the home of the Aldine Press, Venice.

Thistlethwayte’s collection manifests his early enthusiasm for the book as cultural artefact, but it is also not without evidence of his attentiveness to the language and intertextuality of literary works. This evidence comes in the form of annotations. Thistlethwayte was by no means a habitual or systematic annotator, and the books that he owned more often than not display no markings attributable to him. However, as an undergraduate he did leave annotations in a number of his books, creating a pattern which enables us to map his interest in the literary exchanges of early modern culture. One of the literary forms which seems especially to have drawn Thistlethwayte’s critical attention is the Latin epigram. While an undergraduate, Thistlethwayte acquired an edition of the poems of Jean Jacques Boissard (?1533–1598), the French antiquary and emblematist, and made a detailed reading of the two collections of epigrams which it contains: the epigrams in ‘Liber Primus’ are marked throughout to highlight striking lines and poems, those in ‘Liber Secundus’ are numbered, and there are minor corrections in both books. Another of Thistlethwayte’s student acquisitions is the Scottish poet John Dunbar’s Epigrammaton (1616), containing six hundred and sixty epigrams dedicated in three divisions to James I, his son Charles and the future duke of Buckingham, George Villiers. Once again, it seems that Thistlethwayte explored the text with a critical eye, marking noteworthy epigrams with crosses, striking through others, and occasionally passing judgement in a marginal note. He crossed out, for instance, an epigram addressed to an abstruse poet (‘Ad
obscurum Poetam’), labelling it ‘a bad Copy of an Epigram of Scæ. Sammarhanus’.  

Though the manner of Thistlethwayte’s criticism is dismissive, its recognition of the influence of French poets such as Scévole de Sainte-Marthe (1536–1623) on Scottish epigram-writing is astute.

Thistlethwayte’s edition of the poems of Sainte-Marthe is not one of the books which carry his Wadham inscription, but his comment on Dunbar’s epigram indicates that it may well have been part of his undergraduate library.  

In this copy, now in the keeping of Winchester College, the text of Sainte-Marthe’s poems is marked with Thistlethwayte’s recognisable highlighting throughout; as well as underlining, vertical lines in the margins pick out notable blocks of text. The most interesting annotations, however, are marginal notes in the first thirty leaves of the book, each one simply calling attention to a ‘Simile’.

The only other book from Thistlethwayte’s collection in which a similar pattern of rhetorical labelling has been found is an edition of the poems of the Dutch scholar and man of letters Daniel Heinsius (1580–1655). Thistlethwayte obtained and inscribed this book as an undergraduate, and seems to have concentrated his attention on a sequence of nine of Heinsius’ odes and elegies, underlining heavily and noting ‘Simile’ repeatedly in the margins.  

This practice may have helped Thistlethwayte in the construction of his own Latin compositions, by marking out moments of rhetorical elaboration from their contexts in the poems that he read. It may alternatively reflect the emphasis placed by commonplacing critics such as Charles Gildon (whose Complete Art of Poetry was another of Thistlethwayte’s undergraduate purchases) on similes and imagery as

---

74 This sequence runs from ‘Ad Reinerum Bontium’ (p. 114) to ‘Elegia II.’ (pp. 133-34) in Daniel Heinsius, Poemata Latina et Graeca (Amsterdam: Jan Janssonius, 1649). Winchester College Fellows’ Library, Book No. 4837.
exemplary elements of poetic style. Whatever their purpose, it is significant that Thistlethwayte’s rhetorical glosses are attached to a sequence of Heinsius’ poems that includes a Pindaric ode on the death of Sainte-Marthe (‘Ode Pindarica, in obitum Scaevolæ Sammarthani, Galli’). By applying the same reading strategy to both Heinsius’ tribute and Sainte-Marthe’s poems, Thistlethwayte gave another glimpse of his alertness to the networks of influence within seventeenth-century humanist culture.

There is little unambiguous evidence that Alexander Thistlethwayte, like his brother, explored first-hand the European culture whose traditions of literature and learning were a focus of his collecting. The sale catalogue of Thistlethwayte’s library lists a French conversation manual (L’Art de Bien Parler François [sic] by Nicolas de La Touche) and several tourist guides to France, Holland and Italy. However, it is by no means certain that Thistlethwayte bought and used these books himself. They may belong to the collection which he inherited from his younger brother, who had been a Grand Tourist, or they may simply have been acquired by Thistlethwayte out of curiosity rather than as practical aids to foreign travel. The only firm indication thus far discovered that Thistlethwayte travelled abroad is an inscription in his copy of Jacques Tarteron’s French translation of Horace, published in Paris in 1740. Thistlethwayte noted on the front endpaper of this elegantly bound volume that it had cost him ‘2 Livres’; roughly

---


equivalent to 1s. 8d. in English money, the use of French currency reveals that Thistlethwayte bought the book abroad, most likely soon after its publication.77

Though it is apparent that Thistlethwayte visited France, the lack of evidence of more extensive travel is in keeping with the narrower horizons of his life before the premature death of his brother in 1751. Until that date, during his late teens and twenties, Thistlethwayte faced an unusual disparity as the elder son whose succession to the family property placed him in an obscurer station than that occupied by his younger brother, the inheritor of wealthy Hampshire estates. While Francis’s newly acquired means enabled him to complete his social formation abroad, Alexander’s education at home and at Wadham kept him in contact with his Wiltshire milieu and local mentors such as Joseph Mede. The expectations of Alexander’s social position aligned closely with his book-buying habits. During his time in education, Alexander’s collecting demonstrated the conservative instincts that would support his future social position. Investing first and foremost in books of the previous century, Alexander formed a collection that not only reflected his habits as a reader, but also represented cultural property to be preserved and enjoyed alongside his ancestral manors at Winterslow and elsewhere. This antiquarian interest in books is not one that his younger brother seems to have shared: Francis’s purchases before his departure on the Grand Tour were recent and accessible editions, acquired in the months of his initiation into communities of taste and learning at Eton and Oxford. Comparing the early phases of Alexander’s book-buying with his brother’s in the same period has revealed just how important books were in helping both young men to inhabit their social roles. Separated by good fortune, their diverging social paths provide a crucial context for understanding how Francis became a consumer of modern books, while Alexander developed into a collector with varied antiquarian and literary interests.

Books for Taste and Use: The Composition of Alexander Thistlethwayte’s Library

By the late 1760s, Thistlethwayte had amassed a library of at least eight and a half thousand volumes, if not substantially more. His collection represented a major investment in books both as cultural artefacts, exhibiting the best of European printing, and as sources of intellectual capital, affirming Thistlethwayte’s capacity for intelligent engagement with learned communities of all kinds. The following discussion assesses the strengths of Thistlethwayte’s library in both respects. Drawing on the 1772 sale catalogue to inform a comprehensive overview of his collection, it establishes Thistlethwayte not only as a gentleman of broad interests, but also as a bibliophile embracing the neoclassical values which governed the culture and economy of book-collecting in the middle of the eighteenth century.

In August 1772, the publisher and leading second-hand bookseller Benjamin White issued A Catalogue of the Library of Alexander Thistlethwayte, Esq; Late Knight of the Shire for the County of Hants; and of Various Other Valuable Collections of Books. White was, as J. E. Elliott observes, ‘one of the most prolific library brokers in the second half of the [eighteenth] century’. Between 1765, when he took over the business of John Whiston at Horace’s Head, and 1784, White issued thirty-eight fixed-price sale catalogues, advertising the books of (among others) Bishop John Thomas of Salisbury, the writer Joseph Spence, and the antiquary and naturalist William Borlase. These catalogues invariably obscure the provenance of the books they contain, subsuming the libraries of named collectors into ‘alphabetically ranked and generically organised listings’ which also include miscellaneous stock (Elliott, p. 361). The Thistlethwayte catalogue is

unnatural among White’s productions in foregrounding a single collection, the ‘Library of Alexander Thistlethwayte, Esq’, in its title. However, it too takes in ‘Various other valuable COLLECTIONS of BOOKS’ and describes many of its more recent titles as ‘new’: these books can be assumed to have been part of White’s recent stock, rather than among those he acquired from Thistlethwayte. Thistlethwayte’s library, therefore, was advertised to the public as the headline collection in a larger sale, and White’s catalogue is an overabundant representation of its contents. In other respects, however, the catalogue is likely to be deficient as a record of the books that Thistlethwayte left behind at his death. It is not known whether Thistlethwayte’s heirs reserved a share of his books for themselves before offering his library for sale. There is, furthermore, an unverifiable possibility that Thistlethwayte collected manuscripts as well as printed books, or art and antiquities to join the prints, drawings and books on antiquities (including such lavish works of scholarship as Bernard de Montfaucon’s illustrated encyclopaedia of 1719, *L’Antiquité Expliquée, et Répresentée en Figures*) in his library.  

Thistlethwayte’s library was many times smaller than the most spectacular printed collections of the eighteenth century, perhaps the greatest being that of Edward Harley (1689–1741), second earl of Oxford and patron of the arts, who amassed a collection of around 50,000 printed books and 350,000 pamphlets; following its posthumous disposal, parts of this collection were still coming to the market almost seven years after Harley’s death. The scale of Thistlethwayte’s collecting, though unable to bear comparison with Harleian extravagance, did surpass that of many contemporaries, including fellow donors such as Richard Hurd (1720–1808), Bishop of Worcester and literary scholar, who

---


80 The sale catalogue of Harley’s printed books is *Catalogus Bibliothecæ Harleianæ*, ed. by Samuel Johnson and others, 5 vols (London: Thomas Osborne, 1743-45).
bequeathed some 4000 books to his episcopal see, and Richard Warner (?1713–1775), botanist, Shakespeare enthusiast and Thistlethwayte’s contemporary at Wadham College, who entrusted his collection of over 4000 books to his alma mater. Size is not the only feature distinguishing these libraries from Thistlethwayte’s. The collections of learned professionals and scholars such as Hurd and Warner were working libraries, evolving to support their owners’ studies as well as reflecting their more general interests. Thistlethwayte’s, conversely, was a collector’s library, the product of no less serious bibliophilic interests but a more inclusive approach to print culture. Thistlethwayte’s collecting, moreover, developed within a specific social context whose contribution to shaping his book-collecting habits has already been emphasised. As neither an aristocrat nor a member of any profession, Thistlethwayte seems to have had no specialist interests and little first-hand experience of continental culture; as a gentleman, however, he acted as a patron and sponsor of learned men in both the arts and sciences, supporting his social associations with intellectual curiosity.

The posthumous sale of books from Thistlethwayte’s library occurred at the start of a decade in which new trends in valuing and collecting antiquarian books precipitated a period of profound change in the market. In the middle of the eighteenth century, the antiquarian trade tended to structure its prices according to the hierarchy of formats, with books in larger formats commanding higher prices. For collectors of the classical canon, moreover, the most highly prized editions, as Arnold Hunt explains, were those ‘produced by the scholar-printers of the early sixteenth century such as Aldus Manutius in Venice, Filippo di Giunta in Florence and Henri Estienne in Paris’ (p. 441). Towards the close of

---

the century, however, rarity and condition emerged as prime factors in determining prices, and ‘first editions began to be perceived as intrinsically desirable and preferable to later’ ones (Hunt, p. 439). The incipient reappraisal of *editiones principes* and the rarities of fifteenth-century printing inspired a major cultural acquisition as early as the 1750s, when the future George III began negotiations to buy the superb classical library of Joseph Smith (1674–1770), British consul at Venice. Smith’s collection, which was eventually acquired for the King’s Library in 1762, contained around 260 incunabula and a remarkable concentration of the earliest books printed in Italy.83

However, it was not until the 1770s that the *editiones principes* of Greek, Latin and Italian classics began to establish themselves at the top end of the market. The landmark sale in this regard, as Hunt has shown, was that of the books of Anthony Askew (1722–1774) in February 1775 (pp. 441-42). Askew was a physician who had studied in Holland and acquired many of the treasures of his collection of books, manuscripts and antiquities while travelling through southern Europe in his twenties.84 The auctioneers Baker and Leigh acclaimed his books as ‘the best, rarest and most valuable Collection of GREEK and LATIN BOOKS that were ever sold in England’, and their catalogue highlighted his numerous *editiones principes* and rare editions.85 The sale of Askew’s books raised almost £4000, and heralded a period in which the fashion for early printed editions drove prices to unprecedented heights.

Three years before the Askew sale, White registered the growing interest in the pioneers of printing in his catalogue of Thistlethwayte’s books. Unlike Baker and Leigh, White did not include notes on the rarity of the books listed, preferring to highlight the

---

best editions (‘edit. opt.’) and most elegant copies (‘exemp. nitidiss.’) in accordance with traditional standards of connoisseurship. However, White did identify three editiones principes of Greek texts in the catalogue, underlining Thistlethwayte’s credentials as a serious classical collector with an interest in incunabula. One of the editiones principes in the catalogue – an Aldine collection of Greek poetry printed in 1496 – contains the first printing of the poetic corpus ascribed to Theognis. Of the remaining two first editions, one is the editio princeps of Aristotle’s collected works, printed by Aldus Manutius in Venice between 1495 and 1498 (a ‘most handsome’ copy with illuminated initials sold for £17 at the sale of Askew’s books), and the other is the earliest printed edition of the Suda Greek lexicon, edited and published by the scholar Demetrios Chalcondylas in Milan in 1499. Thistlethwayte’s copy of the Suda, a text also known under the name of Suidas, is priced at £2 2s. in White’s catalogue. Askew’s copy, enriched with a goatskin binding and gilt leaves (‘compact. in corio turcico, cum foliis deuratis’) sold in 1775 for four times that amount, at £8 8s. Though Thistlethwayte’s copy might have realised a larger sum had it sold later in the decade, the gulf in monetary terms between the two reflects more than simply the rising commercial value of editiones principes. It is also revealing of Thistlethwayte’s inability to match the increasingly rigorous standards of bibliophilic culture in the last decades of the eighteenth century. The contents of Thistlethwayte’s donated collections consistently show that he did not commission fine

---

bindings to reify the cultural value of his rarer books, nor did he habitually acquire the best-preserved copies. Consequently, though it has not been traced, his copy of the *Suda* was probably inferior to Askew’s in both condition and binding. It also belonged to a comparatively small group of incunabula in Thistlethwayte’s library: in White’s catalogue and the Winchester benefaction, this study has identified a total of fourteen.

Like most collectors of his generation, Thistlethwayte appears not to have sought out *editiones principes* and the best-preserved fifteenth-century books for their own sake. Instead, in accordance with mid-century taste, he assembled a library whose bibliophilic interest lay chiefly in its concentration of fine early sixteenth-century books. Early Italian printing was represented pre-eminently by products of the Aldine Press, including such landmark editions as the earliest Aldine printing of Martial’s epigrams (1501) and that of Statius’ poems (1502).90 The most exquisite of Thistlethwayte’s Aldine possessions now traceable is an illuminated copy of the second Aldine edition (1513) of the neo-Latin poems of Joannes Jovianus Pontanus, preserved in the Fellows’ Library of Winchester College.91 The illuminated initials in this copy are characteristic of books from the library of the French diplomat, administrator and bibliophile Jean Grolier (1489/90–1565), and Grolier’s arms, sprouting curled stalks with strawberries on each side, are painted in the lower margin of the third printed page (Fig. 12).92 Besides the strong representation in Thistlethwayte’s library of Venetian printing from the Aldine era, there were also several

---


92 This book is not recorded in Gabriel Austin’s census of books owned by Grolier, *The Library of Jean Grolier: A Preliminary Catalogue* (New York: Grolier Club, 1971). Unfortunately its original binding has not survived; the present binding, in a seventeenth- or early eighteenth-century plain style, was almost certainly in place when Thistlethwayte obtained the book. Grolier’s copy of the first Aldine edition of Pontanus (1505), with similar illuminated initials and an emblematic device balancing his hand-painted arms, is described by Anthony Hobson in *Renaissance Book Collecting: Jean Grolier and Diego Hurtado de Mendoza, Their Books and Bindings* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), pp. 11-12.
exceptional examples of Roman printing from the same period; these included an extremely rare copy of *De Viridario Augustini Chigi* (1511), a poem in praise of the villa of one of Rome’s wealthiest residents, the financier and patron Agostino Chigi.⁹³ The last, and perhaps most abundant, concentration of fine Renaissance books in Thistlethwayte’s library comprises those printed in early sixteenth-century Paris; among these, editions issued by Robert Estienne and Simon de Colines – relatives and associates in learned printing from the 1520s onwards – are especially numerous.

Thistlethwayte’s education had focused in large part on absorbing classical culture and languages, and his collecting celebrated the achievements of humanist print culture in renovating classical texts and publishing contemporary neo-Latin works. In Thistlethwayte’s library, collectible editions and rarities from the first half of the sixteenth century formed the core of a larger classical collection, in which more recent traditions of poetry, scholarship and fine printing were represented in abundance. Thistlethwayte, as
we have seen, began to collect the neo-Latin literature of the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries at least as early as his university years, and this category of texts rivals French literature as one of the largest in his gift to Winchester College. One of the distinctions of this donated collection is the appearance of a number of small editions produced by the Elzevirs, a firm noted for the elegance of its printing in smaller formats; these include editions of early modern texts as diverse as the neo-Latin poems of Hadrianus Junius (1598), the diplomatic correspondence of Ogier Ghislain de Busbecq (1633), John Barclay’s satirical roman à clef Euphormionis Lusinini Satyricon (1637) and the poetic works of Anna Maria van Schurman (1650). Compared to the Latin tradition, classical Greek literature is a far smaller presence in Thistlethwayte’s collection as a whole, an imbalance which in part reflects the lesser vitality of Greek studies in education and scholarship before the second half of the eighteenth century. Nevertheless, it is notable that in White’s sale catalogue, Greek and Latin editions of Homer together amount to a total of forty-one volumes, worth £14 2s. at White’s prices. Though it is not certain that all of these books belonged to Thistlethwayte, the scale of his investment in the Homeric textual tradition, from the sixteenth century to a recent Foulis Press edition of the *Iliad* (1756), seems to have been considerable. Thistlethwayte had no specialist scholarly interest in the classics, his occasional annotations revealing rather a wide-ranging reader and verbal critic of Latin poetry in particular. However, the scale and quality of the collection he assembled would have held great interest for students of the classics, and it is conceivable that Thistlethwayte made it accessible to friends and visitors as a scholarly resource.

Besides the learned languages, Thistlethwayte’s collecting of Europe’s literary heritage embraced a number of modern foreign languages, the foremost of which, as might be expected, were French and Italian. Literature in Spanish and Dutch was represented in Thistlethwayte’s library by much smaller assortments of seventeenth-century works, while German literature was not represented at all. Broadly, therefore, the weighting of foreign languages in Thistlethwayte’s literary collection conforms to the strictures of neoclassical taste, by which ‘Italian literature tended to rank highest, followed by French, Spanish and other romance languages’, while the literature of the Germanic languages lagged behind in the critical regard ‘as being furthest from classical models’ (Hunt, p. 439). However, the ‘order of priorities’ that Hunt describes is in practice more tangled than he suggests: in Thistlethwayte’s case, his most substantial acquisition of foreign books makes clear that works from the less widely read Germanic literary traditions often circulated through the same channels and in the same transactions as texts in the romance languages. Thistlethwayte obtained the small number of Dutch books in his library along with one hundred Latin, Greek, French and Italian titles from the collection of Francis Mutel (1704/5–1740), a Hampshire clergyman of Huguenot descent. Mutel’s library, which is the subject of a case-study in the next part of this chapter, contained books owned by three generations of his family, many of which were brought from Holland during the family’s migrations in the wake of the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685. Thus, the Dutch books in Thistlethwayte’s collection point to more than simply a minor interest on his part in a language which remained in the shadow of other literary traditions. They also form part of the heritage of a local clergyman, the sale of whose collection to Thistlethwayte exemplifies the important role of French Protestant exiles in bringing continental taste to English collectors.\textsuperscript{95}

\textsuperscript{95} Giles Mandelbrote, ‘Personal Owners of Books’, pp. 184-85.
The only Germanic language to rival the coverage of continental traditions in Thistlethwayte’s literary collection is, of course, English. Here, as in all the other areas covered by his collecting, Thistlethwayte accumulated a mixture of ‘curious’ and ‘useful’ books, to adopt a distinction current in the language of late eighteenth-century book-collecting. The former category, encompassing rare and antiquarian books, has gaps that underscore the extent to which Thistlethwayte’s bibliophilic interests remained within the bounds of the classical canon. There are no editions of English texts printed before 1550 in Thistlethwayte’s collection, an absence in keeping with the fact that early English vernacular printing was a province of interest to specialist collectors only – such as the tradesman John Ratcliffe (1707–1776) and the bibliographer William Herbert (1718–1795) – before the end of the eighteenth century (Hunt, p. 447). One of the earliest English books in Thistlethwayte’s collection is a translation of a classical original – the pioneering translation of the poetry of Horace by Thomas Drant, published in 1567 – and Thistlethwayte also owned a copy of the lavish first edition of John Harington’s translation of the Italian Renaissance epic *Orlando Furioso* (1591).96 His selection of sixteenth-century English books thus contains some of the earliest vernacular appropriations of continental literary culture.

Besides this neoclassical influence, the strongest motive governing Thistlethwayte’s English collecting seems to have been an interest in the history of his native Britain. Thistlethwayte assembled a fine collection of late sixteenth- and seventeenth-century literature that included many of the major publications of the Jacobean and Caroline eras, such as Ben Jonson’s folio Workes of 1616, the Second Folio of Shakespeare (1632), the Protestant poet George Wither’s *Collection of Emblemes* (1635) and Michael Drayton’s

---

British epic *Poly-Olbion* (the first part published in 1612). Drayton’s poem belongs to a tradition of epic writing about the origins and history of the nation which is strongly represented in Thistlethwayte’s collection. Thistlethwayte owned two editions of William Warner’s influential poem *Albions England. Or Historicall Map of the Same Island* (the first four books printed in 1586). He also owned copies of two Jacobean reinventions of the historical poem, the dramatist Thomas Heywood’s *Troia Britanica* (1609), a compendium of history from the beginnings of creation to contemporary Britain, and William Slatyer’s *History of Great Britanie* (1621) in Latin and English verse, also known according to its running title as *Palæ-Albion*. In addition to poems exploring the state of the nation, Thistlethwayte collected a substantial body of prose writings offering new visions of Britain for the Stuart era. These included a number of prose histories (most notably a posthumous 1632 edition of John Speed’s *Historie of Great Britaine*), essays on government, treatises celebrating the peace and security of the Jacobean regime, and a 1604 genealogy of James I showing ‘his lineall descent from Noah, by diuers direct lynes to Brutus, first Inhabiter of this Ile of Brittayne’, and ultimately to the present royal line.

History is a subject of major importance in Thistlethwayte’s library, and the

---


historical consciousness of late sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century England is a topic in which his collecting excelled. Correspondingly, Thistlethwayte’s collection of the literature of the period, though relatively short on religious and lyric poetry, has a concentration of longer works that engage with English history and the revival of British identity under the Stuarts.

