A Little Beef and Some Thick Ale
Tenants and the Book of Evidences

In 1667, by order of the Governing Body, two men sat down in the college archive, wherever that was, and began the tedious task of sorting through the foundation documents, every property deed, every lease register, and all the manorial court rolls. Bit by bit, John Willis, who was the Chapter Clerk, and Anthony Wood, the famous Oxford antiquarian, produced the Book of Evidences. It was a huge book, the best part of a thousand pages, hand-written of course. They listed every property that the college owned at the time, with the details of the rent due and all the tenants between the foundation of Christ Church and 1667, sometimes with the history of the property or details of disputes and court cases. It formed, and still forms, one of the most important documents in the archive. But why 1667, and why was it needed at all? When Thomas Wolsey founded Christ Church in 1525, he gave it a massive endowment of revenue derived almost entirely from the estates of suppressed monasteries.

continued on page 18
Dating the manuscript
From lines 2-4 of the second stanza on folio 85, the poems can be dated between 25 September 1593 (the death of Henry the 4th Earl) and 16 April 1594 (the death of Ferdinando the 5th Earl of Derby):

of egles brood hatchet in a loftie nest
The earle of derby & the kinge of manne
her father was her brother now possesst
These same three lines also provide a clue to the 'double majesty' of Shakespeare's Sonnet 78, where it may allude to the 'king of birds' (the eagle of the Derby crest) and the 'king of man' epithet (the Isle of Man of which the Earl of Derby held the lordship). Also that Ferdinando might have been the inspiration for this sonnet, as Alice, his widow, possibly was for Sonnet 97 and Sonnet 98. From the last two lines of the first poem, the period in which they were written can be narrowed to mid-January/mid-March 1594:

And thus in myyddest of all his mirth & glee
I'le take my leave of courteus Salusbury.
At Christmas 1593 there was much revelry at Lleweni where, as part of their tour of the great houses, poets and musicians entertained John Salusbury's guests.1 The entertainment probably took place during the twelve days of Christmas, although traditionally it was allowed to continue until Candlemas (2 February). In March 1594 John Salusbury was admitted as a student of the Middle Temple and in the same month he was appointed one of the Esquires of the Body to the Queen. Thereafter he spent more time in London than in Wales.

Attribution
As both poems are subscribed 'finis quoth Danielle', a certain Daniel must have been the author. However, the lines sound so Shakespearean that Tom Lloyd-Roberts attributed them to Shakespeare in his article 'Bard of Lleweni' (The New Welsh Review No. 23). Professor David Crystal has kindly undertaken a lexical analysis of the poems.2 He concluded that the vocabulary of the poem is 97% within what we know Shakespeare to have used at the time, but that it was unlikely that Shakespeare would have used 'in myyddest of'. He consistently used 'in the midst'. Even when he wanted to lose a metrical syllable, he abbreviated it to 'i' th' midst' (Coriolanus I, 1.97). Tom Lloyd-Roberts' attribution caused much interest from the media at the time, and, under pressure from the press, I said that I thought that the poems might have been by Samuel Daniel. Clearly I was wrong, as they are unlike any of his works and they are not in his hand.

Above the subscription at the end of the second poem a contemporary hand has written 'Danyell' and then tried to delete it. The only Daniel to spell his name Danyell without variation was William Danyell of Over Tabley in Cheshire. He was born circa 1526 and educated at Eton and King's College, Cambridge. He was entered at Gray's Inn in 1556 and became Reader there in 1579 and Treasurer in 1580 and 1587. In 1584 he was appointed Deputy Recorder of London to Serjeant Fleetwood. During this period he was involved in the case of an Italian merchant (from Venice?) who had died intestate in London. He delivered his opinion on 22 February 1585.3 This could have been a possible catalyst for Shakespeare's The Merchant of Venice. Act IV not only alludes to Daniel of the Old Testament, but, more importantly, to William Daniel. The case of 'Daniel' as judge is mentioned time and again by Shylock and Graziano when Portia is pretending to be Balthasar. Could this have been an exercise by Shakespeare to get his mentor promoted? If it was, it succeeded as in 1604 Daniel was appointed a Judge of the Common Pleas thereby becoming Sir William Daniel.4

Background
The Daniel home in Cheshire was about thirty miles from Lord Strange's household at Lathom in Lancashire where, on Friday 14 July 1587, the Earl of Leicester's Players entertained Lord Strange's guests.5 Among the guests were many dignitaries including 'young Mr Leigh', 'Mr Danyell' and 'Mr Salesbury'. 'Young Mr Leigh' was Peter Leigh of Lyme, 'Mr Danyell' was William Daniel, the likely author of the poems, and 'Mr Salesbury' was John Salusbury, the honorand of the first poem.