Thistlethwayte’s antiquarian interests are balanced by the strengths of his collection in eighteenth-century English texts, especially those published before 1750. Besides the predominantly poetic works preserved in his donation to Winchester College, Thistlethwayte’s collection also included some fiction, as an examination of White’s sale catalogue reveals. Several of the more recent prose titles in the catalogue – among them editions of novels by Fielding and Richardson – are described as ‘new’, a label which identifies them as items from White’s existing stock, rather than from Thistlethwayte’s collection. The remaining titles are more than likely – although not certain – to have belonged to Thistlethwayte, and among these is a group of texts which foregrounds the probable influence of Thistlethwayte’s family on his legacy as a book-collector. This is a sizeable assortment of popular fiction, in which the preponderance of female authors and subjects makes it more likely that these texts were read by Thistlethwayte’s wife and daughters than by Thistlethwayte himself. White’s catalogue contains novels by the early innovators of eighteenth-century prose fiction, including Daniel Defoe, Eliza Haywood and Penelope Aubin, alongside *romans à clef*, scandal memoirs and translations of French fictions. A translation of Pierre de Marivaux’s novel of female sensibility, *La Vie de Marianne* (1736), for example, is listed along with its successor, Samuel Richardson’s epistolary sensation *Pamela* (White’s catalogue lists the ‘sixth edition’ of 1742).  

---

102 Pierre Carlet de Chamblain de Marivaux, *The Life of Marianne: Or, the Adventures of the Countess of***, translator unnamed, 3 vols (London: Charles Davis, 1736-1742), and Samuel Richardson, *Pamela: Or,*
titles represent only a fraction of the reading material in Thistlethwayte’s collection that might have captured the interest of the girls and women in his household. Jacqueline Pearson has noted that the cultural anxieties surrounding women’s imaginative reading in this period were relaxed in regard to informative reading, and genteel women were expected to develop interests in ‘history, geography, travel-writing, manuals on household skills, literary criticism and some kinds of science’, such as natural history. Thistlethwayte’s shelves were certainly well stocked with books in most of these areas, and the religious dimension of women’s reading was also well catered for: in White’s catalogue, the section devoted to ‘Sermons’ contains 121 lots (excluding those described as ‘new’ or partially bound, which are probably from stock), and among the devotional books in the catalogue are works by female authors such as Elizabeth Burnet and Elizabeth Rowe. Though nothing is known about the domestic organisation of Thistlethwayte’s collection, it is reasonable to speculate that some, if not all, of the books in the subject areas just mentioned were accessible to the whole family in their shared living space. The range of subjects represented is thus an important reminder not just of Thistlethwayte’s own intellectual horizons, but also of a domestic readership whose interests helped to furnish his house with books.

Thistlethwayte’s household may have helped foster the diversity of his collection; however, the depth of the collection within a number of subject areas is more closely connected to his public roles as a patron and sponsor of learning. Besides classics and

---

_Virtue Rewarded_, 4 vols (London: S. Richardson, 1742), are Lots 5699 and 5737 respectively in White, _A Catalogue of the Library of Alexander Thistlethwayte_, pp. 165, 166.


secular history, one of the subjects most extensively covered in Thistlethwayte’s library is religion: books on faith and the church make up a significant part of Thistlethwayte’s donation to Wadham College, and there are close to one thousand religious titles in White’s sale catalogue. Thistlethwayte conspicuously chose not to dedicate these books to reinforcing his relationship with Winchester College, but his religious collection nevertheless signals his closeness to the intellectual culture of the church. Thistlethwayte was a landlord and patron of church livings, acting from the 1750s on in association with Winchester College. Records from the 1750s show that Thistlethwayte and the College jointly administered leases of the rectories and parsonages of Portsea and Portsmouth. Furthermore, in 1768 – one year after his donation to the Fellows’ Library – Thistlethwayte acted as patron in the appointment of John Taylor (d.1777), a Fellow of the College, to Widley rectory and Wymering vicarage, in the vicinity of his Southwick seat; the appointment was made, according to church records, following the College’s nomination of four of its fellows.

Given their shared dealings with the church, it is perhaps surprising that Winchester College received only a small selection of religious books from Thistlethwayte’s library, among them poetic paraphrases of the Psalms and Latin treatises by the seventeenth-century churchman Thomas Gataker. That Thistlethwayte designed his donation to shore up the literary foundations of the school’s curriculum, rather than support its relationship with the religious establishment, is a decision which will be examined in the closing chapter. For now, it seems that preservation was the guiding principle in Thistlethwayte’s religious collection. The collection as a whole is distinctly old: of the books in White’s sale catalogue that probably belonged to Thistlethwayte (having no notes highlighting

105 HRO, 4M53/51/9-12; 4M53/72/1-8; 4M53/77/2-3.
‘new’ or ‘neat’ condition, or partial binding), only 121 were printed in 1740 or later. Thistlethwayte may have inherited many of these books from his father or his brother Francis (the library of his uncle Robert, the Warden of Wadham College, was passed down to his youngest brother). He may also have acquired a large number of older titles through bulk purchases from the libraries of clergymen, as he is known to have done in the case of Francis Mutel, underlining the importance of the intellectual network of the church in feeding Thistlethwayte’s book-collecting.

While his filial inheritance of 1751 added to Thistlethwayte’s responsibilities as a landowning gentleman, it also introduced him to the London ‘High Life’ as one of Hampshire’s parliamentary representatives. Thistlethwayte reflected disdainfully on this ‘scene of Nonsense’ in a letter of 1761, already quoted, but his experience of London’s fashionable sociability was not without a solid intellectual dimension. On 21 April 1757, during his second term in Parliament, Thistlethwayte was elected a Fellow of the Royal Society. While his political office and social privilege certainly opened the door to membership of the Society, Thistlethwayte’s status alone was not enough to secure admission; as Richard Sorrenson points out, ‘most election certificates opened with the phrase, “a gentleman well versed in… most branches of curious and natural learning,’” and prospective Fellows needed to be able to demonstrate more than a casual interest in and aptitude for the natural philosophy to be accepted. For Thistlethwayte’s part, the evidence of his book-collecting indicates that he was familiar with most branches of the natural philosophy, and that he retained an interest in the latest publications even after his renunciation of the London social scene. There are nearly two hundred of Thistlethwayte’s books in the science collection of Wadham College library, and many
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107 Blakiston, ‘Winchester College Library’, p. 35.
more are listed in White’s catalogue. Though most of the more recent titles in this catalogue are advertised as ‘new’ or awaiting binding, there is a notable assortment of books from the 1760s which are likely to have come from Thistlethwayte’s library, including first editions of new works in pharmacology (William Lewis’s *Experimental History of the Materia Medica* of 1761), natural history (a translation of the Swedish naturalist Fredrik Hasselquist’s travel journal, published in 1766) and physics (Joseph Priestley’s *History and Present State of Electricity* of 1767).  

Finally, while Thistlethwayte’s books offered diversion, edification and a tangible connection to cultural traditions, some also offered more practical guidance on how to manage his everyday affairs. White’s sale catalogue reveals that Thistlethwayte’s library probably contained a large number of titles designed to assist gentlemen and country landowners in running their estates and transacting business: the catalogue lists works on agricultural husbandry and farriery, alongside practical guides to land surveying, quantity surveying and architecture. In matters of finance, Thistlethwayte appears to have had a similar array of tools to hand: among the books in White’s catalogue which probably belonged to him are accounting manuals, guides to the value of stocks and annuities, and tables of interest. A copy of George Mabbut’s *Tables for Renewing and Purchasing the Leases of Cathedral-Churches and Colleges, according to the several Rates of Interest* (‘seventh edition’, 1758) may have been of particular use to Thistlethwayte in his dealings with Winchester College over the leasing of church properties.

---


110 George Mabbut, *Sir Isaac Newton’s Tables for Renewing and Purchasing the Leases of Cathedral-Churches and Colleges, according to the several Rates of Interest* (London: Thomas Astley, 1758) is Lot
There is, however, a notable absence of legal digests from Thistlethwayte’s collection of reference tools, and this corresponds to a broader neglect of the law in Thistlethwayte’s library as a whole: coverage of the subject is limited to the legal scholarship of the seventeenth-century jurists Francis Bacon and John Selden, and various works of legal philosophy (including Montesquieu’s *De l’Esprit des Lois*, originally published in 1748), with few further titles on the substance and institutions of English law. In his everyday affairs, it appears that Thistlethwayte relied on the legal expertise of an attorney, whose interference in the latter stages of canvassing prior to the election of 1761 was resented by the rival candidate Legge: on 5 April, three days before the vote, Legge wrote to Newcastle alleging that

> [Thistlethwayte] receiv’d your letter but it past thrô the hands of his evil genius the Attorney who governs him & who reported in the Country because it was a letter of yours that it meant encouragement in direct contradiction to the contents, thô the County are now thoroughly undeceiv’d[.]"  

If Thistlethwayte did indeed allow himself to be ‘governed’ by his attorney in personal matters, as Legge insinuates, he would probably have had little use for legal handbooks. In regard to the law of the land, moreover, it seems that although Thistlethwayte had a stake in the legislature during his decade as an MP, he was less interested in the statutes than in the history and workings of constitutional government. Thistlethwayte’s early initiation into the legal community of Lincoln’s Inn makes his neglect of the law somewhat surprising; however, it is in keeping with his inactivity in Parliament, and indicates that in his political life, as in other areas, Thistlethwayte may have had a keener sense of the traditions associated with his role than he did a grasp of its practical business.

---

Though Thistlethwayte’s books and the sale catalogue of his library together tell the story of the social evolution of his collecting, the picture of Thistlethwayte’s dealings as a book-buyer remains elusive. The most significant gap in the evidence concerns Thistlethwayte’s contact with the thriving auction trade in books. During his lifetime, the sale of books at auction – a commercial mechanism that the London book trade adopted in the last quarter of the seventeenth century – established itself at the centre of an expanding consumer network, and the sale of extraordinary collections tended to change the pattern of consumer demand while ushering in new collecting fashions.\textsuperscript{113} In the 1750s, while Thistlethwayte enjoyed the high living of an MP in London, there were several major book auctions in the capital: the library of the physician Richard Mead went under the hammer in November 1754 and April 1755, and the printed collections of Richard Rawlinson, Nonjuring churchman and Bodleian Library benefactor, were dispersed in March 1757.\textsuperscript{114} However, the complete absence of contemporary auction catalogues from Thistlethwayte’s library leaves his interest in such sales in doubt. This is only amplified by the three books in Thistlethwayte’s collection whose provenance is traceable to auctioned libraries, namely those of the Huguenot scholar Michael Maittaire (1668–1747) and the religious controversialist John Jackson (1686–1763); all three books were almost certainly bought by Thistlethwayte through the second-hand trade, not in the saleroom.\textsuperscript{115}


\textsuperscript{115} First, Thistlethwayte donated two books to Winchester College Fellows’ Library which have Maittaire’s name written inside. One is a copy of Jacques de Vintimille, \textit{Macuti Pomponii Senatoris Dijonensis Monumentum} (Paris: Fédéric Morel, 1580), with ‘Mr Maittaire’ written on the front endpaper. Fellows’ Library, Book No. 9880. The other is a copy of Abel de Sainte-Marthe, \textit{Panegyricus Ludovico XIII Regi
While the extent of Thistlethwayte’s interaction with the growing trade network of auctioneers and agents remains hidden, there are clear indications that Thistlethwayte was quick to take advantage of local contacts in order to expand his library. The previous chapter discussed his acquisition of books from the collection of the Wiltshire clergyman and Oxford alumnus Richard Triplett, making the case that it was soon after Thistlethwayte’s arrival in Oxford in 1735 that he purchased Triplett’s books through the local second-hand market. This case-study brings to light the largest second-hand purchase that Thistlethwayte is known to have made, and another example of his interest in clerical libraries marketed locally. In 1740 or after, Thistlethwayte acquired books from the library of Francis Mutel (1704/5–1740), a native of Thistlethwayte’s home county of Wiltshire, and a parish priest in northern Hampshire from 1733 until his death. Francis’s father and grandfather were French Huguenots who escaped France following the official abandonment of religious toleration in 1685, and found refuge in the Dutch Republic before migrating to England in the 1690s. Their books, including a notable assortment of Dutch titles, were passed down to Francis over the years and preserved in a library which became a storehouse of the family’s Protestant intellectual heritage.

140 volumes formerly owned by the Mutels have been identified in the libraries of Winchester College and Wadham College, each one carrying the signature of one or more generations of the family. Though a large number, it is almost certain that these volumes do not represent the whole of the collection that Thistlethwayte acquired from Francis Mutel. Some of the Mutels’ books were no doubt dispersed in the posthumous sale of Thistlethwayte’s library; within the Winchester and Wadham collections, moreover, it is

---

likely that further comparison of bindings and marks of ownership would add a significant number of new books to the Mutel legacy. However, even with these qualifications, the collection that has so far emerged opens a window on to the lives of a hitherto unresearched Huguenot family. This case-study traces their progress from religious exile to cultured Anglicanism, a journey made possible by their involvement in the international Protestant community.

François Mutel, pastor of the Reformed church at Coucy-la-Ville, around seventy-five miles north-east of Paris, had been a minister in the region for at least two decades before the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes on 22 October 1685 outlawed Protestant worship in France. In the aftermath, François lost not only the freedom of his native realm, but also the guardianship of his family. The terms of the Revocation gave Huguenot pastors a fortnight’s interval in which to embrace the Catholic faith or leave the kingdom, and François travelled to Paris with his wife, his seventeen-year-old son Charles and his sixteen-year-old daughter Susanne to prepare for exile. In the city, however, he was incapacitated by illness, and although the authorities granted him a further eight days to comply with the Edict, his children and the family’s serving-woman were taken into custody. François himself eventually found refuge in the United Provinces, where in 1686 he was one of the 202 Huguenot refugee ministers present at the Rotterdam synod of the Walloon Church, the French-speaking Reformed church in which Protestant exiles in the Netherlands had worshipped for over a century. François’s son Charles was able to join him in the United Provinces, but his daughter Susanne was not so fortunate:

---

116 François Mutel was serving as pastor of the Reformed church in Vouël, in the department of Aisne, in 1665; by 1677 he had moved to nearby Coucy-la-Ville. O. Douen, Essai Historique sur les Églises Réformées du Département de l’Aisne (Quincy: chez l’auteur, 1860), pp. 58, 60.


118 Douen, Essai Historique, p. 85.
Sa fille Susanne, travestie en Suisse, essaya de gagner la frontière avec un guide suisse nommé Stoudal; elle fut arrêtée à Bondy le 18 avril 1686, mise le 1er mai au Grand-Châtelet, où on l’inscrivit comme ayant fait abjuration [...], et transférée, par ordre du 16, aux Nouvelles-Catholiques, où elle se trouvait encore le 23 juillet 1687[.]

[His daughter Susanne, disguised as a Swiss, tried to reach the border with a Swiss guide called Stoudal; she was arrested at Bondy on 18 April 1686, sent on the 1st May to the Grand Châtelet [a Parisian complex of courts and prisons], where she was registered as having abjured, and transferred, by an order of 16th, to the Nouvelles Catholiques [a sisterhood dedicated to housing female Protestant converts], where she found herself still on 23 July 1687.]

Following her conversion under duress, no more is known of Susanne’s fate, or her mother’s.

François settled in Dordrecht, where he can be assumed to have continued his Protestant ministry in the Walloon Church. In the early years of his exile, he managed to sustain two of his closest relationships, and in the process to maintain contact with some of the more heterodox and international currents of thought and belief in the Protestant world. First, in 1689, François gave his son a collection of sermons by the Dutch Protestant minister and historian Geeraerdt Brandt (1626–1685), a supporter of an Amsterdam-based Arminian tradition whose influence was resisted by the theological conservatism of the Walloon Church. The copy gifted by François is now in the library of Wadham College, and bears the following donor’s inscription:

Franciscus Mutel me emit Dordraci, anno 1689. donoque dedit Carissimo filio suo Carolo Theophilo Mutel; Cui, utinam affatim, et in omnibus cumulatissimè benedicat Deus omnis bona donationis author.

[François Mutel bought me at Dordrecht, in the year 1689, and gave me as a gift to his dearest son Charles Theophilus Mutel; in which – if only it were

119 Douen, La Révocation de l’Édit de Nantes, II, p. 10; my translation.
enough! – and in all things may God, the originator of gifts, most benevolently bless all his goods.\footnote{Geeraerdt Brandt, \textit{XXXII Predikatien over Verscheyde Texten der Heilige Schriftuure} (Rotterdam: Barent Bos, 1685). Wadham College Library, shelf-mark G17.20. The translation of François’s inscription is mine.}

The book in which this benediction appears is the only one in which unambiguous evidence of François’s ownership has been found. If, as is probable, many of François’s books passed to his son on his death, his personal collection is no longer distinguishable within the family legacy that forms such a large part of Thistlethwayte’s donations to learned libraries.

Secondly, François maintained an active connection with Huguenot intellectual circles through his friendship with Huguenot expatriate Jean Rou. Rou (1638–1711) had been a lawyer at the Parlement of Paris, where he and François probably met, before charges of anti-Catholicism brought against his series of chronological tables, \textit{Histoire Universelle Moderne} (1672–75), led him to take up employment abroad as a tutor. Settling at The Hague in 1680, Rou became a sponsor of Huguenot intellectual networks in the United Provinces, participating among his other engagements in the activities of the Féauté, a ‘French-oriented literary club’ which brought together pastors and men of letters to discuss theology, philosophy and literature (Cerny, p. 91). In his memoirs, Rou described François Mutel as ‘le plus ancien de mes amis, […] avec qui j’ai toujours eu un assez grand commerce’.\footnote{‘The oldest of my friends, with whom I have always had plenty of exchanges’. Jean Rou, \textit{Mémoires Inédits et Opuscules}, ed. by Francis Waddington, 2 vols (Paris: Agence Centrale de la Société de l’Histoire du Protestantisme Français, 1857), I, p. 295.} Though the two men may have lived at too great a distance to meet regularly in Holland, they appear to have sustained a lively, learned correspondence dealing with topics that were undoubtedly of interest to the Féauté. The sole surviving part of this correspondence is an exchange reproduced by Rou in his memoirs. In a letter
of 3 July 1690, François took his friend to task for characterising his appraisal of Rou’s latest writings as ‘honnête flatterie’, and highlighted a semantic error to prove his point:

[A]fin de vous faire mieux voir que ce n’est pas trop mon humeur d’encenser les gens à tout propos, lisez ces lignes: Prenez garde, mon cher Monsieur, que vous, qui accusez les autres si aisément de mauvais gout, ne vous fassiez à la cour une affaire considerable, de parler si basement que vous faites de ce qui se sert pour être présenté devant la première et la meilleure reine du monde. Dites-moi encore, je vous prie, si votre palais est fort fin lorsque vous prenez de l’ambrosie pour du nectar. Nous autres, qui ne sommes nullement poëtes, y mettions toujours quelque petite différence; et j’avois cru, en mon particulier bonnement, avec le bonhomme Homère au livre IV de l’Iliade et au Ve de l’Odyssée que la première de ces deux choses étoit le manger des dieux, et la seconde leur breuvage qui leur étoit versé par Hébé. Je vous supplie de m’apprendre si je me trompe, et je vous en remercierai de tout mon cœur, comme je le fais dès à present de la grâce que vous avez bien voulu me faire de me communiquer vos belles productions, et de me continuer votre précieuse bienveillance.

[In order to make clearer to you that I am not much disposed to praise people for any and all reason, read these lines: take care, my dear sir, that you, who accuse others so easily of poor taste, do not provoke a considerable outcry at court, by speaking as basely as you do of that which is served in order to be presented before the first and best queen in the world. Tell me also, I pray you, whether your palate is very fine when you take ambrosia for nectar. The rest of us, who are not at all poets, always allowed some small difference there; and I believed, quite honestly for myself, with the old fellow Homer in Book IV of the Iliad and in the 5th of the Odyssey that the first of these two things was the food of the gods, and the second their beverage which was poured for them by Hebe. I beg you to let me know if I am mistaken, and I will thank you with all my heart, as I do already for the favour that you have deigned to do me in sending me your handsome productions, and in carrying on your precious kindness to me.] (Rou, I, pp. 295-96; my translation)

Beneath the ironic superlatives of François’s reference to ‘la première et la meilleure reine du monde’, Rou may have discerned an allusion to Mary II, who had held court in The Hague as Princess of Orange, and in the summer of 1690 was queen regnant in England while her husband William III was away on campaign. Such glancing awareness of the growth of Protestant interests on the international stage, along with the free and honest exchange of ideas, brings what is known of François’s correspondence with Rou into the
sphere of the late seventeenth-century Republic of Letters, an ‘international, inter-confessional, and democratic’ network of information exchange and collaboration (Cerny, p. 92). Whatever other friendships François cultivated during this period, his longstanding intimacy with Rou was clearly a constant and familiar source of intellectual stimulation in his Dutch exile.

While François participated in a community of learning outside the academy, his son Charles became a student at the University of Groningen in the early 1690s or before. Though no traces of the social connections which Charles made during this period have survived, it appears that by the mid-1690s he had come into contact with a distinguished Anglo-European circle, gaining a foreign patron whose support would change the course of both his and his father’s lives. One clue to the beginnings of this connection appears among the contents of Charles’s student library. Charles compiled a handlist of the books that he had gathered together at Groningen in the flyleaves of a bilingual French-Flemish dictionary, now at Wadham College.123 Headed ‘Catalogus Librorum, Caroli Thophilii Mutel Philosophiae Studiosi Groningæ’, the list is dominated by theology, classics and neo-Latin epistolary writing, reflecting the traditional demands of the university curriculum.124 The list indicates, furthermore, that Charles had an interest in new developments in the international scholarly community: among its most recent titles is the Nouvelles de la République des Lettres, a pioneering review journal established in 1684 by the Rotterdam Huguenot philosopher Pierre Bayle.

In Rotterdam, home to a thriving Huguenot community, Bayle enjoyed not only the intercourse of the Republic of Letters, but also the sociability of a number of local

---

124 See Appendix 10 for a full transcription of Charles’s booklist.
intellectual clubs and associations. He was an occasional visitor to the Lantern Club, a cosmopolitan ‘circle of literary figures, religious mystics and scholars, radical politicians, and professional men’ created and hosted in the city by the English Quaker merchant Benjamin Furly (Cerny, pp. 89-92). Furly opened his house and library to English travellers, including the Whig Anthony Ashley Cooper, third earl of Shaftesbury, and political exiles, among them the philosopher John Locke. Furly’s Lantern Club, a forum of liberal thought, was also instrumental in introducing Bayle and other Huguenot refugee intellectuals, such as the pastor Jacques Basnage, to the Whig churchman and historian Gilbert Burnet. Burnet (1643–1715) had taken refuge on the continent in the spring of 1685 in the hope of quashing any suspicion of his involvement in fomenting rebellion against James II.\footnote{Martin Greig, ‘Burnet, Gilbert (1643–1715)’, in Oxford Dictionary of National Biography <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/4061> [accessed 2 July 2013].}

He spent more than two years at The Hague, gaining the favour of William and Mary, and on his return to England he remained an active collaborator and patron of Huguenot exiles. Bayle’s periodical, the Nouvelles de la République des Lettres, carried a total of ten notices or articles relating to Burnet’s writings from November 1685 to December 1688, and it may have been these that gave Charles Mutel his earliest acquaintance with the English churchman.\footnote{Hendrika Johanna Reesink, L’Angleterre et la Littérature Anglaise dans les Trois Plus Anciens Périodiques Français de Hollande de 1684 à 1709 (Paris: H. Champion, 1931; repr. Geneva: Slatkine, 1971), pp. 172-73.}

It is also conceivable that François Mutel’s attachment to Jean Rou brought him and his son Charles into the social milieu of The Hague, where they may have encountered Burnet during roughly the same period.