In 1563 the Earl of Leicester had received from the Queen the Lordship and Castle of Denbigh and he had become the guardian of John Salusbury following his father's death in 1566. To finance his Netherlands Expedition6 of 1585-6 the Earl of Leicester remortgaged the Castle of Denbigh.

On this expedition William Daniel's nephew, Peter, accompanied the Earl of Leicester as his footman leaving at home his wife and baby. He left his lands in Cheshire under the trusteeship of his uncle,3 See The National Archives SP12/176/63 refoliated 204.
4 Ten years earlier, on 14 March 1594, Attorney General Egerton wrote to Lord Keeper Puckering that 'the Lord Chief Justice [Burghley] knows Mr Daniel to be both learned and wise, and now a serjeant elect'. This was written with regard to selecting suitable candidates to judge the Queen's physician who was allegedly involved in a Jesuit plot to poison her. See The National Archives SP12/248/26.1 subsequently refoliated.

1 See Sally Harper's article 'Shakespearean Revels' on University of Wales, Bangor Ms Gwynedd 4, in The New Welsh Review No 56, where she opts for the date 1595 rather than 1593. However, 1593 might be more likely as Salusbury spent most of 1595 in London.
William Daniel, and Roger Wilbraham, Solicitor-General of Ireland, and Peter Leigh of Lyme for his son Peter. When he died in 1590, his son was aged six which would make Peter aged ten when the poems were written. It is likely that this young lad was invited as head of the Daniel family to the Salusbury Christmas festivities along with his great-uncle, William, who wrote the poems as though they were by young Peter himself. The Earl of Derby’s eldest daughter, Anne Stanley, who would have been fourteen at the time, was probably in charge of the youngsters at the festivities as Daniel in the last line of the second poem says: ‘tho last not lest vale m[istress] Ane stanley’. The paper on which the poems are written is unwatermarked, of the highest quality and it measures 29 x 19 cm. It has been folded three times to sextodecimo size for carrying in a pocket or wallet before being unfolded and bound into Salusbury’s Commonplace Book.

Ben Jonson's holograph poem (folio 40), which is on inferior paper, has been folded in the same way. It is difficult to identify Elizabethan handwriting, especially when it is in this ‘copybook’ style, but I hope that palaeographers will conclude, as I have, that the poems have been written by Daniel himself. As the poems are in a ‘one-off’ for presentation on behalf of his great-nephew they are subscribed ‘finis quoth Danielle’ rather than ‘finis quoth Danyell’. Although there is no precise match extant for this stylized writing, three examples of his handwriting follow.

The image above (reproduced by courtesy of the Bodleian Library) is the ownership inscription from an 11th century manuscript (MS Bodl. 655, fol.287v) which had been brought over from Normandy by one of William Daniel’s ancestors, a member of the De Anyers family and a companion of William the Conqueror in 1066. It was acquired by Thomas Allen in 1598 and presented to the Bodleian in 1601. According to Andrew Watson, Allen was also in contact with the circle of Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, Chancellor of the University of Oxford 1564-1585.

The outstanding features between them and the poems are, firstly, the capital ‘W’s where there is a distinctive upstroke at the beginning, and the final downstroke forming a base-line to meet the middle downstroke. Secondly, the capital ‘D’ of his signature

---

7 George Ormerod in his The History of the County Palatine and City of Chester, 2nd edn (1882), Vol.1, p.474 is wrong when he says that this William Daniel was the brother of Peter. Although Peter had a brother William the deed of 27 Ellz. clearly states that it was ‘Willm: D. de Graies Inne’ and this William was Peter’s uncle.


9 I would like to thank Theresa Thorn, Librarian at Gray’s Inn, for finding the entry and for providing me with a photograph.

10 The National Archives SP12/176/63 refoliated 204.
is identical to the ‘D’ of Denbigh where, being the first word on a new page (folio 84v), Daniel has forgotten to write the stylised ‘D’ as at the beginning of stanza 4, and has written his cursive ‘D’. The characteristics which are peculiar to Daniel are the way in which he forms his capital ‘A’s and, in the lower case, the way in which he always puts an upward flourish on the final ‘s’ of a word. In his The Teares of the Muses (1591), dedicated to Lady Strange, Edmund Spenser writes:

Our pleasant Willy, oh is dead of late […]

Doth rather choose to sit in idle cell

Than so himselfe to mokerie to sell.

(Thalia, 208; 221-222)

Shakespeare’s ‘cell’ was presumably a carrel in the library at Lathom where he was not idle but working with William Daniel on Henry VI. The ‘mokerie’ was the criticism by Robert Greene which was published after his death in Groatsworth (1592). The characteristics of the annotations in Edward Halle’s Chronicle, which Alan Keen and Roger Lubbock\(^{11}\) use to justify a Shakespeare attribution, apply equally well to Daniel and I think that they are by Shakespeare’s mentor and collaborator, William Daniel.