The immediate social context of their meeting may be impossible to accurately reconstruct, but Charles’s relationship with Burnet was without doubt the most transformative of his life. The energetic bishop of Salisbury probably gave Charles his incentive to end a decade of residence in the United Provinces and migrate to England,
where Burnet appointed him vicar of Potterne, a Wiltshire manor under his episcopal lordship, on 6 May 1696. It is not known whether this was the beginning of Charles’s clerical vocation, or whether re-ordination in the Church of England preceded his appointment; it is clear, however, that Burnet’s patronage extended further than simply establishing Charles as a rural servant of the Church. In 1700, the Huguenot minister acknowledged a debt of gratitude to Burnet for ‘the benefit of your Example and Instructions, which I have enjoyed several Years in your Family’. His attachment to Burnet’s household, possibly as a chaplain or a tutor to the bishop’s young sons, ensured that he remained at the centre of an international Protestant community whose members shared and promoted each other’s work. First, Charles claimed to enjoy ‘some share in [the] Friendship’ of the Swiss Reformed pastor Jean Frédéric Ostervald (1663–1747), the author of a lengthy treatise on the failure of practical Christianity to improve moral behaviour, *Traité des Sources de la Corruption qui Règne Aujourd’hui parmi les Chrestiens* (1700). Burnet commissioned Charles Mutel to produce an English translation of Ostervald’s treatise, and this version appeared in London in the same year as the first printing of the original in Amsterdam. The near-simultaneous nature of these print publications makes it extremely likely that Charles’s translation was done from an early manuscript copy, obtained either directly from the author or through Dutch Protestant networks. Secondly, Charles’s close association with Burnet may have resulted in encounters with some of the other continental Protestants whom the bishop met and supported in England; these included Michel Le Vassor, a French convert to Protestantism.

——

whose *Traité de la Maniere d’Examiner les Differens de Religion* (1697), on the study of religious controversies, is among the books bearing Charles’s signature at Wadham College.\(^{131}\)

Though Charles’s relocation to England seems to have amplified his role in the international Protestant community, the fact remains that in embracing a new Anglican vocation he distanced himself from both the local centres of Huguenot refuge and the Calvinist traditions of his earlier religious life. The unwillingness of many Huguenot immigrants to follow this conformist path is exemplified by the ongoing ministry of Charles’s father. François Mutel appears to have followed his son to England, where he settled among the growing concentration of Huguenot congregations – many of them retaining French Calvinist forms of worship – in London’s West End.\(^ {132}\) In 1697, he was registered as a minister at the French non-conformist churches in Glasshouse Street and Leicester Fields, near Westminster.\(^ {133}\) His last appearance in church records, in 1699, saw him in attendance at the nearby conformist Swallow Street Church for the marriage of a couple from Picardy, the north-eastern region of France whereFrançois had ministered before the Revocation.\(^ {134}\) In a new country, moving into his second decade of exile, the contours ofFrançois’s social and religious life were still fundamentally shaped by his French heritage and identity.

While his father was one of many Huguenots who resisted assimilation, Charles negotiated a path from religious exile to Anglican conformity following his arrival in England. The books that have survived from Charles’s library provide insight into the practical and political dimensions of this negotiation. They reveal that in performing his pastoral duties Charles could draw on a sound cross-confessional grounding in Christian apologetics and devotional practice. He collected a range of handbooks in these areas, including a French translation of *Manuductio ad Cœlum* (1658), a popular manual of moral and spiritual advice compiled by the Italian cardinal Giovanni Bona, and the Huguenot pastor Charles Drelincourt’s collection of pious meditations, *Les Visites Charitables, ou les Consolations Chrétiennes* (first published in 1656). Charles’s learning and Huguenot background are more clearly reflected in his assortment of works relating to Protestant theories of church unity and the historiography of sectarian division. His interest in these topics may have deepened in the wake of his own experience of migrating from a Protestant refugee church to an established one. Charles’s collection included works by the Jesuit historian Louis Maimbourg, on the Iconoclast movement in eighth- and ninth-century Christendom, and one of his Huguenot adversaries, the theologian Pierre Jurieu, on ancient Jewish and Pagan religious practices. Charles also owned a Latin translation of Paolo Sarpi’s *Historia del Concilio Tridentino* (1619), a political analysis of the failure of the Council of Trent which David Wootton has described as ‘a continuing source of inspiration for those who were opposed to clerical interference in secular affairs, to religious persecution, and to doctrinal intolerance’.

---

135 Appendix 11 lists the books with Charles’s signature which have been discovered by this study.
Charles died in his Wiltshire parish in 1711, and was survived by his young son Francis. The first of the Mutels to be born in England, Francis initially followed a path typical of a son of the Anglican clergy. He attended Oxford University, taking his BA from Trinity College in 1725, and gained a foothold in the church as curate of West Knoyle, Wiltshire, two years later. However, Francis’s horizons soon broadened; like his father, he found a role in the cultural commerce between England and the continent. Since the late seventeenth century, some French Huguenots and their descendants had profited from their transnational existence by becoming professional agents of cultural exchange, taking on roles as translators, tutors, Grand Tour guides and foreign buyers. The nature of Francis’s role in this transnational context is open to speculation, but it is clear that in his twenties he embarked on a period of foreign travel, possibly as tutor or chaplain to an English traveller. In 1728 he was in Paris, according to the inscription in his copy of a calendar of saints’ lives (‘Fran: Mutel Paris 1728’ is noted on the title page). It may have been at this time that Francis attended the Sorbonne, recording his attachment to the College in his copy of an Italian compendium of trades and professions (‘Fran: Mutel E coll: Sorbonnico’). The Sorbonne was ‘the senior faculty for the study of theology in Europe’, and Francis appears to have resided as a guest of the society, attending its lectures and sermons. For a young curate, this was a privileged opportunity to gain further clerical training, as well as an understanding of the intellectual currents of the orthodox Catholic world.

138 Foster, 1715-1886, III, p. 1002. Francis’s appointment at West Knoyle is documented in Wiltshire and Swindon History Centre, D/1/14/1/7/161.
139 Mandelbrote, ‘Personal Owners of Books’, II, p. 188.
141 Tomaso Garzoni, La Piazza Universale di Tutte le Professioni del Mondo (Venice: Pietro Maria Bertano, 1638). Wadham College library, shelf-mark F27.18.
Francis left Paris before the end of the year, continuing his travels south to Italy. He visited Venice, making a note of his stay on the title page of his guide to the city (‘Fran: Mutel Venice 1728’), and it may have been at this time that he acquired a copy of the account of Italian society and culture authored by the native Protestant convert Gregorio Leti.  

Travelling on the Grand Tourist trail, Francis was exposed to the Tourist practice of collecting relics of foreign cultures, and a similar habit of collecting curious books and specimens of foreign literature is evident in the surviving portion of his library. Francis collected, for example, a small assortment of late seventeenth-century French plays and poetry, including an edition of the works of Nicolas Boileau-Despreaux, one of the era’s leading literary figures, and two plays representing the fashions of French comic theatre in the 1660s and 1670s. From the same period, Francis also acquired a copy of Louis de Gaya’s *Traité des Armes* (1678), a description of weapons and armour whose interest for an eighteenth-century clergyman probably lay less in the subject matter than in the numerous full-page illustrations which enliven the book. It is not certain that Francis bought any of these books abroad; nevertheless, it seems likely that his experience of cultural tourism encouraged him to develop stronger antiquarian and cosmopolitan tastes as a collector. It is notable that Francis’s books form a distinctly older collection than his father’s: whereas more than two thirds of the books inscribed by Charles were published during his lifetime, the same applies to less than one fifth of the books in which Francis wrote his name. Furthermore, Francis’s assortment of late seventeenth-century French literature indicates that, unlike his father, he found some value in engaging with the cultural legacy of the regime which exiled his family.

---


144 Books with Francis’s signature which have been found in Winchester and Wadham are listed in Appendix 11.
By 1730, Francis had returned to England and taken a new office as curate of Salisbury St Edmund.\(^{145}\) His move to the cathedral town may have brought him into the orbit of the Thistlethwaytes, if they and the Mutels had not already come to one another’s notice during the time that Charles spent with Bishop Burnet. Francis’s clerical career finally took him to the Hampshire parish of Hurstbourne Tarrant, where he served as vicar from 1733 until his death in the winter of 1740, apparently without heirs.\(^{146}\) He did, however, leave a library of great personal and cultural significance. In preserving his ancestors’ books alongside his own purchases, Francis reconciled the legacy of his family’s Protestant exile with that of his own travels in Catholic Europe. He also consolidated a significant migration of cultural property, taking ownership of a collection which had originated on the continent and eventually transplanting it to rural Hampshire. Both of these aspects of Francis’s library are likely to have captured Thistlethwayte’s interest, and it was probably not long after Francis’s death that Thistlethwayte acquired a portion of the library. The purchase ensured not only that many of the Mutels’ books remained together, but also that they remained part of the fabric of Hampshire’s cultural heritage.

The story of the formation of Thistlethwayte’s library has provided a new perspective on the intellectual life of late seventeenth- and early eighteenth-century Wiltshire and Hampshire, highlighting the ways in which these provincial communities profited from their exchanges with the continent. In the first place, the most privileged young men, such as Thistlethwayte’s brother Francis Whithed, travelled abroad to complete their education, and returned with the polish of worldly experience and the foundations of valuable


cultural collections. Secondly, the Mutels, part of a wider influx of Huguenot refugees in England, brought with them a network of international connections and an evolving relationship with Anglican orthodoxy. Thistlethwayte himself seems to have had little experience of foreign travel, but his library displays the profound importance of classical culture and its European legacy for a gentleman of means and education. Thistlethwayte’s purchases from local libraries such as the Mutels’, as well as his inheritance from Francis Whithed, show him taking advantage of his provincial station to fashion himself both as a collector of continental taste and interests, and as a preserver of his local cultural heritage.
CONCLUSION

FROM PRIVATE COLLECTING TO PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT:
THISTLETHWAYTE’S BOOKS AND THE FUTURE OF THE
FELLOWS’ LIBRARY

In December 1767, just months after the delivery of Thistlethwayte’s books, the
governing body of Winchester College recorded that its members had raised
supplementary funds for ‘the publick Library belonging to’ the school.¹ The designation
of the Fellows’ Library as a ‘publick’ collection reiterated the traditional understanding
that any learned visitor wishing to see the books could do so, and affirmed that the library
had a significant role to play in maintaining the school’s distinguished character as a seat
of learning. This final chapter considers how the Fellows’ Library’s approach to engaging
public audiences has changed since the time of Thistlethwayte’s donation, and identifies
key communities which could benefit from new approaches to sharing information and
expertise. It shows that in the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, despite the
transformative impact of Thistlethwayte’s donation on the cultural identity of the Fellows’
Library, few members of the learned community took advantage of the College’s open
invitation to explore its collections. By contrast, in more recent times the Fellows’
Library has actively worked to open up its collections to the academic community,
schools and the wider public, not least as a partner in the AHRC-funded research project
centred on this thesis. However, these initiatives have focused on extending and enriching
physical access to the books in the Fellows’ Library; this chapter in contrast considers

¹ Blakiston, ‘Winchester College Library’, p. 29.
networking and digital initiatives that could enable more open and informed interaction between the Fellows’ Library and its potential audiences.

The Fellows’ Library is not alone in recognising either the value of outreach or the challenge of digital access. It belongs to a rich landscape of distinctive collections in the UK, populated by independent libraries and by special collections connected to institutions including universities, colleges, church bodies, and museums and heritage organisations. These libraries differ in their access provisions, but share a responsibility for managing unique and historic collections which are housed separately from other institutional collections (where these exist) and are overseen by specialised services. A recent report by OCLC Research and RLUK found that the most pressing challenge for libraries of this type is outreach. With almost sixty per cent of libraries consulted disclosing a drop in overall funding in 2009-2010, there is an imperative to demonstrate the value of special collections as resources which can engage a range of audiences and contribute to the distinctive academic or cultural profile of their parent institutions (p. 30). However, the management of these collections places complex demands on limited staff, and ‘outreach work is time-consuming to promote, prepare and deliver’ (p. 84). Similarly, while there is ‘ubiquitous’ pressure to widen access to collections through large-scale digitisation, smaller institutions may find that such projects are impossible to fund and that the long-term benefits are uncertain (p. 18).

In February 2013, Winchester College hosted Unlocking the Private Library, a symposium organised in association with the present research project to bring together members of the various groups working in or engaging with distinctive collections.

---

Among the attendees were fifteen library representatives from across the sector surveyed by OCLC Research and RLUK, and many expressed an interest in participating in further discussions about managing access and public engagement; making contact with a broader network of libraries could provide the Fellows’ Library with new audiences and opportunities for collaborative working in the future. Furthermore, this chapter discusses a development which would have even greater impact on the Fellows’ Library’s role in the special collections community. Providing online access to the library’s catalogue records would give potential users and collaborators the digital tools to unlock new areas of interest within the collections.

**The Legacy of a Gentleman**

My research, as a later section of this chapter will explain, has updated the current catalogue of the Fellows’ Library to form an unprecedently accurate record of the books given by Alexander Thistlethwayte in 1767. However, there remains a puzzling discrepancy between the size of Thistlethwayte’s donation as recorded in this catalogue and as testified in the archival record. The Library Donations Book contains the following entry for Thistlethwayte’s gift: ‘Alexander Thistlethwayte Armiger. de Southwick in Agro Hantoniensi, Dedit [space] Volumina Poesin tum veterrimam tum recentiorem Græcè, Latinè, Anglicè, Gallicè, Italicè, Scriptam complectentia’ (‘Alexander Thistlethwayte Esq. of Southwick in the county of Hampshire, gave [?] volumes of poetry, some ancient, some more recent, written in languages including Greek, Latin, English, French, Italian’).³ The mystery created by the blank space where the number of volumes should be is only compounded by the later version of this record in the College Benefactors’ Book, compiled by former Fellow Charles Blackstone in 1784: Blackstone’s

entry states that Thistlethwayte ‘Sent from his own Library three thousand volumes of Poetry in most of the living and dead languages’. The current catalogue records a little over 1250 titles, probably making up around one thousand volumes. Of these, 559 volumes are listed in the late eighteenth-century manuscript catalogue of Thistlethwayte’s foreign-language books; the rest have Thistlethwayte’s bookplate (Figs 13 and 14) or signature to verify their provenance, and are mostly English books. Therefore, if Blackstone’s figure is correct, then almost two-thirds of the books sent by Thistlethwayte to the Fellows’ Library must have been lost or redistributed before any record was made, or must alternatively remain undocumented and invisible within the collections. Both of these possibilities are highly improbable. Blackstone’s ‘three thousand volumes’, if not a severely misconceived estimate, may instead recall a figure raised in negotiations between Thistlethwayte and the College prior to the settlement of the gift.

---

4 Charles Blackstone, ‘Benefactors who by their patronage, or donations, or both, have contributed to the foundation, endowment, improvement of the revenues, and support of the rights, of Winchester College: together with an account of their respective Benefactions’, fol. 117. Winchester College Muniments 23459.
The previous chapter established that Thistlethwayte’s donation of books to Winchester College heralded the renewal of long-standing ties between his family and the school. Thistlethwayte’s father and grandfather had been educated at the College, and in 1767 the library endowment distinguished the beginning of Thistlethwayte’s eldest nephew’s career at the school. There is now scope to explore the role of the College authorities in shaping Thistlethwayte’s intentions as a donor, and the key figure in this regard is the poet and literary critic Joseph Warton (1722–1800). In 1766, just one year before Thistlethwayte donated his collection of ‘Poetry in most of the living and dead languages’, Warton was appointed headmaster of Winchester College. He had previously served as assistant master for eleven years, publishing his revisionist *Essay on the*...
Writings and Genius of Pope (1756) during this time.\(^5\) It is more than likely that as Warton rose to prominence in Winchester, a relationship developed between the Warton and Thistlethwayte families. In later years, this connection was maintained by Joseph’s younger brother Thomas Warton (1728–1790), also a poet and literary historian. Thomas spent time with his brother in Winchester each year, and from there paid visits to friends in the area.\(^6\) In the summer of 1783, his hosts included Alexander Thistlethwayte (1756–1827), Rector of West Tytherley and younger nephew of the collector, and John Bowle, the nearby clergyman whose friendship with the elder Thistlethwayte has already been explored in connection with James I’s Essayes.\(^7\) In light of these later affinities, there can be little doubt that the library benefactor and the Wartons were on social terms, although the extent to which this acquaintance shaped the literary character of Thistlethwayte’s donation is not known. Since, as will be demonstrated below, both Joseph and Thomas Warton took an interest in Thistlethwayte’s editions of English poetry when they arrived in the Fellows’ Library, it is possible that Joseph, aware of Thistlethwayte’s desire to mark his family’s return to Winchester College with a gift, solicited a donation of poetry to remedy a conspicuous gap in the library’s holdings. Wherever the initiative came from, it appears that Thistlethwayte’s gift was the collaborative product of Thistlethwayte’s own ideas about his legacy and the cultural priorities of the new headmaster.

It is now possible to extend Blakiston’s understanding of the rationale governing Thistlethwayte’s donations to Winchester and Wadham. Blakiston argues that Thistlethwayte entered into consultation ‘with the authorities of both Colleges’ to ensure that his donations complemented and extended their existing collections; this meant


\(^7\) For Alexander Thistlethwayte of West Tytherley, see Foster, 1715–1886, IV, p. 1403. Thomas Warton’s diary entries recording his visits are quoted in Correspondence of Thomas Warton, ed. by David Fairer (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1995), pp. 488-89.
checking for duplicates and avoiding competition with expected donations from other sources. This is a convincing account, but Thistlethwayte did not assemble the contents of his donations purely on an ad hoc basis. Two fundamental ideas determine the character of the Winchester and Wadham collections. First, both bring together antiquarian and collectible books, and exclude new works and up-to-date editions. New books published during the 1750s and 1760s are almost totally absent from Thistlethwayte’s donations, though White’s sale catalogue shows that Thistlethwayte continued to acquire new publications until the end of his life. Seventeenth-century books and sixteenth-century printings of Latin and Greek texts predominate in the Winchester collection – just over 60% of the non-English books listed in the manuscript catalogue are products of the seventeenth century – though there is also a large and varied selection of early eighteenth-century English poetry. Secondly, a fundamental literary distinction defines the Winchester and Wadham collections in opposition to each other. Though both collections have an element of variety, the overwhelming majority of the books in Winchester contain poetry, while most of those given to Wadham contain prose texts, including works in theology, history and antiquities, geography and travel, and science. The distinction shows that if Thistlethwayte had been encouraged in 1767 to devote his Winchester gift to poetry, he ensured that his second donation four years later had the same coherence in its literary character, rather than simply in its subject matter.

Thistlethwayte has been justly credited with ushering in the modern character of the Fellows’ Library as a repository of rare books and specialised collections in all subject areas. What had been ‘a small, learned, ecclesiastical, and essentially Latin collection’ was transformed in 1767, in more than one respect. First, a sorely neglected field within the Fellows’ Library was suddenly established as one of its strongest, owing to the
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8 Blakiston, ‘Winchester College Library’, p. 35.
acquisition of a large corpus of poetry. Before the end of the seventeenth century, the library had contained no printed editions of English poetry and only a small selection of classical texts; three quarters of a century later, Thistlethwayte’s donation supplied the full compass of European poetry, from the classics to the neo-Latin tradition and works in French, Italian, Spanish and Dutch. Secondly, Thistlethwayte’s gift established that curious and collectible books had a place in the Fellows’ Library. While late seventeenth- and eighteenth-century librarians had used their limited funds to update the historic collections with new classical editions and works of reference, Thistlethwayte’s donation reflected the fashions of eighteenth-century bibliophilic culture, with many examples of fine continental printing and association copies.10

However, as this chapter shows, the story of the impact of Thistlethwayte’s donation extends beyond the books themselves. For the Wartons, members of the small community of Fellows and visitors who could readily gain access to the library, the new collection of literary texts furnished a wealth of material for study. For the wider school community, the significance of Thistlethwayte’s gift was symbolic. At the outset of Warton’s tenure as headmaster, his success in securing this donation of ‘Poetry in most of the living and dead languages’ could be seen as a marker of his cultural power. The gift could also be interpreted as Thistlethwayte’s endorsement of Warton’s role in strengthening the literary culture of Winchester College. During his time as headmaster, Warton broadened his connections with an alumni network of Wykehamist authors, as well as with a London-based artistic circle that included his longstanding friends Joseph Reynolds, David Garrick and Samuel Johnson. Warton also worked to shore up the prevailing literary humanism of elite public education, voicing his convictions in an edition of Pope’s works which he edited during his retirement. In a note on Book IV of *The Dunciad*, commenting on

Pope’s characterisation of a schoolmaster devoted to the mechanical study of literary language, Warton declared the satirist ‘very ill-informed of what is constantly taught in our great schools’. He continued:

To read, to interpret, to translate the best poets, orators, and historians, of the best ages; that is, those authors, “that supply most axioms of prudence, most principles of moral truth, most examples of virtue and integrity, most materials for conversation;” cannot be called confining youth to words alone, and keeping them out of the way of real knowledge.\(^\text{11}\)

These convictions underpinned Warton’s work as a schoolmaster, and they may have convinced Thistlethwayte that the intellectual climate to which he was entrusting his poetry collection was one that recognised its value.

In addition to securing his family’s place in the annals of the school, Thistlethwayte’s donation was a timely contribution to consolidating the school’s cultural identity under the Warton regime. The Thistlethwayte collection in the Fellows’ Library can now be understood in context, both as the legacy of a private collector’s tastes and interests, and as the product of negotiation with the College authorities in the late 1760s. For the school community, this knowledge has the potential to generate new interest in the life and legacy of one of the most important cultural donors in the College’s history.

‘Publick’ Library, Public Benefits?

The arrival of Thistlethwayte’s books seems to have spurred the College authorities to take a more active interest in the management of the Fellows’ Library. The minutes of a College meeting of 3 December 1767 noted that ‘the present Fund for purchasing Books for the publick Library belonging to the […] College is insufficient’, and a special

contribution of £32 11s. was raised jointly by the Headmaster Joseph Warton, the Warden and Fellows, and the Usher.\textsuperscript{12} In addition to recording the College’s renewed investment in the Fellows’ Library, the minutes of this meeting invoke a conception of its ‘publick’ value which seems to have governed its management until the twentieth century. The use of the term ‘publick’ in this context alludes not to the interests of a broadly defined public, but rather to those of the learned community of which the College was part. Thus, the minutes of 1767, as Blakiston explains, show the College acknowledging its responsibility to maintain the Fellows’ Library not just for the benefit of the school community, but also as a resource for any educated enquirer with an interest in the books.\textsuperscript{13} Today, as the library continues to honour its commitment to enabling scholarship, it also works to engage wider audiences through outreach activities and public events. Its handling of Thistlethwayte’s legacy illuminates both the library’s relationship with the learned community and the recent evolution of a more inclusive approach to public engagement.