While at Lathom, Shakespeare wrote, in addition to Henry VI, Titus Andronicus (which he dedicated to his hostess, Lady Strange), Venus and Adonis, The Rape of Lucrece, numerous sonnets, and possibly much of the Two Gentlemen of Verona, The Comedy of Errors and Love’s Labour’s Lost. I can see no reason to doubt Spenser’s claims in Colin Clouts Come Home Again (1595) that:

Amyntas quite is gone and lies full low,

Having his Amaryllis left to mone.

Helpe, O ye shepheards helpe ye all in this,

Helpe Amaryllis this her loss to mourne:

Her losse is yours, your losse Amyntas is,

Amyntas floure of shepheards pride forlorne:

He whilst he liued was the noblest swaine,

That euer piped in an oaten quill:

Both did he other, which could pipe, maintaine,

And eke could pipe himselfe with passing skill.

And there though last not least is Aetion,

A gentler shepheard may no where be found:

Whose Muse full of high thoughts inuention,

Doth like himselfe Heroically sound. (434-447)

In circumstances as the ones described above, Amyntas could perhaps be a subtle allusion to Ferdinando, 5th Earl of Derby, formerly Lord Strange, Amaryllis a hint at Alice, Countess of Derby, formerly Lady Strange, and Aetion (Greek for ‘of the eagle’) a personification of William Shakespeare himself.

Possibly the finest poem to come from this Shakespeare/Derby/Salusbury circle was The Phoenix and Turtle, published in Robert Chester’s Love’s Martyr (1601), dedicated to John Salusbury on the occasion of his knighthood. Robert Chester was John Salusbury’s amanuensis. As it happens, it seems he had no difficulty persuading Shakespeare to write a poem on the theme of the phoenix and the turtle for his book (with the phoenix potentially referring to Ursula Salusbury and the turtle-dove to John).

Although scholars have matched the other Poetical Essaies by Marston, Chapman and Jonson with Chester’s, until now it proved impossible to reconcile Shakespeare’s allegory (probably written in 1601) with Ursula and John Salusbury even though it would have doubtlessly been read by them. In an article, ‘Another Turn for the Turtle’,\(^{12}\) John Finnis and Patrick Martin identified Shakespeare’s phoenix and turtle as Ann and Roger Lyne.\(^{13}\) Both were Catholic, Roger had died in 1594/5, Ann never remarried and was executed at Tyburn on 27 February 1601.

There has been much speculation on whether Shakespeare was one of Lord Strange’s Players.\(^{14}\) He was almost certainly at Lathom from 1592 to 1594 when London theatres were shut because of the plague and it is likely that William Daniel returned home at the same time. It is possible that Shakespeare was already one of the Earl of Leicester’s Players when they entertained Lord Strange’s guests at Lathom in July 1587 and that, when the Earl died in 1588, Shakespeare and a few others were taken over by Lord Strange. Spenser’s words\(^{15}\) in the lines quoted above indicate that Shakespeare was with Lord Strange, who, when the poems were written, was the late 6th Earl of Derby. After his death Shakespeare left Lancashire to join the Lord Chamberlain’s Men in London. On his departure, Alice, Ferdinando’s widow, gave him North’s version of Plutarch’s Lives (1579), which Shakespeare had been using in the Derby library. It was to be the major source of his classical tragedies and is now, appropriately, in The Shakespeare Centre at Stratford-upon-Avon.

Postscript

Peter Daniel continued his great-uncle’s preoccupation with poetry by assembling a miscellany of poems which is now ‘Bodl. MS. Eng. poet.c.50’. I am grateful to Peter Beal for bringing it to my attention. It is a volume bound in full leather with the initials ‘P.D.’ gilt-stamped on the covers. The first poem in it is by Peter Daniel himself and is entitled ‘Fortune’s whole’. The volume also contains transcriptions of works by Carew, Herrick, Jonson, Randolph, Shirley, Waller and others. Thomas Percy, the compiler of Reliques of Ancient Poetry (to whom the manuscript was loaned by ‘A.B.’ in 1780, but

\(^{11}\) The Annotator (1954).

\(^{12}\) See The Times Literary Supplement, 18 April (2003).

\(^{13}\) This had been suggested previously by Clara Longworth, Comtesse de Chambrun, in 1935, but was not accepted at the time.

\(^{14}\) See Ernst Honigmann’s Shakespeare: The Lost Years (1985), Eric Sams’s The Real Shakespeare (1995) and John Idris Jones’s Where Was Shakespeare? (forthcoming).