Prior to the twentieth century, the only evidence that Thistlethwayte’s books were directly consulted by readers comes from the period of Warton’s headmastership. During these years, it is possible that Thistlethwayte’s was the most thoroughly explored of the Fellows’ Library’s collections, as both of the Wartons appear to have scrutinised its literary materials with an eye to their potential usefulness to fellow scholars. In July 1789, Thomas Warton sent a brief note to the scholar Edmond Malone notifying him of ‘a Copy of Heath’s Epigrams in Winchester College Library’.\textsuperscript{14} The book, John Heath’s \textit{Two Centuries of Epigrammes} (1610), is part of a \textit{Sammelband} given to the library by

\textsuperscript{12} Blakiston, ‘Winchester College Library’, p. 29.
\textsuperscript{14} Letter of Thomas Warton to Edmond Malone, 28 July 1789. \textit{Correspondence of Thomas Warton}, ed. by Fairer, p. 626.
Malone had ‘mentioned this Book’ to Warton in connection with research for his groundbreaking edition of Shakespeare, which was finally published in 1790; although Warton concluded that Heath’s *Epigrammes* held no relevant material for Malone, his message provides a glimpse of his conscientious approach to the Thistlethwayte books as resources for scholarship.

On 25 April 1780, Joseph Warton wrote to the printer and antiquary John Nichols, then seeing through the press his *Select Collection of Poems* (1780–82), offering assistance:

> We have a good many old Miscellaneous Poems in our College Library; and, if I thought your plan was not completed, might perhaps point out some to you. I believe there are some things in the Miscellanies of *Husband*, of *Lewis*, of *Harte*, and of *Diaper*, Whalley, and *Cobbe* […], that might deserve to be inserted.16

The collections of four of the six authors and compilers named by Warton – John Husbands’ *Miscellany of Poems by Several Hands* (1731), David Lewis’ *Miscellaneous Poems, by Several Hands* (1726), Walter Harte’s *Poems on Several Occasions* (1727) and Samuel Cobb’s *Poems on Several Occasions* (1707) – were given to the Fellows’ Library by Thistlethwayte.17 The recent Thistlethwayte benefaction had also provided the bulk of the ‘good many old Miscellaneous Poems’ to which Warton refers; the donation included a large concentration of single-author collections published during the first four decades of the eighteenth century, showcasing the work of Stephen Duck and Anne Finch, countess of Winchilsea, as well as that of lesser-known poets such as John Bancks, John

---

15 John Heath, *Two Centuries of Epigrammes* (London: printed by John Windet, 1610). Winchester College Fellows’ Library, Book No. 4809. The *Sammelband* to which this book belongs was compiled by Richard Triplett, with a contents page in his hand.


Glanvill and Benjamin Loveling. Though most of these collections were around half a century old when Warton recommended them to Nichols, and few contained an acclaimed corpus of poetry, Warton’s attention shows that their shorter poems could still claim places in the literary history being shaped by contemporary anthology culture.

In the nineteenth century, the College continued to manage the Fellows’ Library with an awareness of its potential interest to learned men and collectors outside the school community. On 29 December 1855, the *Literary Gazette* published a detailed survey of the collections, which were then housed on open shelves in the College’s disused chantry. The survey was written by James Bohn, a bookman employed in the library, and prefaced with a statement reiterating the library’s ‘publick’ character: ‘It is the wish of the Warden and Fellows that literary men may have access to the library’ (p. 835). Bohn’s account highlights the strengths of the manuscript and early printed book collections, paying little attention to the legacies of individual donors. It is notable, however, that many of the books singled out by Bohn as part of ‘an extraordinary collection of old English poetry’ came from Thistlethwayte (p. 836). In the following list of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century treasures, all of the books described belong to the Thistlethwayte benefaction:

Books like ‘Mistriss Fage’s Fame’s Rowl,’ in which the names of all the English aristocracy of the middle of the seventeenth century are given in acrostics and anagrams; ‘Essais of a Prentis in the Arte of Poesie,’ written by King James I., when only 18 years of age, and not included in the [1616] edition of his collected works; ‘the Mirror for Magistrates,’—the works of ‘Sir David Lyndsaye of the Mount,’ […] and hundreds of others of equal rarity and interest, but all well known to lovers of rare books and bibliography, may afford some idea of the value of the collection[.]
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Despite the express intentions of the College authorities, however, there is no evidence that Bohn’s notice succeeded in broadening the library’s network of interested scholars and bookmen.

In 1908, a period of uncertainty for the Fellows’ Library came to an end when the books were moved to the Long Gallery, the largest of the rooms currently occupied by the collections. However, according to Blakiston, it was not until the 1930s that ‘a general change of tempo’ took place in the library’s relationship with the school community, other libraries and the public.¹⁹ At this time, a selection of special artefacts from the library, including the manuscripts and the more valuable printed books, moved into a Strong Room adjacent to the school’s general reference library, which had been established in the 1860s. The physical proximity of the two collections enabled Walter Oakeshott, the school librarian, to realise the educational and scholarly potential of the Fellows’ Library’s books through a series of exhibitions. The larger of these exhibitions, curated in association with external partners and with increasing public participation, have ever since been a focus of the library’s community engagement. During his tenure as Fellows’ Librarian, Blakiston mounted exhibitions that included loans from the British Museum and the Bibliothèque Nationale de France. Once again, Thistlethwayte’s books came to the fore: in 1961, Blakiston reported that ‘no section of the old library plays a more living role today, through exhibitions, than Thistlethwayte’s French books’, a collection dominated by seventeenth-century editions of French verse, drama and classical poetry in translation.²⁰

In 2011, Thistlethwayte’s copy of James VI and I’s debut publication, *Essayes of a Prentise, in the Divine Art of Poesie*, went on display in a major exhibition
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²⁰ Blakiston, ‘Winchester College Library’, p. 36.
commemorating the four hundredth anniversary of the King James Bible and the contribution of Winchester scholars to its making. Open to the public free of charge, this exhibition took part in a year of commemorative activity across the UK, capitalising on broad public awareness of the anniversary; it also benefited from local interest in the history of an elite institution. The exhibition attracted seven hundred visitors during two weeks of public opening; in the following three weeks, a further 2300 people visited as part of organised parties. Groups came from local parishes, history societies, schools and colleges; visits were also made by representatives of the Bodleian Library, members of two London social clubs, and representatives of various religious groups including the monastic community of Douai Abbey and the Greek Orthodox Church. The illustrated catalogue of the exhibition, written by Paul Quarrie, underpins its scholarly value, and substantial sales of the catalogue have raised funds for the Fellows’ Library.21 Exhibitions on this scale require intensive preparation and cannot be mounted often; however, as the last part of this chapter outlines, the Fellows’ Library sustains regular public encounters with its collections through a programme of smaller exhibitions and community activities.

**The Thistlethwayte Collection and the History of the Book**

Until the twentieth century the ‘publick’ character of the Fellows’ Library lay in its notional cooperation with the needs of the scholarly community. In reality, the pressure from readers was minimal, and successive librarians managed the collections with a light touch, avoiding exposing them to sale or subjecting them to unnecessary physical alteration. Any such alterations to the condition or configuration of the books were discouraged not only by the library’s limited funds, but also by the compound demands on librarians’ time; the ‘post of Librarian was filled by one of the Fellows’, and until the
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nineteenth century this Fellow customarily had the additional charge of caring for the books and plate in the College chapel. For much of its history, therefore, the Fellows’ Library lay dormant as an underused resource for a learned ‘publick’. These conditions ensured the preservation of its collections in a way that is now opening up major research possibilities for scholars interested both in specialist material and in historic book collections.

This study of the Thistlethwayte books in the Fellows’ Library has exploited some of these possibilities. Thistlethwayte’s benefaction and the Fellows’ Library’s management practices have together preserved a collection of books whose individual characteristics, as discussed in the present thesis, support new histories of textual transmission and book ownership. The first two chapters have been devoted to unique literary artefacts from the Thistlethwayte collection, whose material and textual forms provide the foundations for a revised understanding of the cultures of manuscript circulation and scholarly editing which produced them. Both of these artefacts are related to items in public collections, most notably the British Library, and in each case-study new knowledge is drawn from a comparison between the Winchester artefact and its British Library counterpart. In one case in particular, this comparison not only helps to interpret the historic properties of the materials, but also highlights the impact of library conservation policies on the potential for scholarly investigation of the materials’ historic states.

In the first case-study, Thistlethwayte’s augmented copy of James VI’s *Essayes of a Prentise* is shown to challenge assumptions advanced by Steven May about the role of print in the circulation of James’s verse. Far from forestalling the manuscript circulation of James’s poetry, the appearance of a printed collection can now be seen to have provided a new context for it; in the Winchester copy of the *Essayes*, members of the
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Scottish elite copied manuscript poems alongside the printed texts, demonstrating that the fashioning of James’s poetic and political identities was an ongoing, collaborative process. Two of the poems by the king which are copied in Thistlethwayte’s Essayes are also preserved in an authorial manuscript at the British Library (Royal MS 18 B.16), and my collation of these texts has revealed that their circulation was almost certainly more widespread than the isolated surviving witnesses suggest.

The second case-study reassesses Lewis Theobald’s work as an editor of Shakespeare, providing a new framework for interpreting the portion of Theobald’s printer’s copy that survives in the Fellows’ Library. During a ‘brief visit’ to Winchester College in the 1980s, Richard Corballis ascertained that Theobald used an interleaved copy of the second edition of Pope’s Shakespear as his copy-text, and that the printers’ marginalia in the surviving leaves provide sporadic insight into the working relationship between Theobald and his printers. Benefiting from extended access to the printer’s copy in the Fellows’ Library, my research has moved beyond this initial appraisal of the material to offer a fresh examination of the practical motives and editorial rationale governing its use. Building on Simon Jarvis’s analysis of Theobald’s editorial practice, my work highlights the high proportion of unauthorised readings which Theobald silently absorbed from his copy-text, despite having built his scholarly reputation on criticism of Pope’s work. It is argued that Theobald’s apparent failure to confront the pervasive errors in his copy-text was a result of his specialised methodology, the nature and reception of which are yet to be fully explored. In addition to reassessing Theobald’s textual work, this case-study also sheds new light on the practical processes involved in the making of his Shakespeare. The printer’s copy’s annotations, sewing holes and cut edges – all of which have been preserved by Thistlethwayte’s untidy binding and the Fellows’ Library’s hands-off approach to preservation – are used to construct a picture of the practical and economic
challenges faced by Theobald and his printers. In contrast, the British Library’s smaller segment of Theobald’s printer’s copy has been subject to handsome rebinding and meticulous repair, an act of conservation which obscures evidence of its prior physical states. This twentieth-century rebinding asserts the library’s recognition of the collectible value and cultural importance of unique material associated with Shakespeare, but hinders scholarly investigation in a way that the Fellows’ Library’s non-interventionist approach avoids.

The third and fourth chapters of the thesis examined the messages conveyed by Thistlethwayte’s books about the intellectual habits and social self-fashioning of their owners. These messages are conveyed in large part through the physical forms of the books, which have remained largely unchanged in the keeping of both Winchester College Fellows’ Library and the library of Wadham College. Neither library has undertaken to systematically replace the old, often second-hand bindings in which Thistlethwayte kept his books, making it possible to distinguish Thistlethwayte’s own bindings and to identify the characteristic styles of earlier owners. Furthermore, the many titles which Thistlethwayte bound up or acquired as part of *Sammelbände* have been spared dismantling and reorganisation into new forms, preserving important evidence of how individual collectors organised and read their books.

Based on archival research undertaken in Winchester and Oxford, the later chapters have made new connections between collecting cultures in the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries and the social profiles of their participants. Thistlethwayte, an obscure gentleman who became a member of the Hampshire elite, has been revealed as one of the more voracious collectors of his generation. He did not belong to a profession or pursue specialist knowledge, but his large investment in books reinforced his status as a custodian of cultural traditions, as well as underpinning his connections to local and
national intellectual networks, from Wiltshire learned society to the Royal Society of London. The ways in which Thistlethwayte responded to and reshaped the culture he collected are, moreover, manifested in the composite bindings that he assembled for more than a third of the literary texts in the Winchester collection. Custom compiling was one of the readiest ways in which collectors could construct an intellectual framework for, or develop a critical response to, the texts that they accumulated, yet the practice of later seventeenth- and eighteenth-century compilers remains relatively unexplored. Studying Thistlethwayte’s habits of compilation, together with those of earlier collectors whose Sammelbände Thistlethwayte bought and kept intact, has revealed that composite books could be sites of complex interaction between the personal responses of collectors and the fashions of published anthology culture.

Special Libraries and the Challenge of Widening Access

This investigation of the Thistlethwayte gift has been undertaken with the support of AHRC funding under the Collaborative Doctoral Award scheme. The CDA partnership between Winchester College and the University of Birmingham established a pattern of research including periods of extended access to the Fellows’ Library. However, while physical access to historic collections is essential for research, it is the provision of library catalogues and archival finding aids that shapes the methods and priorities of scholarly enquiry. In the case of the Fellows’ Library, the research questions asked by this project could not have been answered with the same accuracy and efficiency had the library not invested in upgrading its bibliographic records.

The old card catalogue of the Fellows’ Library’s holdings has now been superseded by an electronic catalogue created by Geoffrey Day, the Fellows’ Librarian and co-supervisor.
of this project. In view of the current organisation of the library, the enhanced searchability of the electronic catalogue has had a major impact on the viability of certain research strategies. The Fellows’ Library’s books are shelved broadly by category, rather than by donor, and as a result the books that Thistlethwayte donated are distributed across all six of the rooms occupied by the library. Thus, it is impossible at present to browse the Thistlethwayte collection in its entirety on the shelves; the catalogue, however, supplies this capability electronically. Not only does a keyword search produce a body of more than 1200 bibliographic records associated with Thistlethwayte, but there is also the potential to find books with marks of earlier ownership through the records’ detailed provenance notes. In addition to providing an essential groundwork of collections data for this study, the electronic catalogue has itself benefited from the findings of the research. In the course of locating the foreign-language titles listed in the late eighteenth-century manuscript catalogue of Thistlethwayte’s donation, it was revealed that sixty-six of Thistlethwayte’s foreign books were not identified as his in the electronic catalogue, having no surviving marks of his ownership. This new provenance information has now been incorporated into the electronic records.

The Fellows’ Library’s recent advance to full electronic cataloguing is a milestone. However, the electronic catalogue remains a private resource, accessible only within the library itself. This means that although the Fellows’ Library’s historic commitment to admitting external users continues, the library does not provide easy public access to bibliographic information which could empower external communities to discover new value in the collections. Though the imperative to make catalogue records accessible online in an age of digital information exchange is clear, this has proved especially challenging for smaller libraries outside the HE sector. A 2010 survey of uncatalogued and invisible collections in UK libraries found that nine institutions in the sample
population provided no access to their catalogue records through a web OPAC; these were smaller, mostly independent libraries including ‘four subscription libraries and a national educational charity, a research library administered by an independent trust, a registered library and an ecclesiastical library’. For libraries of this kind, building the digital infrastructure needed to create and maintain online catalogue records may simply be unaffordable, and providing data to be integrated into an existing OPAC presents its own challenges, as the case of the Fellows’ Library illustrates.

There is an online bibliographic database which already contains some information about the Fellows’ Library’s holdings. This is the English Short Title Catalogue, hosted online by the British Library (http://estc.bl.uk), with entries for all books printed in the English language and in British territories before 1801. ESTC also records the locations of surviving copies, representing the holdings of around two thousand libraries, the majority in Britain and North America. Winchester College Fellows’ Library is one of ESTC’s contributing collections, and just over 1900 entries in the online catalogue now record the existence of a copy in the Fellows’ Library. However, the library’s active participation in the ESTC project ended before the project’s expansion to cover pre-1700 printing, and as a result it is the eighteenth-century holdings of the Fellows’ Library which are represented in the current database, including many copies belonging to the Thistlethwayte collection. ESTC thus contains a substantial, though not comprehensive, set of records detailing one portion of the Fellows’ Library’s collections, and the library forms part of the picture that ESTC provides of the distribution of eighteenth-century books in modern repositories. However, even within this limited range, ESTC is unable to record the unique characteristics of the Fellows’ Library’s books which distinguish them from copies of the same titles in major research libraries. The construction of the

23 Hidden Collections, pp. 6, 15.
catalogue primarily as a database of standard bibliographic records makes no provision for notes on the physical state or provenance of the individual copies whose locations are recorded.

If the Fellows’ Library is to build an online presence which provides a meaningful pathway to engagement with its historic collections, it will need to add its catalogue records to a web OPAC which can incorporate information about the individual characteristics of the books. Copac (http://copac.ac.uk) is a promising candidate in this regard. The ‘de facto union catalogue across the UK’, Copac holds online records for more than seventy libraries (Dooley, p. 92). Though its contributors are mainly national and university libraries, an increasing number of special libraries have joined in recent years. The launch of the Copac Challenge Fund in 2006 encouraged libraries outside the academy to add their holdings to the catalogue, and by 2009 the Fund had supported nineteen libraries through the process; besides eight university collections, the new contributors included four collections belonging to museums and arts charities, the libraries of two professional bodies, two public reference libraries and an ecclesiastical library.24 In 2010, moreover, Copac became the sole online portal to catalogue records for the libraries of the National Trust, an association of 140 historic collections which are ‘generally preserved in the places where they were originally assembled and read’.25 The Trust looks after a large and hugely varied heritage of private book-collecting, and its representation on Copac accentuates the value of the collections as repositories of unique information about historic reading and collecting practices. Though the extent of individual collections is somewhat obscured, as Copac has no search function capable of searching within the collection at any one property owned by the Trust, the online records

do specify the location of each item and supply copy-specific information about condition and provenance.

Whether Copac could incorporate a similar layer of copy-specific information into online records of the Fellows’ Library’s books is an issue yet to be negotiated. The electronic records database currently in use in the library is an archival system, and there are several obstacles to processing this data in accordance with Copac standards. First, some of the bibliographic records have irregular content, reflecting the distinctive content or form of the books themselves. A significant number, for example, merge the details of two titles bound together in one volume; others contain exceptionally large amounts of descriptive text, which may need to be culled from the online records. Secondly, the electronic database stores records belonging to both the Fellows’ Library and the College Archives, meaning that confidential archival information would need to be filtered out before submission to Copac. If these problems can be overcome, however, joining Copac would give the Fellows’ Library public visibility as part of a high-quality database with an established academic and professional user base. It would make the existing catalogue records accessible to scholars interested in the nature of the library’s holdings, as well as to independent researchers pursuing local and specialist interests. Providing a persistent online platform for catalogue access has the potential to encourage audiences both within and outside the academy to direct new intellectual attention towards hitherto unexplored material in the library.

In the long term, the creation of digitised content may offer a viable means of extending access to the Fellows’ Library’s unique collections, with wider impact across the educational sector. The current strategic priorities of Jisc, a leading supporter of digital projects in UK education and research, are focused on large-scale digitisation of
specialist collections to create resources for HE teaching and learning. The Fellows’ Library has much material of national and international importance which could enrich future digital projects, from fourteenth-century manuscripts to a collection of maps and documents from the 1944 D-Day landings. The digitisation of such materials could take place, under this model, as part of a larger collaborative project aiming to build and curate a digital collection for use in teaching and learning as well as research. On a smaller scale, a ‘boutique’ digitisation project could expose the extraordinary properties of an individual artefact or discrete collection from the Fellows’ Library. The resulting product would offer high-quality content tailored to the special features of each artefact, while the process would allow the library to experiment with digitisation technologies that could be used in further projects. However, funding opportunities for ‘boutique’ projects are currently limited, and the Fellows’ Library may need to build on the experience of academic collaboration that it has gained through the present CDA partnership to find a role in the new landscape of large-scale, co-ordinated digitisation activity.

While the development of a digital strategy must be a priority for its future, the Fellows’ Library has proved that there are more immediate benefits to be gained from intelligent use of its physical spaces. It will be remembered that in the 1930s the construction of a Strong Room adjacent to the school reference library created conditions amenable to displaying the Fellows’ Library’s books in exhibitions; more recently, the refurbishment of the Eccles Room in the same building has created a dedicated exhibition and teaching space within the Fellows’ Library itself. This room regularly hosts small-scale exhibitions offering information-rich snapshots of the Library and Archive collections to a wide variety of audiences, including current pupils and their families, Old Wykehamists, local societies and academics. The Eccles Room also provides a setting for

educational workshops which offer encounters with rare books and archival material: in 2012, for example, pupils from a local primary school took part in a session extending their curriculum-based learning through exploration and handling of an autograph manuscript of Elizabeth I.

One of the more recent Eccles Room exhibitions emerged directly from the present research project. On 9 February 2013, Winchester College hosted *Unlocking the Private Library*, a symposium organised under the auspices of the Winchester-Birmingham partnership to highlight and foster relationships between the academic community and libraries outside the HE sector. Papers were given by doctoral researchers engaged in AHRC-funded collaborative projects, as well as by representatives of secular and religious institutions with historic libraries, including the National Trust. In addition to coordinating this programme of speakers, my contribution to the organisation of the symposium included designing and captioning a display of books from the Thistlethwayte collection to be mounted in the Eccles Room. Open to delegates in between sessions, this exhibition extended the discussion about Thistlethwayte’s library which had begun with my opening paper, and invited those with rare books expertise to comment on the mysterious codes found in many of Thistlethwayte’s volumes. Its subsequent exposure is testament to the effectiveness of a programme of small exhibitions in maintaining the visibility of the Fellows’ Library to internal and external audiences: the display remained in place for eight weeks after the event, and received visits from two local arts groups representing NADFAS (the National Association of Decorative & Fine Arts Societies), senior representatives of Sotheby’s, Oxford and Cambridge academics, as well as members of the school community.

The programme can be found at ‘Unlocking the Private Library’ [webpage] <http://unlockingtheprivatelibrary.wordpress.com> [accessed 30 September 2013].
The success of *Unlocking the Private Library* showed that there is scope for the Fellows’ Library to pursue more focused interactions with other members of the special libraries community. Fourteen of the forty delegates attending the symposium were librarians or library assistants, the majority associated with private or special collections libraries ranging from a cathedral library to a historic subscription library. The event generated useful discussions about the imperatives for and rewards of promoting wider access to libraries in this sector: among the topics addressed were opportunities for collaboration between special libraries and universities, the role of cataloguing in enhancing access, and the challenges for academics of balancing research with outreach activities creating impact in the community. Several of the delegates were keen to see future events organised on broadly the same model, with input from across the library and academic sectors, and contacts made through the symposium may in future provide the basis for a networked programme of activities.