\(^{15}\) Amyntas, maintaine, Aetion, gentler, Heroically sound.
never returned) thought Peter Daniel’s poem worthy of publication. The manuscript was Lot 1 in Sotheby’s ‘Percy Sale’ of 29 April 1884 and was bought by the Bodleian Library from Quaritch in 1957. The family’s thespian tradition at Lathom was continued by Edward Bootle-Wilbraham (1895-1930), 3rd Earl of Lathom, who created the ‘Lathom Club’ with its well-designed stage. William Daniel’s mother was Margaret Wilbraham. In 1991 Tom Lloyd – Roberts wrote to me in my capacity as Assistant Librarian at Christ Church asking if I could identify the erased signature on folio 85 which he thought might be that of William Shakespeare.

What he and the late Jeremy Griffiths saw as a long ‘s’ between the ‘a’ and ‘n’ of the deleted and widely spaced ‘Danyell’ is an exceptionally long flourish at the beginning of the ‘D’ of the italicised ‘Danielle’ (see *The New Welsh Review*, No.25). Sadly Tom died before I could identify what is not a signature but a contemporary attempt to identify ‘Danielle’. John Idris Jones has nurtured Tom’s Shakespearean speculation for these two poems and I dedicate this article to the memory of Tom and to the indefatigability of John. I am indebted also to the works and personal correspondence of Simon Adams, Clare Asquith, Peter Beal, David Crystal, Katherine Duncan-Jones, John Finnis, Ernst Honigmann and ‘the last not lest’ Stanley Wells, and the unfailing assistance of both past and present members of staff of the Library and Archives of Christ Church.

John Wing
Christ Church Library 1962-1995

BOY’S TOYS AND THE CASTLE OF LOVE
Ideas for a Young Prince in MS 92

It was common practice in the medieval period for princes to be presented during their formative years with copies of the great treatises of the classical age. Although not all nobles could read or write and few knew enough Latin to fully understand these books, they would be used in discussions with their tutors.

The treatise MS92 in the Christ Church Upper Library, *de Nobilitatibus, Sapientiis, et Prudentiis Regum* (“Of the Nobility, Wisdom and Prudence of Kings”) by Walter de Milemete, was one of three volumes prepared in late 1326 and early 1327 for Edward Plantagenet, Duke of Aquitaine, soon to become Edward III.1

One of the other texts was Walter’s transcription of *de Secretis Secretorum Aristotelis*, the ‘Secret of Secrets’ supposedly based on the teachings of Aristotle to his pupil Alexander the Great, and known to scholars as the ‘Pseudo-Aristotle’.2 Walter’s references to it in *de Nobilitatibus* infer that the Pseudo-Aristotle was made first, but the illumination for both documents is incomplete, the *de Secretis to

---

1 Although Edward II’s eldest son, Edward was never made Prince of Wales, and was known by his childhood title of Earl of Chester until he was appointed Duke of Aquitaine in his father’s stead in 1325; Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, and W R Childs, revision ed. and trans. of N Denholm-Young, *Vita Edvardi Secundi: the life of Edward the Second*, Oxford 2005.

2 British Library Additional MSS 47680, formerly in the Earl of Leicester’s collection at Holkham Hall; for a detailed introduction to this see M R James, *The Treatise of Walter de Milemete*, Roxburghe Club 1913.
a greater extent than the Christ Church treatise. The third treatise, another copy in French of *de Secretis*, was given to Edward by Philippa of Hainault on their betrothal prior to their marriage at the end of 1327.3

Walter, the author of the first two treatises – more correctly termed the editor, as he composed the bulk of both volumes from previous texts – probably came from Milemete (now called Milemead) near Tavistock in Devon. It is likely that the Walter Milemete mentioned in a Close Roll entry of November 1416 as holding an extensive messuage near Tavistock, and who became a Member of the House of Commons in the latter part of the Fourteenth century, was a close relative, perhaps his nephew.4 The depiction of Walter presenting the treatise to Edward in folio 8 verso, at the head of chapter II, shows him in a cloak tipped with vair implying some seniority, and in the rubric to this chapter he describes himself as ‘your humble and devoted clerk’, using the term ‘clericus’ which implies an administrative official, who in this period would have been in holy orders.5 He would have spoken English and court French and was obviously well educated in Latin.

In a Patent Roll entry of 2 Edward III, for March 5 1327 (New Style 1328), Walter is described as King’s Clerk, implying a higher position in the King’s personal retinue. Montague Rhodes James, in his edition of the Milemete Treatise printed for the Roxburghe Club (1913), cites this Patent Roll entry which shows that Walter was rewarded with the grant of a prebend at Glasney in Cornwall.6 He was appointed King’s Scholar at King’s Hall (now Trinity College) Cambridge in 1329. He was occasionally sent gowns by the king during the 1330s, small in value perhaps but very welcome in the chill of the over the royal palace at Windsor. The education of a warrior prince

At the beginning of this article I generalised about the learning of medieval princes, which was usually quite rudimentary, other, more warlike skills being thought more appropriate for future rulers, and competence in reading and writing considered the province of priests and scribes.