This thesis is an unprecedented examination of the history and treasures of an entire collection belonging to the Fellows’ Library, and the research has been made possible by the funding and access provisions of the Winchester-Birmingham partnership. However, the project has also evaluated strategies for broadening awareness of and access to the Fellows’ Library’s collections, while creating new and potentially rewarding contacts between libraries exploring similar initiatives. First, the methodology of the research has both exploited and enhanced the capabilities of the Fellows’ Library’s electronic catalogue. Currently a private resource, this chapter proposes that the catalogue be made visible through a web OPAC to act as the cornerstone of the library’s public accessibility, bringing its collections to the attention of researchers both within and beyond the academy. Copac, which already incorporates the records of many private libraries and special collections, has realistic potential to provide a stable and active online platform for
the Fellows’ Library’s records. Secondly, the initial dissemination of the research through *Unlocking the Private Library* has made contact with a community of small-library representatives, whose interest in engaging new audiences may form the basis of further networking events and visits. For much of its history, the Fellows’ Library has relied primarily on the generosity of private donors to drive its growth, and since the benefaction of Alexander Thistlethwayte in 1767 its character has reflected the variety of its donors’ secular and religious interests. This study of Thistlethwayte’s legacy has brought new understanding to a formative chapter in the Fellows’ Library’s history, and revealing its heritage of private collecting and donation as a reservoir of cultural knowledge to be drawn on in the future by both academic and wider publics.
APPENDIX ONE

TRANSCRIPTIONS OF MANUSCRIPT POEMS IN THE WINCHESTER COPY OF ESSAYES OF A PRENTEISE

Note on manuscript abbreviations: Substantive variants found in other manuscript copies of the poems are given in the right column. The following abbreviations are used to denote their sources:

A British Library, Add. MS 24195
B Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 165
R British Library, Royal MS 18 B.16

‘Sonnet’, sig. A2:

SONNET

THY race, quhilk you resemblis,¹ come we Reid
Of Grecs & Greice, quhilk greitest vves² in gloires
Quhilk did the sisters Citheri/a\ds breid,
Quha does with laur thy Diadem decoire,
Quhairby thy weeds & wirschip salbe moire,
Then thairs,³ that did ald Dardanie distroy:
Quha neuir haid sic honor heitfoir
As of thair race is rissin sic a Roy.
As Pergame thae, sua sall you tak new troy,
And greiter wirschip sall obtene thairby,
And palme & laur as vvirthiest, enioy.
Thy veirdis and werteu stryues as be inuy
The till aduance, & surlie to consere:
That michtie Mars hes machit with Minerwe

1 The m in resemblis is supplied here to expand a scribal contraction; a large tilde signals its absence in the manuscript. Further contractions are routinely expanded and superscript lowered in these transcriptions. Italic is used to indicate where this has occurred.
2 The letter w appears in two forms in the text: as a detached pair of v’s and as a single letter characterised by a bold final upstroke.
3 In the manuscript the letter y represents the hard th sound in thairs, thair (line 8) and thai (line 9); here it is replaced by the digraph. Grant Simpson explains that in Anglo-Saxon þ, or thorn, represented the hard th sound, but the ‘form of this symbol had become debased by the late fourteenth century and it was now identical in appearance with the letter y. This convenient method of writing th, simply as a y, became very common’. Grant Simpson, Scottish Handwriting, 1150-1650: An Introduction to the Reading of Documents (Edinburgh: Bratton Publishing, 1973), p. 42.
‘On Women’, fols. X1r-X2r:

On Women

As falconis ar bye nature fair of flicht
Of kynd as sparhalkis far excellis in speid
As marlyownes half in springing greitest micht
As goshalkis ar of nature gevin to greid
As mawisis of kynd ar gevin to sing
And laurolkis efter candilmes to spring

As pyettis steillis quhat ewer thai can beir
Of kynd as corbeis followis carionis wyld
As gaes will cunterfute quhat sound thai heir
As gleddis of nature killis not oft the vyld
As crawis and kais will clatter quhen thai play
As hennis of nature kekkillis quhen thai lay

As kynd makkis houndis to follow hairis by sent
As cursouris nikkeris rydand in the nicht
As lyonis for to seik thair pray ar bent
As beiris, by kynd of leggis ar wondrous wicht
As Tygres fleis the watteris & the weittis
As nature gevis the ounces cruell spreittis

As gaittis delytis to clim throw craig and cleuche
As deir of nature hantis the forrestis fair,
As connis by kynd will skipp from branche to beuch
As foxis can by craft escaip the snair
As brokkis in winter lyckis, to sleip and rest
As swyne by nature lovis the midding best

As scooles of hering fleis the quhale for feir
As greit auld pykis will eit the young & small,
As remora will stopp, ane schip to steir
As kynd makkis sea horss to be cruell all

---

4 This title was supplied by a later hand.
5 See note 3.
6 Here and throughout this sequence of three poems by James the letter z appears in place of consonantal y. Simpson explains that the origin of this practice is the Anglo-Saxon symbol ȝ, or yogh, which came to be ‘used in Scots vernacular texts as an equivalent for consonantal y […] In the later middle ages it came to be indistinguishable in written form from z’ (Scottish Handwriting, p. 42). In these transcriptions the z symbol is replaced by the letter y in all cases.
As kynd makkis creuissis to swim a bak
As troutes of nature fischear baitis will tak

As Marmaides hailis all men by naturis will
As Dallfinis loves all bairnes in wondrous soirt
As by the contrar Crocodiles thame kill
As Mereswynes loves of nature for to spoirt
Of kynd as salmound in fresche riveris spawnes
As selchis haif milk & young onis laiking rawness

In schorit as fowles by kynd in air do flie
And as the beastis by nature go on ground
And as the fisches swimmes in frothie sie
And as all leving thingis ar euer bound
To follow nature rewling tham alway
Quhose will they must obey but let or stay

Ewin so all wemen ar of nature vane
And can not keip in secreit unreweylit
And quhair as once they do consave disdane
Thay ar unabil to be reconceillit
Fulfillit with talk & clatteris but respect
And oftintymes of small or non effect

Ambitious ar without regard or schame
But anye measure gevin to greid of geir
Desyring euer for to win a name
With flattering all that will tham not forbeir
Sum craft thai haif yit foolishche ar indeid
With leing quhyles esteming best to speid

Excuse

Expone me richt ye dames of worthie fame
Since for your honors I employit my cair
For wemen bad, heirbye ar less to blame
for that thai follow nature euerie quhair
And ye most worthie prais quhose reasoun dantis
That nature, quhilk into your sex so hantis

Finis

---

7 This is an unusual spelling of the Scots adjective unreveilit, or English unrevealed.
Psalm 148.

Sing laude vn to the lord
Heauenis induellaris, I say
To do the same accord
In places hie, and stay
And so alwayise
ye angelis all
Greit hoistis, and tall
Iehoue prayise

Prayse him, both sunne, and moone
And starres, of schyning licht
The sam of you be done.
ye heauenis, of heauenis most bricht
Set furth his fame
ye watteris eauen
above this heauen
And praise his name

All ye quho by his will,
and word, created bene:
Praise great Iehoua still:
Quho dois yow ay contene
In stablist rest
Quhose iust decree
can nouayis be
By ocht transgrest

Praise him eache leauing beast
That on the earthe dois go:
Thou deaph with most, and least
of fische, and whailis also,
Thou glanceing loue,
Hayll roundly rolde
Snow, whyte, and colde

8 This title is in the same hand as the title ‘On Women’.
9 The variant readings for this text are derived from the copy in James’s own hand in British Library, Royal MS 18 B.16, fols 39'-40'. A second copy of the poem in this manuscript, made by a secretary, has no substantive variants.
His praise furth shoue.

Ye exallationis wak
with stormy, wyndis, and shill
whome he dothe euer mak
His worde for to fulfill
    ye cidres great
Hudge hillis, and knouis
frute treis *that* growis
    praise godis hie seat

Ye beastis and cattell tame,
eache foule, and creping thing
eache people, and prince of name:  *and* or R
eache earthly Judge, and king  *and* or R
    ye uirginis eik
ye babis and olde
with young men bolde
    His praise furth speike

For *that* his name allone
Doth heauen and earth adorne:
He is *that* onely one
Exaltis his peoples horne
    *their* praise I mene
Of israell
Quhome he luifis well
    praise god diuine

    Finis

‘Ecclesiastes xij’, fols. X4v:

Ecclesiastes xij

Be glaid o young men in thy youthfull dayis  *men* or R
    and let thy saule reioise in youth I say
And follow furth *that* most thy spreit dois praise
And quhat thyne eis delytis in euerie way
    bot knau *that* once sall cum *that* dreidfull day
quhen for thois deidis god sall exame the soir
And he him self in Judgement set thairfoir

Remoue beleue all rancor from thy brane
contemm thy fleseche vnworking euill at all
for youth alsweill as chylyheid is bot vane
thairfoir on thy creatur think you sall
quhill in thy lothsum dayis, you sall say ¹⁰ does not fail
And quhill the tyme is not quhen yow sall say
Nou in thir yeiris my pleasur is away

And quhill the sonne and licht is not obscure
d.and quhill the monne and starris ar schyning bricht
To follou efter darknyng all the licht
Quhat tym thai salbe boued that ar of micht
Than sall the hous garrdis trimbill all at onis
the grinderis stay for lak of counter bonis

Thay salbe dimed that throth the wyndoik keik
the vetter durris thai salbe schot als sone
the grinderis sonne salbe abassid eik
He sall auai thar at the lauerokis tone
His hoill delyte in singing salbe done
And thai salbe for hie thingis soir affrayit
And feir sall mak tham in the way dismaid

Then sall the almond tree be floreshit fair
the gershopper sall bayth be hauie and greit
he sall of l¹¹ lust and pleasur haif no cair
for man drauis neir to his eternall seitt
And doill in streit luikis for him air and lait
quhill tyme the siluer clud yit will not rax
and goldin circles nayer brekis nor crakis

And quhill the picher brekis not at the well
Nor quhill the cisterme thar it cumis at last
that dust returns in earth and in it sell
the spreit returnis to god quhome for it past
from ony trubill fred or warldlie blast

¹⁰ This scribal error is the result of eye-skip on to the next line in the copy.
¹¹ This letter has been traced twice by the scribe and then abandoned.
All varietie all vanitie most vane

all thir ar vanitie: I say agane

Finis
APPENDIX TWO

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL DESCRIPTION OF THE WINCHESTER VOLUMES OF LEWIS THEOBALD’S PRINTER’S COPY

Theobald’s printer’s copy for nine plays has survived in three volumes assembled by Alexander Thistlethwayte. The volumes contain a mixture of printed and manuscript material, of which almost all the leaves have been cut apart so that only two pairs now appear to be conjugate. The printed leaves come from the eight duodecimo volumes of Pope’s second edition, which were issued twice in 1728 – in an eight-volume set under Tonson’s individual imprint, and in a ten-volume issue under the imprint of ‘J. and J. Knapton’ and others.¹ In Thistlethwayte’s volumes, the printed leaves for each play are grouped together, with the leaves of Theobald’s manuscript notes following.

In the following collations, signatures in parentheses preceded by a minus sign, e.g. (–P1-7), are those of leaves which appear in the gatherings of Pope’s 1728 edition but not in Thistlethwayte’s volumes. Signatures in parentheses with no other sign, e.g. (D1-9), are those of leaves which are present in the volumes, but are separated from the rest of their ‘gathering’ by a quantity of MS leaves.

First volume contains:

52 leaves of printed material for King Lear, comprising pp. 351-353 354-454 of Pope’s Vol. III.

P8 half-title ‘[rule] | THE | LIFE and DEATH | OF | KING LEAR. | [rule]’

12°: P¹² (– P1-7), Q-S¹² (S7+χ1), T¹² (– T12)

S(χ1) is a MS slip.

¹ These issues are E1STC Nos T138594 and T138590.
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58 leaves of MS notes for *King Lear*.

52 leaves of printed matter for *Othello*, comprising pp. 323-325 326-398 401-428 of Pope’s Vol. VIII.

O6 half-title ‘[rule] | OTHELLO, | THE | MOOR of VENICE. | [rule]’

O^{12} (– O1-5), P-Q^{12}, R^{12} (– R8), S^{12} (– S11-12)

54 leaves of MS material for *Othello*; four of these are conjugate pairs bound at the unfolded edges.

60 leaves of printed material for *Richard III*, comprising pp. 289-291 292-408 of Pope’s Vol. V.

N1 half-title ‘[rule] | THE | LIFE and DEATH | OF | RICHARD III. | [rule]’

N-R^{12}

27 leaves of MS notes for *Richard III*.

**Second volume contains:**


E2 half-title ‘[rule] | TIMON | OF | ATHENS. | [rule]’

E^{12} (– E1), F-G^{12}, H^{12} (– H3-12)

44 leaves of MS notes for *Timon of Athens*; the penultimate MS leaf is preceded by duplicate H1 and the final MS leaf by duplicate H2.

39 leaves of printed matter for *Titus Andronicus*, comprising pp. 111-113 114-187 of Pope’s Vol. VII.

E8 half-title ‘[rule] | TITUS | ANDRONICUS. | [rule]’

E^{12} (– E1-7), F-G^{12}, H^{12} (– H11-12)

22 leaves of MS notes for *Titus Andronicus*.

54 leaves of printed material for *Troilus and Cressida*, comprising pp. 265-269 270-371 of Pope’s Vol. VII.

M1 half-title ‘[rule] | TROILUS | AND | CRESSIDA. | [rule]’

M-P^{12}, Q^{12} (– Q7-12)
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44 leaves of MS notes for *Troilus and Cressida*.

**Third volume contains:**

44 leaves of printed matter for *Henry VI Part 1*, comprising pp. 3-5 6-90 of Pope’s Vol. V.

A2 half-title ‘[rule] | The FIRST PART of | HENRY | THE | SIXTH. | [rule]’

A12 (– A1), B-C12, D12 (D1-9)

26 leaves of MS notes for *Henry VI Part 1*.

50 leaves of printed matter for *Henry VI Part 2*, comprising pp. 91-93 94-189 of Pope’s Vol. V.

D10 half-title ‘[rule] | The | SECOND PART of | HENRY | THE | SIXTH. | With the DEATH of the | Good Duke HUMPHRY. | [rule]’

D12 (D10-12), E-G12, H12 (H1-11)

21 leaves of MS notes for *Henry VI Part 2*.

49 leaves of printed material for *Henry VI Part 3*, comprising pp. 191-193 194-287 of Pope’s Vol. V.

H12 half-title ‘[rule] | The THIRD PART of | HENRY | THE | SIXTH. | With the DEATH of the | DUKE of YORK. | [rule]’

H12 (H12 only), I-M12

26 leaves of MS notes for *Henry VI Part 3*. 
APPENDIX THREE

COLLABORATIONS OF POPE’S AND THEOBALD’S TEXTS OF

King Lear

The following collations record variants identified through line-by-line comparisons of Pope’s 1728 text of King Lear with the text it is based on – Rowe’s 1714 text – and Theobald’s 1733 text of King Lear with his copy-text, Pope (1728). Pope’s text is not directly based on Rowe’s: it is a revised version of the text first printed in 1725, for which Pope used Rowe’s 1714 edition as his copy-text. Pope’s 1728 text is analysed here against Rowe’s both to illuminate Pope’s editorial practice and to lay bare the condition of the text which Theobald worked with and studied most closely.

The collations are laid out in the form adopted by Simon Jarvis in the second appendix to his doctoral thesis.¹ Readings introduced by Pope or Theobald appear in the right-hand column, while the readings of their copy-texts are given in the left-hand column. The column headed ‘Source’ records every seventeenth-century edition in which the reading in the right-hand column can be found. Where an editor adopts a reading from a seventeenth-century text in emended form, the source appears as ‘none’.

The collations record substantive variants. Variations in scene divisions, stage directions, lineation and punctuation are not recorded. Contractions (for example, ‘I’ve’ for ‘I have’) are not noted. Variant speech prefixes are recorded only when the character speaking changes; this excludes Theobald’s substitution of ‘Edm.’ for Pope’s ‘Bast.’ throughout his text. Variant spellings which appear to affect the sense are recorded. Thus, corrected spellings which replace apparently erroneous spellings are noted; in

addition, in cases where the emended spelling and the original spelling may be interpreted as different words (as in Theobald’s emendation of ‘germains’ to ‘germins’ on p. 157 of his text) the variation is noted. Spellings and forms have been checked in the Oxford English Dictionary to verify where error and variation occur. Variant pronoun forms such as ‘thy’ and ‘thine’, ‘you’ and ‘ye’, where the sense remains the same, are not noted. Obvious misprints (such as ‘dreaful’ for ‘dreadful’ on p. 404 of Pope’s text) are not recorded.

Where an editor conjecturally emends a passage not present in his copy-text, and for which the sole source is the Quarto tradition, the ‘Source’ column notes the rejected reading of the Quarto text or texts. R. A. Foakes’ edition of King Lear records variations between the uncorrected and corrected states of the First Quarto (1608) and the First Folio (1623); these are distinguished in the ‘Source’ column. However, uncorrected and corrected readings are not recorded as variants where the Quartos are the sole source for a line or lines which Pope or Theobald printed for the first time in an eighteenth-century edition of King Lear.

In addition to noting the seventeenth-century editions in which a reading occurs, the ‘Source’ column in the collation of Pope’s 1728 text indicates where an emendation made by Pope was originally proposed by Theobald in the Appendix to Shakespeare Restored (1726). Peter Seary has calculated that ‘the second edition of [Pope’s] Shakespear (1728) incorporated some 106 alterations based on Theobald’s work’, and two of these occur in Pope’s text of King Lear.

---

Key to abbreviations:

Q1 = *M. William Shak-speare: His True Chronicle Historie of the Life and Death of King Lear* (London: Nathaniel Butter, 1608)

Q2 = *M. William Shake-speare, his True Chronicle History of the Life and Death of King Lear* ([London]: ‘Nathaniel Butter’ [false imprint; published by Thomas Pavier], ‘1608’ [i.e. 1619])

Q3 = *M. William Shake-speare, his True Chronicle History of the Life and Death of King Lear* (London: printed by Jane Bell, 1655)

Qu = the First Quarto in its uncorrected state.

Qc = the First Quarto in its corrected state.

Qq = all of the Quartos.

F1 = *M. William Shakespeares Comedies, Histories, & Tragedies* (London: [William Jaggard and others], 1623)

F2 = *M. William Shakespeares Comedies, Histories, and Tragedies* (London: Robert Allot [and others], 1632)

F3 = *Mr. William Shakespeares Comedies, Histories, and Tragedies* (London: Philip Chetwinde, 1663)

F4 = *Mr. William Shakespear’s Comedies, Histories, and Tragedies* (London: H. Herringman and others, 1685)

Fu = the First Folio in its uncorrected state.

Ff = all of the Folios.


Rowe (1714) = *The Works of Mr. William Shakespear*, ed. by Nicholas Rowe, 8 vols (London: Jacob Tonson, 1714)

---


6 The copy consulted in *Eighteenth Century Collections Online* <http://gale.cengage.co.uk> belongs to the second version of this edition, recorded in ESTC as No. N25979.

Theobald (1733) = The Works of Shakespeare, ed. by Lewis Theobald, 7 vols (London: A. Bettesworth and others, 1733)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Rowe (1714)</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Pope (1728)</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I shall study [deserving]</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>[your deserving]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td><em>France</em> and [Burgundy, Gloster]</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>[Burgundy]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I shall, my [Lord]</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>[Liere]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Know, [that we] have divided</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>[we]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>[Into] three, our Kingdom</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>[In]</td>
<td>Qq F1 F2 F3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>'tis [our fast] intent</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>[our]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Tell me, [my Daughters]</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>[daughters]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>[Sir, I love you more than word can weild the matter]</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>[I love you Sir]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>What shall <em>Cordelia</em> [speak]</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>[do]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>and <em>Albany’s</em> [Issues]</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>[issue]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Wife of <em>[Cornwall?]</em></td>
<td>355</td>
<td><em>Cornwall?</em> speak.]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>square of sense [professes]</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>[possesses]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>our last [and least]</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>[not least]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>What [can you say], to draw</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>[say you]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>[omitted]</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>[To love my father all]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Rowe (1714)</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Pope (1728)</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>[the] Truth then be</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>[thy]</td>
<td>Qq F1 F2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Hence, [and avoid] my sight</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>[avoid]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>with you by due [turn]</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>[turns]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>only [we shall retain]</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>[retain]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Revenue, [Execution of the rest]</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>[execution]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Majesty [falls to Folly]</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>[to folly falls]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>[And in thy best consideration,]check</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>[with better judgment]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>[answer my Life, my Judgment]</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>[with my life I answer]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>whose low [sounds]</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>[sound]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>wage against thine [Enemies]</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>[foes]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Enemies, [ne’er] fear to lose</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>[nor]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Safety being [Motive]</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>[the motive]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>revoke [the Gift]</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>[thy doom]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Recreant, [on thine Allegiance hear me]</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>[omitted]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>[That] thou hast sought</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>[Since]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Rowe (1714)</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Pope (1728)</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>break our [Vows]</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>[vow]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Potency [made] good</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>[make]</td>
<td>Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>what [in the] least</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>[at]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>with our displeasure [piec’d]</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>[piec’d]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>[Pardon me], Royal Sir</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>[Pardon]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>up [in] such Conditions</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>[on]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>a more [worthier] way</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>[worthy]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>[The Argument of your Praise], balm</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>[Your Praise’s argument]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>[The best, the dearest], should</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>[Dearest and best]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>sure [her] Offence</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>[th’]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>since what I [will] intend</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>[well]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>than not [t’have] pleas’d me</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>[have]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>with regards, that [stands]</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>[stand]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Point, [will] you have her</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>[Say will]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>I have [Sworn, I am firm]</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>[sworn]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Rowe (1714)</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Pope (1728)</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>To your [professed] Bosoms</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>[professing]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>That’s [most certain]</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>[certain]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>made of it [hath] been little</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>[hath not]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>The [Curiosity] of Nations</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>[nicety]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Why brand they [thus]</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>[us]</td>
<td>Qq Ff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Go to [th’creating]</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>[creating]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Shall [to] th’legitimate</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>[be]</td>
<td>Theo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>[Prescrib’d] his Power</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>[subscrib’d]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>This Policy, and Reverence of [Age]</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>[ages]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>A Heart and [a Brain]</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>[brain]</td>
<td>Qq Ff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>and Fathers [declin’d]</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>[declining]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Father should be as [Ward]</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>[a ward]</td>
<td>Q3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>hear us [confer] this</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>[confer of]</td>
<td>Qq F1 F2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>should have been [that] I am</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>[what]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Rowe (1714)</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Pope (1728)</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Knaves, Thieves, and [Treachers]</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>[treacherous]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>these Eclipses [do portend]</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>[portend]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>by Word, [nor] Countenance</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>[or]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>I [do serve] you</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>[serve]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>[Now, banisht] Kent</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>[Banish’d]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>[Not] tript neither</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>[Nor]</td>
<td>Qq Ff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>seen him [this] two Days</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>[these]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>And keep [in] Door</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>[within]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>[Fool. Nuncle, give me an Egg, and I’ll give thee two Crowns]</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>[Lear. Dost thou call me fool… Give me an egg nuncle, and I’ll give thee two crowns]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>372</td>
<td>thou call me [fool]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>372</td>
<td>a monopoly [on’t]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>372</td>
<td>[foole boy] Qq</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>372</td>
<td>[out] Qq</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Rowe (1714)</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Pope (1728)</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>372</td>
<td>would have part [on’t]</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>[nay the Ladies] too</td>
<td>Q2 Q3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>372</td>
<td>[nay the Ladies] too</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>let me have [all fool]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>372</td>
<td>let me have [all fool]</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>have all fool [my self]</td>
<td>[and Ladies] Qc Q2 Q3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>372</td>
<td>have all fool [my self]</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Fools [had ne’er] less Grace</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>[ne’er had]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>[And] you lie, Sirrah</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>[If]</td>
<td>Q2 Q3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>I [had thought] by making this</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>[thought]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>your Allowance; [which if] you should</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>[if]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>[Fool. Lear’s Shadow. / Lear. Your Name, fair Gentlewoman]</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>[Lear’s Shadow? I would learn, for by the marks… I should be false persuaded I had daughters. / Your name, fair gentlewoman]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>375</td>
<td>I would [learn]</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>[learne that] Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>375</td>
<td>Of sovereignty, [of knowledge]</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>[knowledge] Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>375</td>
<td>knowledge, [and of] reason</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Rowe (1714)</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Pope (1728)</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>[The Shame] it self doth speak</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>[Shame]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>[A little] to disquantity</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>[Of fifty]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>[Which] know themselves, and you</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>[And]</td>
<td>Q2 Q3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>dear Goddess, [hear]</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>[hear a Father]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>thankless Child. [Away, away]</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>[Go, go, my people]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Th’ [untented] Woundings</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>[untender]</td>
<td>Qu Q2 Q3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Ha! [Let it be so]</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>[is it come to this]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>[At point a hundred] Knights</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>[A hundred]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>fear still to be [taken]</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>[harm’d]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>some Company, [and away]</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>[away]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>of my particular [Fear]</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>[fears]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>[Get] you gone</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>[So get]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Though I [condemn] not</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>[condemn it]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Rowe (1714)</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Pope (1728)</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>i’th’ [middle] on’s Face</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>[middle of]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>You [may do] then in time</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>[may]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>i’th’ Night, [i’th’ haste]</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>[haste]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>pregnant and potential [Spirits]</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>[spurs]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>[strange and] fastned Villain</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>[strange]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>I have heard [strangeness]</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>[strange news]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>[For him I thank] your Grace</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>[I thank]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Good [dawning] to thee</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>[evening]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>but two [Years] o’th’ Trade</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>[hours]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Speak [yet], how grew</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>[you]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>[The] ancient Ruffian</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>[This]</td>
<td>Qq F1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>oft bite [the holy Cords]</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>[those cords]</td>
<td>Qu Q2 Q3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Cords [a-twain]</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>[in twain]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>[Which art t’intrince], t’unloose</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>[Too intricate]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>[Smooth] every Passion</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>[sooth]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Rowe (1714)</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Pope (1728)</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>in the [Natures] of their Lords</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>[nature]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>their Lords [rebel]</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>[rebels]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>[Being] Oil to Fire</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>[Bring]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>[Knowing] nought, like Dogs</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>[As knowing]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Than [stands] on any Shoulder</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>[stand]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>and [more] corrupter Ends</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>[far]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Or [flicking] Phœbus front</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>[flickering]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>When he [compact], and flattering</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>[conjunct]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>of this [dead] Exploit</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>[dread]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>You shall do small [Respects]</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>[respect]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>You [should] not use me so</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>[could]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>the self-same [Colour]</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>[nature]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>[Come, bring] away the Stocks</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>[Bring]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>[The King his Master needs] must take it ill</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>[His fault is much, and the good King his master… Are punish’d with. The King] must take it ill</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Rowe (1714)</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Pope (1728)</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>[omitted]</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>[For following her affairs. Put in his legs]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>and [most] poorest Shape</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>[the]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>and mortified [Arms]</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>[bare arms]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>thou [this Shame] thy Pastime</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>[shame]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>came [there a] reeking Post</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>[a]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>down [thou] climbing Sorrow</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>[thy]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>thou<code>dst well [deserv</code>d] it</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>[deserve]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>[serves and seeks] for Gain</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>[serves]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>[Fetch] me a better Answer</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>[Bring]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Fiery? [what] quality</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>[what fiery]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Commands [tends] Service</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>[her]</td>
<td>Qc Q2 Q3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>my more [headier] Will</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>[heady]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Death on my State; [wherefore]</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>[but wherefore]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Rowe (1714)</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Pope (1728)</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>he [knapt] 'em</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>[rapt]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>thou [shouldst not be] glad</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>[wert not]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>[Say? How] is that</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>[How]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>[If, Sir], perchance</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>[If]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>her ingrateful [top]</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>[head]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>[You] nimble Lightnings</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>[Your]</td>
<td>Q3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>To fall, and [blister]</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>[blast her pride]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Dwellsn in the [sickly] grace</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>[fickle]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>if [you your] selves are old</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>[your]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>The [hot-bloody’d] France</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>[hot-blooded]</td>
<td>Fu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Not [altogether so], / I look’d not</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>[all together]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>[give ear, Sir], to my Sister</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>[give ear]</td>
<td>Q2 Q3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>[Sith that] both charge and danger</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>[since]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>[What must] I come to you</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>[must]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Rowe (1714)</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Pope (1728)</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>wicked, not being [the worst]</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>[worst]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>thou [art] twice her Love</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>[hast]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>What [need] one</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>[needs]</td>
<td>Qq Ff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>give me that [patience, patience] I need</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>[patience which]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>[And let] not Womens weapons</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>[O let]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>[But this] Heart shall break</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>[This]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>into a [hundred thousand] flaws</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>[thousand]</td>
<td>Q2 Q3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>This House is [little]</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>[small]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>in high rage [ / Corn. Whither is he going? /</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>[and will I know not whither]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Glo. He calls to Horse, but will I know not whither.]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Do sorely [ruffle], for many Miles</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>[russle]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>[omitted]</td>
<td>400-1</td>
<td>[tears his white hair, / Which the impetuous blasts with eyeless rage / Catch in their fury, and make nothing of. (two lines omitted) This night, in which the cub-drawn bear… And bids what will, take all]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Page</strong></td>
<td><strong>Rowe (1714)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Page</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pope (1728)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Source</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401</td>
<td>[omitted]</td>
<td></td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Striues in his little world of man to outscorne / The too and fro conflicting wind and raine] Qq</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401</td>
<td>[in which] the cub-drawn</td>
<td></td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[wherin] Qq</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>With mutual [Cunning]</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>[craft]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>[Who have (as who have not, whom their great Stars / Thron’d and set high?)… Whereof, perchance, these are but furnishings]</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>[degraded to footnote]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>What [hath] been seen</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>[have] in footnote</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>[omitted]</td>
<td>401-2</td>
<td>[But true it is from France there comes a pow’r… And from some knowledge and assurance of you, / Offer this office]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>have secret [sea]</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[feet] Q1 [fee] Q2 [sec] Q3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and [madding] sorrow</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[bemadding] Q1 Q2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Rowe (1714)</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Pope (1728)</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>402</td>
<td>knowledge and [assurance of you]</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402</td>
<td>Offer this [office]</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>the King, in which [your pain]</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>That way, [I’ll] this</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>[drown] the Cocks</td>
<td>Qq</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>[Vaunt-curriours] of Oak-cleaving</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Crack Nature’s [moulds]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>That [makes] ingrateful Man</td>
<td>Qq</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>better than the [Rain-water]</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>here’s a Night [pities]</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>You owe me no [Subscription]</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>That [will] with two pernicious</td>
<td>Qq</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>pernicious Daughters [join]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Th’affliction, not the [fear]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Rowe (1714)</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Pope (1728)</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>keep this dreadful [pudder]</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>[thund’ring]</td>
<td>Q2 Q3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>thou [Simular] of Virtue</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>[simular man]</td>
<td>Q1 Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Caitiff, [to pieces shake]</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>[shake to pieces]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>concealing Continents, and [cry]</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>[ask]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>More [harder] than the Stones</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>[hard]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>[than the Stones] whereof</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>[is the stone]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>[And] can make vild things</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>[That]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>I have one [part] in my Heart</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>[thing]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>[This is] a brave Night</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>['Tis]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>a Prophecy [ere] I go</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>[or ere]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>[Nor] Cut-purses come not</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>[And]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>a Power already [footed]</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>[landed]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>I will look [him], and privily</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>[for him]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Most [savage unnatural]</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>[savage and unnatural]</td>
<td>Qq Ff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>There [is] strange things toward</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>[are]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Rowe (1714)</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Pope (1728)</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>The Tyranny [of the] open Night’s</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>[of]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Your [lop’d] and window’d</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>[loop’d]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>sharp Hawthorn [blow the Winds]</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>[blows the cold wind]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>through Flame, through [Sword]</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>[ford]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>over [four arch’d] Bridges</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>[four inch’d]</td>
<td>Qq F1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>[would’st] thou give ’em</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>[did’st]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>keep thy Word, [do Justice]</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>[justly]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Oaths, as I spake [Words]</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>[works]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Wine lov’d I [dearly]</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>[deeply]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>light of Ear, bloody [handed]</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>[of hand]</td>
<td>Qq F1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>and walks [at] First Cock</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>[till the]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>and [stockt, punish’d], and imprison’d</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>[stock-punish’d]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>[Poor Tom’s] a-cold</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>[Tom’s]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>[Good, my Lord], take his Offer</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>[My good lord]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>come [to seek] you out</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>[seek]</td>
<td>Qq F1 F2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Rowe (1714)</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Pope (1728)</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Importune him [once more to go]</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>[to go]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>In, [Fellow, there]</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>[fellow]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>[Go along] with us</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>[along]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>thou shalt find a [dear] Father</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>[dearer]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Power of his Wits, [have]</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>[has]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>[omitted]</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>[Edg. The foul fiend bites my back… (some lines omitted)… False justice, why hast thou let her scape]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>413</td>
<td>[the health of a horse]</td>
<td></td>
<td>none</td>
<td>[a horses health] Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>413</td>
<td>[the love of a boy]</td>
<td></td>
<td>none</td>
<td>[a boyes loue] Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>413</td>
<td>[the oath of a whore]</td>
<td></td>
<td>none</td>
<td>[a whores oath] Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>413</td>
<td>[now] ye she foxes</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>Q2  Q3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>413</td>
<td>[omitted]</td>
<td></td>
<td>none</td>
<td>[Edg. Looke where he stands… Why she dares not]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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413 for two white [herrings] none

413 [omitted] none

413 I'll see their [tryal] none

413 bring [me in the] evidence none

413 [omitted] none

413 [omitted] none

413 [omitted] none

Source

come ouer to thee] Qq

[Kent. How doe you sir… rest vpon the cushings] Qq

[Kent. How doe you sir… rest vpon the cushings] Qq

[I here take my oath… the poore king her father] Qq

[Lear. And heres another… stop her there] Qq
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Rowe (1714)</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Pope (1728)</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>have boasted to [remain]</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>[retain]</td>
<td>Qq F1 F2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>[make] these hard Hearts</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>[makes]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Gloster [had] convey’d him hence</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>[hath]</td>
<td>Qq F1 F2 F3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Be simple [answer’d]</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>[answerer]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>[You have sent] the Lunatick</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>[Have you sent]</td>
<td>Q2 Q3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>The lowest, [and most] deject</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>[most]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>most [deject] thing of Fortune</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>[dejected]</td>
<td>Qq F1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>nothing to [my] Blasts</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>[thy]</td>
<td>Ff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Our [means secure] us</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>[mean secures]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Flies [to th’] wanton Boys</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>[to]</td>
<td>F1 F2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>[that must] play the Fool</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>[must play]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>[Which] I’ll intreat to lead me</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>[Whom]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>covering for [his] naked Soul</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>[this]</td>
<td>Qq Ff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Do as I [bid thee]</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>[bid]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>I cannot [daub] it further</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>[dance]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Rowe (1714)</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Pope (1728)</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Bless thee [good Man’s Son]</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>[good man]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>[omitted]</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>[Five fiends have been in poor Tom at once… <em>(four words omitted)</em>… possesses chamber-maids and waiting-women]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>421</td>
<td><em>omitted</em></td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>421</td>
<td><em>[Flibbertigibbet]</em> of moping</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>421</td>
<td>of <em>[moping]</em>, and <em>Mowing</em></td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>421</td>
<td>and <em>[Mowing]</em> who since possesses</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>421</td>
<td>waiting-women. <em>omitted</em></td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>[and the] Lust-dieted Man</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>[and]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>change [Names] at home</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>[arms]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>[ere long you are like to] hear</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>[you ere long shall]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>the [difference] of Man, and Man</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>[strange difference]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Rowe (1714)</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Pope (1728)</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>omitted</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>[I fear your disposition. / That nature which contemns its origine… (two lines omitted)… Like monsters of the deep] Qq</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>423</td>
<td>will [shiver] and dis-branch none [sliver] Qq</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>423</td>
<td>which contemns [its] origine Q3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>423</td>
<td>No more, [tis foolish] none [the text is foolish] Qq</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>423</td>
<td>[omitted] none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>423</td>
<td>offences, [omitted] none [it will come] Qq</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>omitted</td>
<td>425-6</td>
<td>[Kent. The King of France so suddenly gone back… (some lines omitted)… Lending me this acquaintance. Pray along with me]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>425</td>
<td>[The] King of France none [Why the] Qq</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Rowe (1714)</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Pope (1728)</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>425</td>
<td>[France] so suddenly gone</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>[Fraunce is] Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>425</td>
<td>Know you [the] reason</td>
<td>Q2 Q3</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>425</td>
<td>[Imports] the Kingdom so much</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>[imports to] Qq</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>425</td>
<td>his [return] was most requir’d</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>[personal returne] Qq</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>425</td>
<td>Monsieur [le Far]</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>[la Far] Qq</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>425</td>
<td>passion, [which] most rebel-like</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>[Who] Qq</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>425</td>
<td>[But not to] rage</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>[Not to a] Q1 Q2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>425</td>
<td>Patience and sorrow [strove]</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>[streme] Qq</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>425</td>
<td>[Which] should express her</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>[Who] Qq</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>425</td>
<td>Those [happiest smiles]</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>[happie smilets] Qq</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Pope (1728)</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>425</td>
<td>[seem’d] not to know</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[seeme] Qq</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>425</td>
<td>[Once] or twice</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Faith once] Qq</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>425</td>
<td>[omitted]</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[her smiles and teares, / Were like a better way] Qq</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>425</td>
<td>[omitted]</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[shame of Ladies sisters: / Kent, father, sisters] Qq</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>425</td>
<td>i’th’ storm [of night]</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ith night] Qq</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>426</td>
<td>Let Pity [ne’er believe it]</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[not be beleef] Qq</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>426</td>
<td>[then] she shook</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[there] Qq</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>426</td>
<td>[And then retir’d]</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[And clamour moystened her, then away she started] Qq</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Rowe (1714)</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Pope (1728)</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>426</td>
<td>[omitted]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>426</td>
<td>one self-mate and [mate]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[It is the stars] Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>426</td>
<td>[Spoke you] with her since</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>426</td>
<td>[The poor] distressed Lear’s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>426</td>
<td>Lear’s [in town]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>426</td>
<td>[sometimes] in his better tune</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>426</td>
<td>shame so [bows] him</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>426</td>
<td>[his] unkindness / That stript her</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>426</td>
<td>These things sting [him]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>426</td>
<td>detains him / From [his Cordelia]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Cordelia] Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Rowe (1714)</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Pope (1728)</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>[A Century send forth]</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>[Pray] along with me</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>In the good Man’s [desire]</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>[Send forth a cent’ry]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mourning and [importun’d] tears</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>[distress]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>[Madam, with] much adoe</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>[important]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>with your [Lord] at home</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>[With]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>her purposes by [word? Belike]</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>[lady]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>[Some things], I know not what</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>[Something]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>So [fare you well]</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>[farewell]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>What [Party] I do follow</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>[lady]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>[Methinks] you’re better spoken</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>[Sure]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>th’unnumbred idle [Pebble] chafes</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>[pebbles]</td>
<td>Q2 Q3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>For all [beneath] the Moon</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>[below]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>The [treasure] of Life</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>[treasury]</td>
<td>Qq F1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Feathers [and Air]</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>[air]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Rowe (1714)</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Pope (1728)</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Ten Masts [at least]</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>[attacht]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>the [shrill gor’d] Lark</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>[shrill-gorg’d]</td>
<td>Qq F1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Horns [walk’d], and wav’d</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>[welk’d]</td>
<td>Qq F1 F2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>like the [enraged] Sea</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>[enridged]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Think that the [clearest] gods</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>[dearest]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Ha! [Gonerill with a white Beard]</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>[Gonerill! hah Regan!]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>dost thou [squiny] at me</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>[squint]</td>
<td>Q3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Were all [thy] Letters</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>[the]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>your Head, [nor no] Mony</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>[nor]</td>
<td>Q2 Q3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>[great] Vices do appear</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>[small]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>[Place] Sins with Gold</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>[Plate]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>in Rags, [and] Pigmy’s Straw</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>[a]</td>
<td>Ff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>upon these [Son-in-Laws]</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>[sons-in-law]</td>
<td>Q2 Q3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>[omitted]</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>[And laying autumn’s dust]. I will die bravely,</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>[Masters] know you that</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>[My Masters]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Rowe (1714)</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Pope (1728)</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>I thank you, [Sir, that’s all]</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>[Sir]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>[Edg. I thank you, Sir]</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>[omitted]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>The benizon of [Heav’n / To boot, and boot]</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>[heav’n to boot]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>[Thou old], unhappy Traitor</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>[Old]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>[Now let] thy friendly Hand</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>[Let]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>my [Ballow] be the harder</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>[bat]</td>
<td>Qc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>[Child] pick your Teeth</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>[Chill]</td>
<td>F1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Oh untimely [death, death]</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>[death]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>the place [of our] Labour</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>[for your]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>space of Woman’s [Will]</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>[wit]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>and in [the mature] time</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>[mature]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>[My Life] will be too short</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>[life]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>be’t [so, my good Lord]</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>[so. / My Lord]</td>
<td>Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>[So please] your Majesty</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>[Please]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>To be [oppos’d] against</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>[expos’d]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Rowe (1714)</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Pope (1728)</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>against the [jarring] Winds</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>[warring]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>[That] art a Soul in bliss</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>[Thou]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>[You] must not kneel</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>[No, Sir, you]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>[Not an hour more, nor less]</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>[omitted]</td>
<td>Ff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>these Garments; [nor] I know</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>[nay]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>You see is [kill’d] in him</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>[cur’d]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>[Trouble] him no more</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>[And trouble]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>[self-reproving; bring] his constant Pleasure</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>[self-reproving brings]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>by mine [Honour, Madam]</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>[honour]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>[omitted]</td>
<td>442</td>
<td></td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Fortune [loves] you</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>[love]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>[Here] is the guess</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>[Hard]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>I do require [them]</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>[then]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Rowe (1714)</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Pope (1728)</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>[Sir, I thought it] fit</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>[I thought]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>to some [retention]</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>[retention and appointed guard]</td>
<td>Qc Q2 Q3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Whose Age [had] Charms</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>[has]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>To pluck the common [Bosom]</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>[bosoms]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>The which [immediacy] may well</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>[immediate]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>More than in your [Addition]</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>[advancement]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>In my [Rights]</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>[right]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>and prove my Title [thine]</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>[good]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>I’ll [make] it on thy Heart</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>[prove]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>I’ll ne’er trust Medicine</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>[poison]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>[my Privilege, / The Privilege] of mine Honours</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>[the privilege]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>[Despight] thy Victor-Sword</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>[Spite of]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>shall I stop [it; hold, Sir]</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>[it]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>worse than any [Name]</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>[thing]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>[Most Monstrous! O], know’st thou</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>[Monster]</td>
<td>Q2 Q3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Rowe (1714)</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Pope (1728)</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Let's [exchange] Charity</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>[exchange our]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Death would hourly [die]</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>[bear]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>[That] very Dogs disdain’d</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>[The]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Their precious [Stones] new lost</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>[gems]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Told him [our] Pilgrimage</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>[my]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Help, [help! O help!]</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>[help]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Be brief [in it, to] th’ Castle</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>[into]</td>
<td>Q2 Q3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>[That she fore-did her self]</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>[omitted]</td>
<td>Q2 Q3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>[Howl, howl, howl]</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>[Howl, howl, howl, howl]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>you are Men of [Stones]</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>[stone]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>[Edg. Or image of that horror. / Alb. Fall and cease]</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>[omitted]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>I would have made [him] skip</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>[them]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>[This is a dull Sight], are you not</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>[omitted]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>your [first] of difference and decay</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>[life]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>[Nor] no Man else</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>['Twas]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Rowe (1714)</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Pope (1728)</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>That’s but a [Trifle here]</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>[trifle]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>[you to your] Rights</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>[to you, your]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>the rack of this [tough] World</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>[rough]</td>
<td>Q3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Pope (1728)</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Theobald (1733)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qq</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>France and [Burgundy.]</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>[Burgundy, Glo'ster.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ff</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>'tis [our] intent</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>[our fast]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qq</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>Strive to be [int’rest]</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>[int’ress’d]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qq</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>Nothing [will] come of nothing</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>[can]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qq F1 F2 F3</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>honour’d as [a] King</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>[my]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qq Ff</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>potency [make] good</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>[made]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qq</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>[Cor.] Here’s France</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>[Glo.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qq Ff</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>with our displeasure [pierc’d]</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>[piec’d]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qq Ff</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>sure [th’] offence</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>[her]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qq</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>[As monstrous is]; or your</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>[That monsters it]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qq</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>[Could not fall] into taint</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>[Fal’n]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qq</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>[respect and fortunes] are his love</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>[respects of fortune]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qq</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>let us [sit] together</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>[hit]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qq</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>The [nicety] of nations</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>[curtesie]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qq F1</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>gap in [your] honour</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>[your own]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Pope (1728)</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Theobald (1733)</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>365</td>
<td>[omitted]</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>[Edm. Nor is not, sure. / Glo. To his Father, that so tenderly and entirely loves him–Heav’n and Earth]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>367</td>
<td>I [serve] you</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>[do serve]</td>
<td>Qq Qq Ff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>368</td>
<td>[omitted]</td>
<td>120-1</td>
<td>[Not to be over-rul’d: Idle old Man… With Checks, like Flatt’rers when they’re seen t’abuse us]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>121</td>
<td>Checks, [like Flatt’rers]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>121</td>
<td>they’re seen [t’abuse us]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>121</td>
<td>[as flatteries] Qq</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>368</td>
<td>[Well], madam</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>[Very well]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>368</td>
<td>And can my speech [disuse]</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>[diffuse]</td>
<td>Qq Qq Ff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>368</td>
<td>[Banish’d] Kent</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>[Now, banish’d]</td>
<td>Qq Qq Ff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>370</td>
<td>he [answer’d] in the roundest manner</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>[answer’d me]</td>
<td>Qq Qq F1 F2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>372</td>
<td>you [give] me nothing for’t</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>[gave]</td>
<td>Qq Qq F1 F2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>372</td>
<td>all [fool] my self</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>[fool to]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>372</td>
<td>[degraded to footnote]</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>[A bitter fool… Lear. No lad, teach me]</td>
<td>Qq Qq Ff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Pope (1728)</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Theobald (1733)</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>372</td>
<td>Dost thou call me [fool]</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>[fool, boy]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>372</td>
<td>[omitted]</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>[Fool. That Lord, that counsel’d thee to give away thy Land… the Other, found out there]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>374</td>
<td>not to be endured [riots Sir]</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>[riots]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>375</td>
<td>[omitted]</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>[O, Sir, are you come?]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>376</td>
<td>With [cadent] tears fret</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>[candent]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>376</td>
<td>[As] dotage gives it</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>[That]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>377</td>
<td>Th’ [untender] woundings</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>[untented]</td>
<td>Qc Ff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>377</td>
<td>Beweep [her once] again</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>[this Cause]</td>
<td>Qq Ff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>378</td>
<td>some company, [away]</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>[and away]</td>
<td>Qq Ff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>378</td>
<td>prais’d for [harmless] mildness</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>[harmful]</td>
<td>Qq Ff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>381</td>
<td>i’th’ night, [haste]</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>[i’th’ haste]</td>
<td>Qq Ff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>382</td>
<td>[launch’d] mine arm</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>[lanc’d]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>382</td>
<td>My worthy [arch and patron]</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>[and arch-patron]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>382</td>
<td>no, [by what] I should deny</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>[what]</td>
<td>Qq Ff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Pope (1728)</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Theobald (1733)</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>382</td>
<td>deny his letter, [said he]</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>I never got him</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>383</td>
<td>That [tended] upon my father</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>[tend]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>383</td>
<td>and waste [of] revenues</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>[of his]</td>
<td>Qc F1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>384</td>
<td>[Thus out of season thredding dark-ey’d night? / Reg. Occasions, noble Glo’ster, of some prize]</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>[Reg. Thus out of season threading dark-ey’d night; / Occasions, noble Glo’ster, of some prize]</td>
<td>Qq Ff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>385</td>
<td>[action-taking Whorson]: Glass-gazing</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>[action-taking, knave; a whorson]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>386</td>
<td>[two days] since</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>[two days ago]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>386</td>
<td>[A tailor], Sir</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>[I, a tailor]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>386</td>
<td>Speak [you], how grew</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>[yet]</td>
<td>Qq Ff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>386</td>
<td>oft bite [those cords]</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>[the holy cords]</td>
<td>Ff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>386</td>
<td>[Too intricate] t’ unloose</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>[Too ’intrinsicate]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>387</td>
<td>and [far] corrupter ends</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>[more]</td>
<td>Qq Ff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>388</td>
<td>such a deal [of man]</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>[of man, that]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>388</td>
<td>[Bring] away the stocks</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>[Come, bring]</td>
<td>Qq Ff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Pope (1728)</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Theobald (1733)</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>388</td>
<td>That [he’s] so slightly</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>[he]</td>
<td>F1 F2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>388</td>
<td>[To] have him thus restrain’d</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>[Should]</td>
<td>Qq Ff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>390</td>
<td>[put] all my hair in knots</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>[elfe]</td>
<td>F1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>391</td>
<td>thou [shame] thy pastime</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>[thy shame]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>391</td>
<td>they read: on [those] contents</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>[whose]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>392</td>
<td>as many dolours [for]</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>[from]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>392</td>
<td>down [thy] climbing sorrow</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>[thou]</td>
<td>Qq Ff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>392</td>
<td>thou’dst well [deserve] it</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>[deserved]</td>
<td>Qq Ff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>392</td>
<td>break thy neck with [following]</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>[following it]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>393</td>
<td>leave thee in [a] storm</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>[the]</td>
<td>Qq F1 F2 F3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>393</td>
<td>[And] I will tarry</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>[But]</td>
<td>Qq F1 F2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>394</td>
<td>my more [heady] will</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>[headier]</td>
<td>Qq Ff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>394</td>
<td>[he] put them i’th’ Pasty</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>[she]</td>
<td>Qq F1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>394</td>
<td>[he] rapt ’em</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>[she]</td>
<td>Qq F2 F3 F4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>394</td>
<td>’Twas [his] brother</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>[her]</td>
<td>Qq F1 F2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
[How] is that this becomes the [house] Look’d [black] upon me her ingrateful [head] [Infected] airs [Your] nimble lightnings Thy [tender-hearted] nature [and dues] of gratitude [Allow] obedience, if your selves [To wage against the enmity o’th’ air, / To be a comrade with the wolf and owl; / To be a comrade with the wolf and owl] Not [all together], / I look’d not thou [hast] twice her love This house is [small] Do sorely [russle], for many miles [omitted]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Pope (1728)</th>
<th>Theobald (1733)</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qq</td>
<td>in which] the cub-drawn bear</td>
<td>[wherein]</td>
<td>401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qq Ff</td>
<td>With mutual [craft]</td>
<td>[cunning]</td>
<td>401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ff</td>
<td>[degraded to footnote]</td>
<td>[Who have (as who have not, whom their great stars / Thron’d and set high?)… (Whereof, perchance, these are but furnishings– )]</td>
<td>401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ff</td>
<td>What [have] been seen in footnote</td>
<td>[hath]</td>
<td>401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1 Q2</td>
<td>and [madding] sorrow</td>
<td>[bemadding]</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ff</td>
<td>[Vaunt-courtiers] of oak-cleaving</td>
<td>[Vaunt-couriers]</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>all [germains] spill at once</td>
<td>[germins]</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qq</td>
<td>Good nuncle, in, [ask]</td>
<td>[and ask]</td>
<td>402-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ff</td>
<td>You owe me no [submission]</td>
<td>[subscription]</td>
<td>403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1 Ff</td>
<td>keep this dreadful [thund’ring]</td>
<td>[pudder]</td>
<td>404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>Thou [perjur’d], and thou</td>
<td>[Perjure]</td>
<td>404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ff</td>
<td>thou [simular man] of virtue</td>
<td>[Simular]</td>
<td>404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Pope (1728)</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Theobald (1733)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>404</td>
<td>Where is [this] straw</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>[the]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>404</td>
<td>I’ve one [thing] in my heart</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>[part]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>405</td>
<td>a power already [landed]</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>[footed]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>406</td>
<td>The tyranny [of] open night’s</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>[o’th’]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>406</td>
<td>But if thy flight [light] toward</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>[lay]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>408</td>
<td>[Have] his daughters brought</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>[What, have]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>408</td>
<td>oaths as I spake [works]</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>[words]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>409</td>
<td>Thou wert better in [a] grave</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>[thy]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>409</td>
<td>[Swithold] footed thrice</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>[St. Withold]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>409</td>
<td>footed thrice the [old]</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>[Wold]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410</td>
<td>who [hath] three suits</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>[hath had]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>411</td>
<td>Importune him [to go]</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>[once more to go]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>413</td>
<td>for he’s a [yeoman] that sees his son</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>[mad yeoman]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>413</td>
<td>here, most learned [justice]</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>[justicer]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>413</td>
<td><em>[omitted]</em></td>
<td>170</td>
<td><em>Edg. Look, where she stands and glares. Wantest thou eyes… Why she</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Pope (1728)</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Theobald (1733)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dares not come over to thee]</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>[she] stands and glares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>413</td>
<td>[omitted]</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>[Kent. How do you, Sir? stand you not so amaz’d; / Will you lye down, and rest upon the Cushions]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>413</td>
<td>I’ll see their [tryal]</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>[tryal first]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>413</td>
<td>[omitted]</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>[Edg. Let us deal justly… Purre, the Cat, is grey]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>413</td>
<td>[omitted]</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>[I here take my Oath before this honourable Assembly, she kick’d the poor King her Father]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>170</td>
<td>[she kick’d] the poor King</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>413</td>
<td>[omitted]</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>[Lear. And here’s another, whose warpt Looks proclaim / What store her Heart is made of. Stop her there]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>171</td>
<td>her Heart is made [of]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>414</td>
<td>[omitted]</td>
<td>172-3</td>
<td>[Kent. Opprest Nature sleeps… safe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Pope (1728)</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Theobald (1733)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>172</td>
<td>balm’d thy broken [Senses]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>172</td>
<td>if [Conveniency] will not allow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>172</td>
<td>wrong [Thought defiles] thee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>417</td>
<td>let him [answer] that</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>[first answer]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>417</td>
<td>quench’d the [steeled] fires</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>[stelled]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>417</td>
<td>All cruels else [subscribe]</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>[subscrib’d]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>418</td>
<td>[omitted]</td>
<td>176-7</td>
<td>[1st. Serv. I'll never care what Wickedness I do… Now, Heaven help him]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>419</td>
<td>mutations make us [hate] thee</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>[wait]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>421</td>
<td>I cannot [dance] it further</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>[daub]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>421</td>
<td>[omitted]</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>[Of Lust, as Obidicut]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>421</td>
<td>Mohu of [murder]</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>[murder; and]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>421</td>
<td>of [moping], and Mowing</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>[mopping]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Pope (1728)</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Theobald (1733)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>421</td>
<td>and [Mowing] who since possesses</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>[mowing]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>423</td>
<td>From her [material] sap</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>[maternal]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>423</td>
<td>[omitted]</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>[Filths savour but themselves–What have you done]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>423</td>
<td>[omitted]</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>[that not know’st, / Fools do these villains pity… “Alack! why does he so]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>183</td>
<td>Fools do [these] villains pity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>183</td>
<td>thy slayer [begins his] threats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[begins] Qc Q2 Q3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>423</td>
<td>[omitted]</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>[Alb. Thou chang’d, and self-converted thing! For shame… Gon. Marry, your manhood now]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>184</td>
<td>chang’d, and [self-converted]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[selfe-couerd] Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>425</td>
<td>[I say] she took ’em</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>[I, Sir]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>425</td>
<td>[omitted]</td>
<td>185-6</td>
<td>[her Smiles and Tears / Were like a wetter May]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>186</td>
<td>Were like a [wetter May]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
[Once] or twice