Milemete’s *de Nobilitatibus* follows in a long line of such treatises and is in essence a collection of writings taken from classical authors with hortative chapter headings. Both this book and Milemete’s Pseudo-Aristotle were to become models for texts on kingship for centuries to come. Much of the text in the Milemete Treatise dealing with the virtues which a king should possess is taken directly from the *Secretis Secretorum*, and a few other well-known texts. Chapter XVI, for example – advice to the King on how to conduct battles and treat his soldiers – is a much abbreviated version of *de re Militari* by Publius Flavius Vegetius Renatus, an instruction book for military leaders composed at the end of the western Roman empire and well known to scholars and royal tutors in the medieval period.7 Edward’s father had been given a copy on his knighting in 1306 – it was in a list of his possessions in the 1320s – and Edward III may have inherited the book when he took over the royal palace at Windsor.


5 “suus humilis et deuotus Walterus de Milemete clericus …”

6 M R James 1913, citing the entry for March 5 1328 at York in the *Calendar of Patent Rolls of Edward III* (London 1898), page xi; Dr Michael, in his article ‘The Iconography of Kingship in the Walter of Milemete Treatise’, *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 57, 1994, pp.35-47, confusingly cites the date as March 5 1327 (i.e. in the Old Style year 1327, the new year then beginning Lady Day, 25 March; this is New Style year 1328), when Edward was still at Westminster (entries for March 1327/8 in *Calendar of Close Rolls of Edward III*, vol 1, 1327-1330, London 1896). For the sake of clarity I use New Style enumeration here for all entries.

7 There is some dispute as for whom *de re Militari* was composed. Vegetius - whose personal dates are unknown - states in his rubric that it was written at the order of the Emperor Valentinian. Flavius Valentinianus, Valentinian I, (321-375AD) had a glorious military career and held back the Germanic hordes during his 11-year reign from 364AD. Valentinian II (371-392AD) was a weak ruler, gaining his father's throne at the age of 4 and dying at 21 leaving the western Roman empire in tatters. Valentinian III (419-455AD) lived a short debauched life in Constantinople displaying no interest in Roman military prowess. The tough military language of Vegetius, and his direct address to the emperor might indicate that he was writing to the order of Valentinian I, but in his first chapter Vegetius admonishes the decayed state of the army, and this would seem to date the treatise to c.390AD.
Latin, and among other things it is very useful to possess a knowledge of the art of writing, even though you may not always be busy with it.”

Recent scholarship into the personal library collected by Edward and his wife Philippa of Hainault, indicates that they were well educated and unusually interested in literature compared to other European secular leaders of the period.

Although he was just 15 years old when he came to power, and was initially subject to the regency of his mother’s lover, Roger Mortimer, Edward soon proved to be strong-minded and decisive. The treatise, probably prepared to the order of Edward’s mother, includes decorative images of mythical monsters, fantastic animals and strange devices which would appeal to a boy. But it is in the tradition of kingly treatises, and the early chapters contain sound advice about governance, the need for kings to display nobility, judgment and mercy, and to heed wise counsel. Given the closing years of his father’s fraught reign, the choice of these topics and the admonitions written by Milemete quoting examples from antiquity are telling.

The book also tutors its reader in the concept of chivalry, both in knightly tournaments and the pursuit of love. When one remembers that it was Edward III who created the Order of the Garter, and who promoted Saint George (depicted in Milemete) as the patron saint of England, it seems that Walter’s instruction had a positive effect upon his protégé.

Edward and his cousin Philippa had already been pledged to each other in marriage by the time Walter began writing and it was appropriate for the young prince to learn how to behave in the Romance tradition of courtly love.

One delightful image – the only matched pair of illuminations to have been completed (folios 3v and 4r) – shows four unarmed knights on horseback, in the full plate armour then coming into fashion, laying siege to a castle, which four ladies are defending by throwing bunches of flowers and shooting flowers from a crossbow and a longbow.

This “Castle of Courtly Love” is a splendid image, and its romantic subject matter is typical of those found on carved ivory document or jewellery caskets of the period.

Almost half the book is taken up with military combat. In two chapters, XI and XVI, Milemete offers serious ideas for waging war, taken from Vegetius’ four chapters on Roman military strategies and tactics, which the new king would appreciate as a useful adjunct to his education.

Milemete’s text here frequently refers to Edward’s grandfather Edward I, and explicitly compliments the new king as being worthy to maintain his grandfather’s tradition of warfare and knightly deeds.