[omitted]

i’th’ storm [of night]

[then] she shook

[And then retir’d], to deal with grief alone

[omitted]

Crown’d with rank [fenitar]

her purposes by [word]

What [lady] I do follow

Would [not I] leap upright

you [Sir! friend! here, you Sir]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Pope (1728)</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Theobald (1733)</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>431</td>
<td>Think that the [dearest] gods</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>[clearest]</td>
<td>Qq Ff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>432</td>
<td>his bow like a [cow-keeper]</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>[crow-keeper]</td>
<td>Qq Ff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>432</td>
<td>O well flown [bird]</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>[Barb]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>432</td>
<td>[wind] to make me chatter</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>[the wind]</td>
<td>Qq F1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>433</td>
<td>dost thou [squint] at me</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>[squiny]</td>
<td>Q1 Q2 Ff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>433</td>
<td>your eyes are [in] heavy case</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>[in a]</td>
<td>Qq F1 F2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>435</td>
<td>Thou hast [a] daughter</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>[one]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>436</td>
<td>The benizon of [heav’n to boot]</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>[heav’n / To boot, and boot]</td>
<td>Ff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>437</td>
<td>space of woman’s [wit]</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>[Will]</td>
<td>Ff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>437</td>
<td>and in [mature] time</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>[the mature]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>439</td>
<td>Kind and [dear] Princess</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>[dearest]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>439</td>
<td>Was this [face]</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>[a face]</td>
<td>Qq F1 F2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>439</td>
<td>[omitted]</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>[To stand against the deep, dread-bolted Thunder… With this thin Helm]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>439</td>
<td>[Mine enemy’s] dog, though he had bit me</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>[My very Enemy’s]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>440</td>
<td>[omitted]</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>[and, yet, ’twere Danger / To make him</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Pope (1728)</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Theobald (1733)</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>even o’er the Time, h’as lost]</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>['twere] Danger</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>440</td>
<td>[And trouble] him no more</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>[trouble]</td>
<td>[it is] Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>440</td>
<td>[omitted]</td>
<td>202-3</td>
<td>[Gent. Holds it true, Sir, that the Duke of Cornwall was so slain… Or well, or ill, as this day’s Battle’s fought]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>441</td>
<td>[self-reproving brings] his constant pleasure</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>[self-reproving: bring]</td>
<td>Qq Ff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>441</td>
<td>by mine [honour]</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>[honour, Madam]</td>
<td>Qq Ff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>441</td>
<td>[omitted]</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>[Gon. I’d rather lose the Battle, than that Sister / Should loosen him and Me]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>441</td>
<td>Sir, this I [heard]</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>[hear]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>442</td>
<td>[for] this business</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>['fore]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>442</td>
<td>[omitted]</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>[Edm. Sir, you speak nobly]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>442</td>
<td>[omitted]</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>[Edm. I shall attend you presently at your Tent]. / Alb. Let’s then determine</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>[line inserted out of sequence]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[at your tent. / Reg. Sister you’ll goe with us] Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Pope (1728)</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Theobald (1733)</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>442</td>
<td>convenient, [pray] go with us</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>[pray you]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>444</td>
<td>[I am] cast down</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>[am I]</td>
<td>Q1 Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>445</td>
<td>[thy] great imployment</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>[My]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>445</td>
<td>[I] do require then</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>[We]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>445</td>
<td>I do require [then]</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>[them]</td>
<td>Ff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>445</td>
<td>[I thought] fit</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>[Sir, I thought it]</td>
<td>Qq Ff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>446</td>
<td>[omitted]</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>[At this time, / We sweat and bleed… Requires a fitter Place]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>446</td>
<td>and prove my title [good]</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>[thine]</td>
<td>Ff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>447</td>
<td>Call by [the] trumpet</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>[thy]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>447</td>
<td>Trust to thy single [virtues]</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>[virtue]</td>
<td>Qq F1 F2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>447</td>
<td>[My] sickness grows upon me</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>[This]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>449</td>
<td>Where [they shall] rest for ever</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>[thou shalt]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>449</td>
<td>[Alb. Save him, save him. / Gon. This is practice, Glo’ster]</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>[Gon. O, save him, save him; This is Practice, Gloster]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>449</td>
<td>Let’s [exchange our] charity</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>[exchange]</td>
<td>Qq Ff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Pope (1728)</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Theobald (1733)</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>449</td>
<td>Make instruments to [plague] us</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>[scourge]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>450</td>
<td>[omitted]</td>
<td>213-4</td>
<td><em>Edg.</em> This would have seem’d a Period, / To such as love not Sorrow… Improper for a Slave</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>213</td>
<td>came [there] a Man</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>213</td>
<td>seen me in my [worser State]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>213</td>
<td>Society; but [now] finding</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>213</td>
<td>Who ’twas, [had] so endur’d</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>213</td>
<td>threw [him] on my Father</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>451</td>
<td>be they [live] or dead</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>[alive]</td>
<td>Q1 Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>451</td>
<td>O! is this [she]</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>[He]</td>
<td>Qq F1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>452</td>
<td>you [murth’rors], traitors all</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>[murth’rous]</td>
<td>Qq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>453</td>
<td>[He’š] a good fellow</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>[’Twas]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Pope (1728)</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Theobald (1733)</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>453</td>
<td>[He’ll] strike, and quickly</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>[He’d]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>453</td>
<td>your [life] of difference and decay</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>[first]</td>
<td>Ff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>453</td>
<td>['Twas] no man else</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>[Nor]</td>
<td>Qq Ff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>453</td>
<td>cheerless, dark, and [deadly]</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>[dead]</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>453</td>
<td>Look [to] my lord</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>[up]</td>
<td>Qq Ff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX FOUR

SAMMELBÄNDE COMPILED BY RICHARD TRIPLETT

Volume titles given in single quotation marks are taken from the volume spines; those without quotation marks have been supplied where no title appears on the volume spine. All but initial capitals in titles have been lowered. Book numbers given here refer properly to the first title in each volume; to reflect the physical integrity of the bound volumes, and to avoid complication, no further book numbers are given.

‘Musae Oxon. et Cant.’, 6 vols

Binding: Part original Triplett binding, part modern. The first three volumes have vellum spines with titles in Triplett’s hand, and marbled paper pieces on the boards. The last three volumes have been rebound in full vellum. Each volume has a table of contents in Triplett’s hand.

Vol. 1; Book No. 8927


Vol. 2; Book No. 7394


**Vol. 3; Book No. 1965**

4. University of Cambridge, *Anthologia in Regis Exanthemata* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1632 [i.e. 1633]). ESTC No. S107294

330
Vol. 4; Book No. 7445


Vol. 5; Book No. 7428


Vol. 6; Book No. 1988

‘Poemata’; Book No. 2144

Binding: Characteristic Triplett binding. Vellum spine with title in Triplett’s hand; marbled paper pieces on boards.


‘Notitia Oxoniensis’; Book No. 3938

Binding: Characteristic Triplett binding. Vellum spine with title in Triplett’s hand; marbled paper and vellum pieces on boards. One of the blank leaves at the front of the volume has a table of contents in Triplett’s hand.

3. Thomas Hobbes, *De Mirabilibus Pecci* ([London(?): n. pub., 1666(?)]). First leaf missing. ESTC No. R20159

---

1 ESTC’s partly edited record for this book names Winchester College Fellows’ Library as the only collection in which a copy can be found.
2 ESTC’s partly edited record for this book names Winchester College Fellows’ Library as the only collection in which a copy can be found.

**‘Heath Etc’; Book No. 4809**

**Binding:** Probably Tripllett’s. Seventeenth-century full calf; the handwritten title on the spine is not Tripllett’s. There is a table of contents in Tripllett’s hand on the front free endpaper.


**‘Miscellaneous Poems’; Book No. 2259**

**Binding:** Nineteenth-century vellum, probably replicating an earlier part-vellum binding of Tripllett’s; the manuscript title on the spine is not in Tripllett’s hand. One of the blank leaves at the front of the volume has a table of contents written by Tripllett.


---

3 First words of title in Greek characters.


**Du Bartas, etc; Book No. 8616**

**Binding:** Variant Tripplett binding. Half-vellum with marbled paper boards.


**‘Miscellanea’; Book No. 2289**

**Binding:** Probably Trippett’s. Seventeenth-century full calf; the handwritten title on the spine is not Trippett’s. There is a table of contents in Trippett’s hand on the front free endpaper.


‘Capiluporum Carmina’; Book No. 2131

**Binding:** Modern cloth, in three volumes labelled ‘Capiluporum Carmina Vol. 1’, ‘Vol. 2’ and ‘Vols 3 & 4’. ‘Vol. 1’ contains item 1 below. ‘Vol. 2’ has item 2. ‘Vols 3 & 4’ is a single volume containing items 3 and 4. In this final volume, the title pages of the books are numbered ‘3’ and ‘4’ in sequence. This numbering is consistent with the labelling of the volume, and supports the conclusion that the contents of all three volumes were once bound into a single compilation, possibly by Triplett.


3. Venceslaus Clemens, *Trinobantiados Augustae Sive Londini Libri IV* ([Leiden: Joannes Maire], 1636)

4. Venceslaus Clemens, *Viola Veris a Moeniss. Nuncia ad Seriam Meditationem Passionis & Resurrectionis Domini Nostri Iesu Christi* ([Leiden(?): n. pub.], 1636)
APPENDIX FIVE

SELECTED SAMMELBÄNDE COMPILED BY ALEXANDER THISTLETHWAYTE

Volume titles given in single quotation marks are taken from the volume spines; those without quotation marks have been supplied where no title appears on the volume spine. All but initial capitals in titles have been lowered. Book numbers given here refer properly to the first title in each volume; to reflect the physical integrity of the bound volumes, and to avoid complication, no further book numbers are given.

‘K². James’s Divine Poesie &c.’; Book No. 5446

**Binding:** Characteristic Thistlethwayte binding. Half-leather with marbled paper boards.

2. *Affectuum Decidua, or Due Expressions in Honour of the Truly Noble Charles Capell Esq.* (Oxford: [n. pub.], 1656). ESTC No. R5314

‘Miscellany Poems’; Book No. 7047

**Binding:** Very likely Thistlethwayte’s. Full calf with lettered spine. The title pages of the books are numbered in red crayon, a feature of many Sammelbände with characteristic Thistlethwayte bindings. Thistlethwayte foliated the volume to fol. 150 (with some errors in sequencing), and his table of contents refers to this numbering.

**University of Oxford, etc; Book No. 7427**

**Binding:** Characteristic Thistlethwayte binding. Half-leather with marbled paper boards.

2. University of Cambridge, *Carmina, Quibus Decedenti Augustissimo Regi Wilhelmo III. Parentat* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, [1702]). ESTC No. T11214

**‘Grammatice Sulpitiana 1513’; Book No. 9368**

**Binding:** Characteristic Thistlethwayte binding. Half-leather with marbled paper boards.

**South, etc; Book No. 9109**

**Binding:** Characteristic Thistlethwayte binding. Quarter-vellum with marbled paper boards.

6. Lawrence Eusden, *Three Poems. I. To the Right Honourable the Lord High Chancellor of Great Britain; […] II. To the Right Honourable the Lord Parker; […] III. To the Same, the Right Honourable the Lord Parker* (London: Jacob Tonson, 1722). ESTC No. T50291
7. Lawrence Eusden, *Three Poems; the First Sacred to the Immortal Memory of the Late King; the Second, on the Happy Succession, and Coronation of His Present Majesty; and a Third Humbly Inscib’d to the Queen* (London: J. Roberts, 1727). ESTC No. T174739
9. *A Sequel to the Dunciad; being the Famous British Sh-rs* (London: ‘A. Moore’ [fictitious name], 1729). ESTC No. T90342

---

10. An Epistle from a Gentleman at Twickenham, to a Nobleman at St. James’s (London: William Guess, [1734]). ESTC No. N1174
27. Hercules Mac-Sturdy [pseudonym], A Trip to Vaux-Hall: Or, a General Satyr on the Times (London: ‘A. Moore’ [fictitious name], 1737). ESTC No. T96371
'J. Jortin and others’; Book No. 5561

Binding: Variant Thistlethwayte binding. Cloth spine with title in another hand; marbled paper boards. There is a table of contents in Thistlethwayte’s hand on the front free endpaper.

4. The Oxford Oyster Women. A Poem. To which is Prefix’d, A Hymn to the Moon ([Oxford(?): n. pub., 1733]). ESTC No. T169903

---

First words of title in Greek characters.

APPENDIX SIX

FAMILY TREES

The Ancestry of Alexander Thistlethwayte (¿1718–1771)

Alexander Thistlethwayte (1611-1670)
Cecilia Hungerford of Black Bourton, Oxfordshire

Alexander Thistlethwayte (1636-1716)
Catherine Chaldecot of East Whiteway, Dorset

Francis Thistlethwayte (1658-1739)
Mary Pelham of Compton Valence, Dorset

Alexander Thistlethwayte (1686/7-1740)
Mary Whithed of Southwick, Hampshire
Francis Thistlethwayte (1689-1744)
Robert Thistlethwayte (1690-1714)

Alexander Thistlethwayte (¿1718-1771)
Sarah Randoll of Salisbury
Francis Whithed (1719-1751)
Robert Thistlethwayte (1720/1-1767)

Robert Thistlethwayte (1755-1802)
Alexander Thistlethwayte (1756-1827)
The Whited and Norton Ancestry of Francis (Thistlethwayte) Whited (1719–1751)

Richard Norton of Southwick and Old Alresford, Hampshire (1615-1691)

Anne Erle of Charborough, Dorset

Henry Whited of East Dean and Norman Court, Hampshire (c.1629-1684)

Sarah Norton

Daniel Norton (d. c.1666), m. Isabel Lawson of Scarborough, Yorkshire

Richard Norton (c.1666-1732)

Richard Whited (c.1660-1693), m. Anne Keck of Westminster, London

Mary Whited (d. in or before 1728)

Alexander Thistlethwayte of Winterslow, Wiltshire (1686/7-1740)

Richard Whited (d. 1734)

Alexander Thistlethwayte (1718-1771)

Francis Whited (1719-1751)

Robert Thistlethwayte (1720/1-1767)
APPENDIX SEVEN

BOOKS BOUGHT BY FRANCIS WHITHED FROM JOSEPH POTE, ETON BOOKSELLER, 1734-1735

The following notes provide further details of the books listed in Table 1 (on p. 193 in Volume I of this thesis), indicating where the same titles appear in the fixed-price sale catalogue of Alexander Thistlethwayte’s library.

1 Adam Littleton, *Linguae Latinæ Liber Dictionarius Quadripartitus*. 
   1678 edition offered in Thistlethwayte sale catalogue (Lot 1351, p. 46), priced at 5s.¹

   1705 London edition offered in Thistlethwayte sale catalogue (Lot 3009, p. 98), priced at 2s.


   First published in London, 1595; reprints ‘still in use’ at Eton in the eighteenth century.²

5 Ovid, *Epistolarum Heroidum Liber […] ad Usum Serenissimi Delphini*. 
   First published in London, 1702; ESTC records a total of five editions published in or before 1734. 
   1727 edition offered in Thistlethwayte sale catalogue (Lot 2827, p. 93), priced at 1s 6d.

¹ Benjamin White, *A Catalogue of the Library of Alexander Thistlethwayte, Esq: Late Knight of the Shire for the County of Hants: and of Various Other Valuable Collections of Books* (London: [n. pub.], 1772). All subsequent references are to this catalogue. 
7 Horace, Opera […] in Usum Serenissimi Delphini.
1711 edition offered in Thistlethwayte sale catalogue (Lot 2773, p. 92), priced at 2s.

8 Cicero, Orationes […] ad Usum Serenissimi Delphini.

9 Virgil, Opera […] ad Usum Serenissimi Delphini.
First published in Paris, 1675; ESTC records six editions published in London between 1696 and 1735 with ‘plates’.
1714 Paris edition, not advertised as part of the ‘Delphin Classics’ series, offered in Thistlethwayte sale catalogue (Lot 2917, p. 95), priced at 8s; this is unlikely to be the ‘Delphin’ edition listed on the bill.

10 Philipp Clüver, Introductionis in Universam Geographiam.
First published in Leiden, 1624. The sole eighteenth-century edition in 4th recorded in ESTC was published in London in 1711.

11 Dionysius, Orbis Descriptio Commentario Critico & Geographicico […] A Guilielmo Hill A.M. Collegii Merton.
First published in London, 1658; ESTC records four editions published in or before 1688.
1688 edition offered in Thistlethwayte sale catalogue (Lot 2730, p. 91), priced at 2s 6d.

12 Edward Wells, A New Sett of Maps both of Antient and Present Geography.
ESTC has details of six London editions published between 1706 and an unknown date c. 1730.
Edition of undisclosed date offered in Thistlethwayte sale catalogue, ‘half bound’ (Lot 103, p. 5), priced at 12s.

13 Edward Wells, A Treatise of Antient and Present Geography […] Designed for the Use of Young Students in the Universities.
First published in Oxford, 1701; three editions were published in London between 1706 and 1726.
1726 edition offered in Thistlethwayte sale catalogue (Lot 3867, p. 121), priced at 1s 6d.

14 The earliest collection entitled Epigrammatum Delectus was published in London in 1683, and followed by several versions advertised as In Usum Scholæ Etonensis (‘for the
use of Eton College’). One new version, compiled by the school’s assistant master Thomas Johnson, went through seven editions between 1694 and 1732.


16 *The Spectator*, 8 vols.

   First published by Tonson in London, 1709. Tonson produced another 8° edition in 1716, followed by two 12° editions in 1721 and 1730, all in three volumes with illustrations.

   First published by Tonson in London, 1720; another edition followed in 1727.
APPENDIX EIGHT

BOOKS BOUGHT BY FRANCIS WHITHED FROM RICHARD CLEMENTS, OXFORD BOOKSELLER, 1737-1738

The following notes provide further details of the books listed in Table 2 (on p. 198 in Volume I of this thesis), indicating where the same titles appear in the fixed-price sale catalogue of Alexander Thistlethwayte’s library.

1 Velleius Paterculus, *Historiæ Romanae […] In Usum Serenissimi Delphini.*
   First published (in 4o) in Paris, 1675; reprinted in London in 1730.
   1675 Paris edition offered in Thistlethwayte sale catalogue (Lot 1277, p. 44), priced at 6s; this is not the octavo edition listed on the bill.

2 Isaac Watts, *Logick: Or, the Right Use of Reason in the Enquiry after Truth.*
   First published (in 12o) in London, 1725; five 8o editions had been published by 1736.
   1736 edition offered in Thistlethwayte sale catalogue (Lot 5820, p. 168), priced at 2s 6d.


   ‘[R]oyal paper’ copy (one of 240 printed, according to ESTC record No. T106027) offered in Thistlethwayte sale catalogue (Lot 1065, p. 37), priced at £1 10s.

5 *Hesiodi Ascraei Quæ Supersunt, cum Notis Variorum* (Oxford: at the Sheldonian Theatre, 1737).
   Offered in Thistlethwayte sale catalogue (Lot 1244, p. 43), priced at 12s 6d.


8 Jonathan Swift, *Travels into Several Remote Nations of the World.*
   First published in London, 1727.

9 Lot 5340 in Thistlethwayte sale catalogue is ‘Milton’s Poetical Works, 2 vol. 8vo. […] 1705’ (p. 157), priced at 6s.
First published by Tonson in London, 1726. Tonson published another 12\(^o\) edition in three volumes in 1736.
Lot 5508 in Thistelthwayte sale catalogue comprises ‘Addison’s Miscellaneous Works, Travels and Freeholder, 5 vol. [...] 1726’ (p. 161), the whole priced at 7s 6d. The books in this lot are very likely to be items 10, 11 and 12 on the bill.

11 Joseph Addison, *Remarks on Several Parts of Italy, &c.*
First published by Tonson in London, 1705, in 8\(^o\). Tonson published the first 12\(^o\) edition in 1718, followed by three further editions in the same format by 1736.
See item 10 above. 1718 edition of Addison’s *Remarks* also offered separately in Thistelthwayte sale catalogue (Lot 3646, p. 115), priced at 1s 6d.

First published in London, 1716. Four further 12\(^o\) editions had been published by 1732.
See item 10 above.

13 *The Lucubrations of Isaac Bickerstaff Esq*, 4 vols.
First published in London, 1716.
1733 edition offered in Thistelthwayte sale catalogue (Lot 5796, p. 168), priced at 7s.

The above title was offered in the Thistelthwayte sale catalogue (Lot 5309, p. 156), priced at 1s 6d.


First published (in 12\(^o\)) in London, 1679; the first octavo edition appeared in 1687, and was most recently reprinted in 1734.
1719 edition with ‘cuts’ offered in Thistelthwayte sale catalogue (Lot 4004, p. 125), priced at 2s.

First published in London, 1706; another edition was published in 1712.
1706 edition offered in Thistelthwayte sale catalogue (Lot 2986, p. 97), priced at 2s 6d.

19 *Pietas Academiae Cantabrigiensis in Funere* […] *Carolinae* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1738).
APPENDIX NINE

BOOKS ACQUIRED BY ALEXANDER THISTLETHWAYTE WHILE STUDYING AT WADHAM COLLEGE, OXFORD, 1735-1736

Each of the following books contains an inscription in Thistlethwayte’s hand noting his affiliation with Wadham: ‘E Libris Alex. Thistlethwayte è Coll. Wadh.’ (‘From the library of Alexander Thistlethwayte of Wadham College’).

Alexander, ab Alexandro, *Genialium Dierum Libri Sex* (Frankfurt: Andreas Wechel, 1591). Wadham College library, shelf-mark E 38.20


Chamberlaine, Sir James, *A Sacred Poem. Wherein the Birth, Miracles, Death, Resurrection, and Ascension of the Most Holy Jesus are Delineated* (London: R. Bentley and M. Magnes, 1680). Winchester College Fellows’ Library, Book No. 2219

   ESTC No. T83900

Curtius Rufus, Quintus, trans. by Claude Favre de Vaugelas, De la Vie et des Actions d’Alexandre le Grand, 2 vols (Paris: Jean Louis Billaine, 1698). Wadham College library, shelf-mark E 34.4

Du Bartas, Guillaume de Salluste, Hebdomas a Gabriele Lermae Latinitate Donata (London: Robert Dexter, 1591). Winchester College Fellows’ Library, Book No. 8616
   ESTC No. S116496. This is the first item in a Sammelband that Thistlethwayte acquired from Triplett; the contents are listed in Appendix 4.

Dunbar, John, Epigrammaton [...] Centuriae Sex, Decades Totidem (London: Thomas Purfoot, 1616). Winchester College Fellows’ Library, Book No. 3148
   ESTC No. S111089

Fabricius, Vincentius, Poemata (Amsterdam: Jan Janssonius, 1638). Winchester College Fellows’ Library, Book No. 3640

Fage, Mary, Fames Roule (London: Richard Oulton, 1637). Winchester College Fellows’ Library, Book No. 3650
   ESTC No. S101808. This is the first item in a Sammelband put together by Thistlethwayte, containing four titles in total.

Gazet, Angelin, Pia Hilaria (London: William Morden, 1657). Winchester College Fellows’ Library, Book No. 4054
   ESTC No. R24965

   ESTC No. T96805

   ESTC No. R24352

Heinsius, Daniel, Herodes Infanticida, Tragœdia (Leiden: Elzevir, 1632). Winchester College Fellows’ Library, Book No. 4838

Heinsius, Daniel, Poemata Latina et Graeca (Amsterdam: Jan Janssonius, 1649). Winchester College Fellows’ Library, Book No. 4837
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Navagero, Andrea, *Orationes Duo* (Paris: Jean Petit, 1531). Winchester College Fellows’ Library, Book No. 7007. This is the eighth item in a *Sammelband* labelled ‘K#. James’s Divine Poesie &c.’ and bound in Thistlethwayte’s characteristic style; see Appendix 5 for a full listing of the contents.


*Peplus. Illustrissimi Viri D. Philippi Sidnaei Supremis Honoribus Dicatus* (Oxford: Joseph Barnes, 1587). Winchester College Fellows’ Library, Book No. 8927. ESTC No. S117410. This is the first item in Vol. 1 of Triplett’s six-volume compilation ‘Musae Oxon. et Cant.’; see Appendix 4 for details of the contents.


Aurelii Prudentii Clementis Quæ Exstant (Amsterdam: Daniel Elzevir, 1667). Winchester College Fellows’ Library, Book No. 8144

   ESTC No. T132805

Rutgers, Johannes, Venusinæ Lectiones (Utrecht: Willem van de Water, 1699). Winchester College Fellows’ Library, Book No. 5178
   Imperfect copy missing all before p. 231, including the Horatian text itself.

Viperano, Giovanni Antonio, Orationes VI (Antwerp: Christophe Plantin, 1581). Wadham College library, shelf-mark E 25.13

Virgil, Bucolica (Deventer: Richardus Pafræt, c.1496-1500). Winchester College Fellows’ Library, Book No. 9887
   This is the first item in a Sammelband given to Thistlethwayte by Joseph Mede of Salisbury, containing three titles. The remaining two are Virgil, Georgica (Deventer: Richardus Pafræt, 1498), and Probleumata Aristotelis (Paris: Alexandre Alyate, 1501).

   ESTC No. T125246

   ESTC No. N861. This is the fifth item in a Sammelband compiled by Thistlethwayte, beginning with South; see Appendix 5 for a full listing of the contents.

   ESTC No. R30209. This is the second item in a Sammelband compiled by Thistlethwayte, containing seven titles.
APPENDIX TEN

THE STUDENT LIBRARY OF CHARLES MUTEL

The following transcription reproduces the booklist found in the front flyleaves of Charles Mutel’s copy of *Le Grand Dictionnaire François-Flamen* (1618), now in the library of Wadham College. Charles’s signature (‘Chr th Mutel’) appears on the title page of the book. The list is written in a reasonably clear hand, with frequent abbreviation; contractions marked with tildes are expanded and supplied letters italicised in this transcription.

Catalogus Librorum Caroli Thophili Mutel Philosophiæ Studiosi Groningæ.

In 4.°

1. Lipsii Epistolæ. [Lipsius, Justus]
2. Cartesii Principia, meditationes, meteora, tractatus de passi: et methodus. [Descartes, René]
3. Logica P. Rami [Ramus, Petrus]
4. Grotius de Principiis juris naturalis. [Groot, Willem de]
5. Dictionarium, Gallico Belgicum. ²

In octavo

2. Dictionarium tetraglotton.
3. Pufendorfi, controver. De jure naturali³
4. Orationes Argite Angentinenses [sic]
5. Con. Tacitus cum notis Jus. Lipsii⁴
6. L’impietè convaincue.⁵
7. Epistolæ Melancthonis [Melanchthon, Philipp]

---

¹ *Le Grand Dictionnaire François-Flamen* (Rotterdam: Jan van Waesberghe, 1618). Wadham College Library, shelf-mark F13.8.
² Probably the book in which this handlist appears, *Le Grand Dictionnaire François-Flamen*.
9. Opera virgili.
11. Bertram de L heucharistie
12. Historia Mundi. [Pliny, the Elder]
13. Novum testamentum Belgicum
14. Trage. De Corneille. [Corneille, Pierre]
15. Logica et Rethorica Dietorici
16. Systema Logicum
17. Sy's/tema Metaphysicus
18. Diverses œuvres de Dumoulin
19. L histoire Asiatique
20. Francion.
21. Terentius
22. Observationes in Lingua Latina.
23. Dictionaire francois flamend
24. Barowius in Elementa Euclidis
25. alter Tho Tomus Episto. Melanc. [Melanchthon, Philipp]

In duodecimo

1. Manuale Pasori
2. Novum testam. græc.
5. Le moine secularise
6. Elixir Jesuiticum

---

7 Charles’s son Francis Mutel owned and inscribed his name in a copy of Pierre Du Moulin, Elements de Logique (Rouen: Jacques Cailloué, 1623), which it is possible he inherited from his father. Wadham College Library, shelf-mark F 1.20.
10 Probably Johann Seising, Observationes Notata Dignæ in Latina Lingua (Lyon: [n. pub.], 1686).
11 Euclid, Elementorum Libri XV. Breviter Demonstrati, ed. by Isaac Barrow. First published in Cambridge in 1655.
13 Nouvelles de la République des Lettres (Amsterdam: Henri Desbordes and others, 1684-1720).
14 Dupré, abbé of Lyons, Le Moine Secularisé. First published in 1675.
15 Johann Leonhard Weidner, Elixir Jesuiticum, sive Quinta Essentia Jesuitarum. First published under a pseudonym, c.1640.
7. Compend. Theologia
8. Gemitus compeditorum.\textsuperscript{16}
9. Languetti Epistolæ\textsuperscript{17}
10. Quinti Curtii hist. [Curtius Rufus, Quintus]
12. Baudii Epistolæ.\textsuperscript{18}
15. Aphthonii Phrogym. [Aphthonius, Progymnasmata]
16. Medulla Oratoria\textsuperscript{19}
17. [misnumbered ‘18’ in Mutel’s list] Les fleurs de Guidon\textsuperscript{20}


1. Lipsius de Constantia\textsuperscript{21}
2. Lipsii Exempla Politic.\textsuperscript{22}
4. Cluverii Geographia.\textsuperscript{23}
5. Henerarium. Benjaminitis.\textsuperscript{24}
6. Prieres francoises.
7. Combat Chrétien\textsuperscript{25}
8. Sphæra Sacro. Bosco. [Sacro Bosco, Joannes de]

\textsuperscript{16} Nicolaus Kessler, Gemitus Compeditorum, Sive Tentationes, Quæ Frequentius Adoriantur Religiosos, et a Perfectione Impediunt. First published in 1674.
\textsuperscript{17} Hubert Languet, Epistolæ Politicae et Historicae. First published in 1633.
\textsuperscript{18} Dominicus Baudius, Epistolæarum. First published in Leiden in 1615.
\textsuperscript{19} Ivarus Petrus Adolphus, Medulla Oratoria. First published in 1646.
\textsuperscript{20} Guy de Chauliac, Les Fleurs de Guidon. First published as a separate title in 1664.
\textsuperscript{21} Justus Lipsius, De Constantia. First published in 1584.
\textsuperscript{22} Justus Lipsius, Monita et Exempla Politica. First published in 1530.
\textsuperscript{23} Philipp Clüver, Introductionis in Universam Geographiam. First published in 1624.
\textsuperscript{24} Probably Benjamin, of Tudela, Itinerarium Benjaminis. First published by Elzevir in 1633, in a range of small formats.
\textsuperscript{25} Pierre Du Moulin, Du Combat Chrestien: Ou des Afflictions. First published in 1622.
APPENDIX ELEVEN

THE MUTEL FAMILY LIBRARY

Books inscribed by Charles Mutel (d. 1711)

ESTC No. S113875

Argonne, Bonaventure d’, *Mélanges d’Histoire et de Littérature*, 2 vols (Rotterdam: Elie Yvans, 1700). Wadham College library, shelf-mark F 1.1


Bochart, Samuel, *Geographia Sacra* (Frankfurt: Johann David Zunner, 1674). Wadham College library, shelf-mark H 11.6


*C. Julii Cesaris Quæ Extant* (Amsterdam: Jan Janssonius, 1665). Wadham College library, shelf-mark E 33.4
Calvin, Jean, *Institutio Christianæ Religionis* (Geneva: Antonius Rebulius, 1561). Wadham College library, shelf-mark F 16.8

*Le Catéchisme du Concile de Trente* (Paris: Guillaume Desprez, 1678). Wadham College library, shelf-mark F 5.10

Cicero, *De Officiis*, ed. by Thomas Cockman (Oxford: at the Sheldonian Theatre, 1695). Wadham College library, shelf-mark F 15.9

ESTC No. R6256


Erasmus, Desiderius, *Adagiorum* (Amsterdam: Elzevir, 1650). Wadham College library, shelf-mark F 7.22


Godeau, Antoine, *De Tafereelen van Penitency* (Antwerp: Philips van Eyck, 1671). Wadham College library, shelf-mark F 5.6


ESTC No. R38768


Hotman, François, *La Vie de Messire Gaspar de Colligny, Seigneur de Chastillon, Admiral de France* (Leiden: Elzevir, 1643). Wadham College library, shelf-mark E 33.3

Jurieu, Pierre, *Traité de la Devotion* (Saumur: René Pean, 1682). Wadham College library, shelf-mark F 6.6

———, *Le Vray Systeme de l’Eglise & la Veritable Analyse de la Foy* (Dordrecht: Goris, 1686). Wadham College library, shelf-mark F 15.25


ESTC No. R42485

———, *Histoire Critique des Dogmes et des Cultes Bons et Mauvais, qui ont été dans l’Eglise depuis Adam jusqu’a Jesus-Christ* (Amsterdam: François L’Honoré, 1704). Wadham College library, shelf-mark H 11.15


La Motte, Antoine Houdar de, *Odes […] Avec un Discours sur la Poësie en Général, & sur l’Ode en Particulier* (Amsterdam: Louis Renard, 1707). Winchester College Fellows’ Library, Book No. 5218

La Placette, Jean, *Traité de la Conscience* (Amsterdam: George Galet, 1695). Wadham College library, shelf-mark E 26.8

Le Clerc, Jean, *De l’Incredulité, Où l’on Examine les Motifs & les Raisons Générales qui Portent les Incredules à Rejeter la Religion Chrétienne* (Amsterdam: Henri Wetstein, 1696). Wadham College library, shelf-mark E 26.9

Le Noble, Eustache, *La Pierre de Touche Politique* (‘Vienna: Peter Hansgood, 1690’ [fictitious imprint]). Wadham College library, shelf-mark E 26.15


Limborch, Philip van, *Theologia Christiana* (Amsterdam: Henri Wetsten, 1695). Wadham College library, shelf-mark H 11.22

---

1 Charles wrote his name on the title page of this book (‘Charles [Th.] Mutel’), and his son Francis appears to have incorporated his own name into his father’s signature, writing ‘Fran:’ over ‘Th.’ to create a composite inscription (‘Charles Fran: Mutel’).

2 Only the surname ‘Mutel’ is written on the front endpaper of this book; the signature could be Charles’s or his father’s.


Melchior, Johannes, *Fundamenta Theologiae Didascaliæ* (Franeker: Johannes Gyselaar, 1689). Wadham College library, shelf-mark E 38.22

Molière, Jean Baptiste de, *Oeuvres*, 4 vols (Brussels: George de Backer, 1694). Winchester College Fellows’ Library, Book No. 6847


Sarpi, Paolo, *Historiae Concilii Tridentini*, trans. by Sir Adam Newton and others ([London]: [n. pub.], 1620). Wadham College library, shelf-mark F 25.21

ESTC No. S116659

Seneca, *Opera Omnia*, 4 vols (Amsterdam: Elzevir, 1659). Wadham College library, shelf-mark E 32.20

Symmachus, Quintus Aurelius, *Epistolarum Libri Decem* (Leiden: Gerhard Wingendorp, 1653). Wadham College library, shelf-mark F 3.11


Til, Salomon van, *Het Euangelium des H. Apostels Matthei […] Geopent* (Amsterdam: Johannes van Someren, 1683). Wadham College library, shelf-mark F 16.11


**Books inscribed by Francis Mutel (1704/5–1740)**


ESTC No. R19043


ESTC No. 101321


Chrysostom, John, *Dialogi Sex* (Louvain: Rutger Rescius and Johannes Sturm, 1529). Wadham College library, shelf-mark F 14.13

Clavius, Christoph, *Computus Ecclesiasticus* (Mainz: Balthasarus Lippius, 1599). Wadham College library, shelf-mark F 10.8

*Coutumes du Pays et Duché de Normandie* (Rouen: Jacques du Mesnel, 1699). Wadham College library, shelf-mark E 34.24


The second volume contains *La Vie et les Avantures Surprenantes de Robinson Crusoe*, Tome 3 and Tome 4 (Amsterdam: L’Honoré and Chatelain, 1721).

The third volume contains *La Vie et les Avantures Surprenantes de Robinson Crusoe*, Tome 5 (Amsterdam: L’Honoré and Chatelain, 1721).

The fourth volume contains *La Vie et les Avantures Surprenantes de Robinson Crusoe*, Tome 6 (Amsterdam: L’Honoré and Chatelain, 1721).


Du Moulin, Pierre, *Elements de Logique* (Rouen: Jacques Cailloué, 1623). Wadham College library, shelf-mark F 1.20

Du Vair, Guillaume, Bishop of Lisieux, *Oeuvres* (Rouen: Estienne Vereul, 1619). Wadham College library, shelf-mark F 2.13

Garzoni, Tomaso, *La Piazza Universale di Tutte le Professioni del Mondo* (Venice: Pietro Maria Bertano, 1638). Wadham College library, shelf-mark F 27.18


Langbaine, Gerard, *Ethices Compendium* (London: Richard Sare, 1721). Wadham College library, shelf-mark E 37.2

ESTC No. T111438

Larroque, Matthieu de, *Réponse au Livre de M’ l’Eveque de Meaux de la Communion sous les Deux Especes* ([n.p.]: [n. pub.], 1683). Wadham College library, shelf-mark F 4.10


ESTC No. N33770


ESTC No. R2938

Oudin, César, *Grammaire Espagnolle* (Brussels: Eugène-Henri Fricx, 1670). Wadham College library, shelf-mark F 13.4

*Pietas Universitatis Oxoniensis in Obitum Augustissimæ & Desideratissimæ Reginæ Mariæ* (Oxford: at the Sheldonian Theatre, 1695). Winchester College Fellows’ Library, Book No. 7414
ESTC No. R5564


*Reflexions Morales sur les Ouvrages de Dieu* (Paris: Charles Osmont and Claude de Hansy, 1701). Wadham College library, shelf-mark E 40.18


Viccars, John, *Decapla in Psalmos* (London: Robert Young, 1639). Wadham College library, shelf-mark F 26.15
ESTC No. S101773


ESTC No. T109726
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