Twenty of the finished illuminations and all ten uncompleted drawings at the end of the book deal with warfare in one form or another. In the main, the weapons shown are the standard arms of this period – lances, double-handed swords and misericorde daggers, pikes, maces, axes, cross-bows and longbows. One of the finished images shows a simple form of cannon, a vase-shaped tube lying on a trestle, with a large arrow coming out of the muzzle and a man-at-arms lighting the touch-hole with a linstock, on which the flame can be clearly seen.

From a military historical perspective, one of the most surprising aspects of the weaponry on display is that there is no depiction of the single-stave cannon. As an historian currently researching medieval naval weaponry I am haunted by the blank leaves at the end of the treatise, which may have been intended to carry images of naval war and weapons illustrating the text of Vegetius’ fifth chapter dealing with marine warfare tactics, an aspect of international conflict which was becoming increasingly important.

---

8 M R James 1913, p.xviii.
9 Recent scholars have cast doubt on Isabella’s influence in this, and even suggest that the treatise was originally conceived for Edward II; see L M Karlinger, Illuminating Kingship: Politics, Patronage, and the Education of Edward III, PhD thesis, Bryn Mawr, Pennsylvania 2001, for a well argued but ultimately unconvincing discussion of this question.
10 M R James 1913, p.xxiv; see also the British Museum website page: http://www.britishmuseum.org/explore/highlights/highlight_objects/pe_ml/all/ivory_casket.aspx
11 As an historian currently researching medieval naval weaponry I am haunted by the blank leaves at the end of the treatise, which may have been intended to carry images of naval war and weapons illustrating the text of Vegetius’ fifth chapter dealing with marine warfare tactics, an aspect of international conflict which was becoming increasingly important.
longbow in the illustrations dealing with warfare. The longbow was the artillery weapon of choice for specialist soldiers in the English army and navy at this period which would be decisive in Edward’s victories at the naval battle of Sluys and at Crécy.

There are six longbows shown in the book; one of these is in a marginal decoration showing an archer shooting vertically in the typical stance of that action; three are in hunting scenes, two showing archers shooting at harts, one depicting a hunter shooting at a duck with a bluntheaded arrow; one bow is being shot by a centaur; and one rather rough-looking bow is in the hands of a courtly lady shooting flowers at the knights besieging the ‘castle of love’.

The military illustrations depict several cross-bows, a weapon which would later be banned by royal edict in England for all but the king’s favoured nobles, but which was the artillery hand-weapon favoured by the German and Italian states, and the French, Burgundians and Bretons. The Catalans and Spanish too preferred this weapon although they were also familiar with the recurved composite short-bow common in the Mediterranean states, a few of which can also be seen in Milemete.

Flemish artists would have seen the cross-bow and short-bow in the hands of hunters and specialist soldiers, and relatively few examples of the English longbow, which in its refined form had been introduced into the English army and navy only a generation earlier. Perhaps the paucity of images of this English weapon in Milemete points to continental artistry. However, the depictions of the longbow are accurate, including the special techniques used to draw and shoot this difficult weapon, and even the horn nocks at the tips of the bows’ limbs can be detected.

In the unfinished drawings, all showing devices of war in action, we see an array of large and small arms, some of them fanciful, others of proven usefulness in medieval warfare. Most are large and impressive, fuel for a small boy’s imagination, but also practical weapons for a grown man’s war. For fifteen year old Edward on the verge of gaining a kingdom, but with potential adversaries waiting in the wings, they must have been tempting toys. He would get to play with them all, in murderous campaigns against England’s old enemies, France and Scotland.

These weapons again derive in part from the fourth chapter of Vegetius, with a few from a later period, dealing with defensive and offensive tactics during a siege. We see siege engines mounted in tall towers, sappers digging tunnels under a castle’s walls for explosive mines, inventive new devices such as the bomb kite (which Mike Loades has shown to be an effective weapon in practice), and strung-tension missile launchers such as arbalests and their smaller derivative, crossbows, and immense trebuchets throwing large stones or Greek fire, and even the fanciful trebuchet launching bee skeps over a castle’s walls. Such weapons were effective in sieges – the burden of Vegetius’ fourth chapter – rather than the open mêlée battles typical of medieval land warfare, or the chevauchée, the laying waste to an enemy’s countryside by raiding parties of hard-riding armed men, which Edward would also use to great effect.

The Milemete Treatise
A detailed analytical description of Walter’s book is not necessary here, as De Nobilitatibus has been well described by experts elsewhere, most recently by Harry Southcott in an issue of this Newsletter.12

The monochrome facsimile edition published by the Roxburghe Club in 1913, with its detailed and scholarly introduction by Montague Rhodes James, is now rare outside specialist libraries and the collections of its original subscribers, but is happily available online, offering an excellent reading tool.13 Dr M A Michael’s article of 1994, cited above, offers a knowledgeable and detailed analysis of the production of the book’s illustrations. However, some description is useful here to put the contents in context.

De Nobilitatibus is a book of 82 bound sheets of vellum, many of them illuminated in red, shades of green and blue. The large areas of gold leaf still shine today as brightly as when they were first burnedished onto the vellum ground. The silver leaf, colouring armour and weapons, has oxidised and in places appears to have been smudged, possibly while the adhesive size was still wet.

Seventeen chapters are named, although the first is missing apart from its opening sheet, and a later leaf appears to have been excised. The text of these chapters is composed in medieval clerical Latin and

---

12 H Southcott, ‘Fresh ideas about MS92 and the education of a King’, Christ Church Library Newsletter, Trinity 2007, pp.1-3.
are all written in a very fine square hand by the same scribe, apart from two small sections in a more contracted hand and a few alterations. However, being edited versions of other writers’ works on the same theme, the text is rather less important than the illustrations, which make the treatise a picture-book of instruction, with many iconographic images which would have clear meanings for the young king, and others of objects unknown to him to excite his imagination, such as war-elephants, mythical monsters and extravagant weaponry.

**The chemise cover**

The treatise’s binding is of plain wooden boards covered with red velvet with remains of silver thread embroidery of what appear to be pomegranates. In the Judeo-Christian iconography the pomegranate is a complex emblem of fertility, of death, resurrection and of temporal power.

This fabric cover is of the type known as ‘chemise’, a large piece of material attached to the binding which wraps protectively over the book when not in use, and unfolds to form a decorative skirt around the book when it is opened on a reading table. The chemise is lined with fine buckskin, which inside the boards appears to be stained rose red.

All books at the time were intrinsically valuable, due to their scarcity and the effort needed to scribe and illustrate them, and the provenance and very fine work of *De Nobilitatibus* makes this volume particularly valuable. As Mike Loades wrote in his recent article on his reconstruction of the bomb-kite illustrated in this treatise, the use of a protective chemise-type cover implies that this book was intended to go with the king as a book of instruction, with many iconographic images to illustrate them, and the provenance and very fine work of *De Nobilitatibus* makes this volume particularly valuable.

However, some scholars think that the extant cover was made 100 years or so after the book, so too much cannot be claimed for this type of cover. If this hypothesis is correct, the cover may have been made in the middle of the fifteenth century to replace a similar chemise or, less plausibly, may have been added to protect an important artefact in the royal archives.

Two intriguing artefacts in the possession of the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York and the Victoria & Albert Museum in London may be connected to the Milemete chemise, and may resolve this question. The chasuble of *opus anglicanum* (“English work” embroidery) at New York and the related cope at London, which are dated to c.1330, are also of embroidered red velvet, albeit of a more luxurious design. These separate robes were originally one set of vestments, perhaps made for a bishop, but there has been speculation that it may have been the coronation vestments for Edward III. It is possible to identify very similar embroidery in the robe in which Edward is depicted in MS92 folio 8v.15

The vestments were altered at some later time and there are sections missing. Perhaps the Milemete chemise was made from just such an off-cut. Further research into the potential connection between Milemete’s cover and the New York and London *opus anglicanum* robes is continuing.

**The illustrations in the Treatise**

The illustrations are in very good condition with only a little discolouring due to handling or exposure to light. They are generally of high quality, and of importance to art history as well as to the study of the political and military history of the period.

There are five different types of illustrations:
- coloured marginal drawings with decorative borders;
- drawings within illuminated initials at each chapter head;
- half-page polychrome miniature paintings on a half-page of text;
- full-page polychrome miniature paintings and one double-page miniature;
- a set of ten preparatory drawings in black ink on fourteen folios, including four double-page drawings.

They are highly decorative, the miniatures recalling stained-glass windows, and the background geometric patterns resembling ceramic tiles or large hanging tapestries. This geometric decoration appears almost Islamic and at this time, following exposure to such art during the Crusades of the previous centuries, there was a taste amongst noble patrons for colourful decoration.

Most of the under-drawing – if not the polychrome painting and gilding - for the full and half-page miniatures, and all ten unfinished preparatory drawings at the back of the book, appear to be by the
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same artist, but as many as eight other artists have been detected by stylistic analysis of the other illustrations. M R James was of the opinion that this artist (whom he terms ‘Artist I’) was more experienced at working on a larger scale than book illustration, from his boldness of line and construction, and may have been a mural painter.

Some of the elements of the paintings are characteristic of Flemish or French artists and although scholarly opinion is that this book was made in London or is of the school of East Anglia, I feel that it is entirely probable that it was worked on by artists from France or the Low Countries, where some aspects of the techniques of miniature painting were further advanced than in England. Isabella, being herself French, may well have had such artists in her retinue on her return to England at the end of 1326. The use of modelling in the polychrome illustrations – especially in the faces of some of the nobles – and the careful perspective of some buildings indicate that Artist I may not have been English, or at least had been subject to Italian influence.

When and how was it made?
It is almost certain that the text was written from Milemete’s drafts by a professional scribe in London at some time after October 1326, and then painted and bound in London around the middle of January 1327. It is probable that the large number of professional scribes and artists who worked on this treatise must have been in one community and this presupposes one enclave of London.  

Apart from a purely secretarial function of copying out official letters, the English court never employed its own scribes working in scriptoria like those of the great monasteries, or its own illuminators such as those at the French and Burgundian courts. Milemete’s book would have been in the hands of several specialist professionals working in close proximity to each other in the city of London, or perhaps around the new houses and royal apartments close to the seat of government at Westminster, in ateliers which might have included Flemish, French and even Italian artists. One might imagine the scribe or the illuminator waiting impatiently for the artist to complete the underdrawings and borders in each quire of folio pages, before they could take them over to do their specialist work in their own workshop along the street.

The images in these drawings and paintings include a wide range of subjects: heraldic shields; the king and his mother; two kings – probably Edward III and his father – in disputatio; St George in several guises; leading nobles of the court identified by their heraldic achievements; religious imagery including several depictions of Christ with the young king; fantastical and real animals; mythical monsters; depictions of chivalry, feasting, hunting and courtly love. However, it is the depictions of warfare and weapons in the second half of the book – the jousting, the bloody mêlée of battle, the “big boys’ toys” of siege engines, trebuchets, arbalisters and the first known illustration of a cannon in Europe – which make up the bulk of the decorated pages.

The smaller images are usually decorative without connection to the text in which they appear, but the half- and full-page miniatures allegorise the text’s theme that a king should have the God-given virtues of nobility, wisdom and prudence, and also chivalric and knightly attributes.

The book was not finished at the time of presentation. Folio 71r contains ruled lines for the inscribing of text, its verso is blank with no decoration, and the subsequent folios contain unfinished under-drawings.

Why wasn’t it finished?
The ten unfinished preparatory illustrations which succeed the blank text leaves at the end of the book are in thin black ink line within simple frames of red crayon. There is no doubt that these illustrations, deemed by M R James as being by the skilled hand of Artist I, would have been as detailed and decoratively finished as the earlier examples. There would have been the three-dimensional use of light and shade seen in Artist I’s finished work, subtle modelling of the faces and the main subjects of each leaf – the engines of war – and perhaps some exegetical illustrations in the borders.

Folios 72v and 73r; 74v and 75r; 76v and 77r; and 77v and 78r – the opening which show soldiers controlling a kite used to carry an incendiary device over the walls of a fortified town, the “bomb kite” discussed in Mike Loades’ recent article – are underdrawings for connected pairs of full-page miniatures, like the one finished example at opening 3v and 4r, the siege of the castle of courtly love.

This seems to indicate that this final section, the visual illustration of Vegetius’ art of war with only one leaf of introductory text, was seen by Milemete or his patron to have special significance. In a sense it marks a transition from the Romance medievalism of the earlier chapters, where pages are illuminated to illustrate text dealing with kingly virtues, to a more pragmatic purpose, a pictorial instruction book preparing a young prince expecting – or expected – to fight hard to keep his enforced inheritance.

It seems that the speedy passage of political events overtook the artists, who did not have time to

---

16 See J G Alexander, ‘Early Fourteenth Century Illumination: recent acquisitions’ in The Bodleian Library Record, vol.9, 1974, pp.72-80, for a discussion of this.
complete their commission. The haste with which the treatise was being worked on is demonstrated by the off-set of the kite’s handling lines in folio 78r onto the facing sheet, a mistake which would have been quite easily erased by scratching out from the vellum ground before painting over, had time allowed. This visible sign of the haste of production in the second part of the book adds to the impression we have today of the immediacy of this unique document. The treatise was given to the young king while it was still in production, and perhaps it was never completed because it quickly became a treasured possession which Edward was reluctant to relinquish. A simple drawing in ink of a goose on the first leaf of the book, facing a marginal illumination of geese on folio 1r may be by the hand of Edward himself.

The prince puts his learning to use
As we have seen, four of the unfinished underdrawings are comprised of matched pairs of folios designed with integral elements facing each other. Only one of the finished full-page polychrome miniatures – the chivalric ‘castle of love’ – is in this format, each of the others being an integral composition on a single folio. This appears to give added importance to the unfinished preparatory drawings, all of which are on a military theme.

This is in keeping with the treatise’s apparent main purpose as an up-to-date illustrated version of Vegetius’ great treatise on the art of war. It was intended for the pragmatic instruction of a young prince about to inherit an emerging state at war with itself, and may have encouraged him as he entered a dangerous era when, now Edward III, he would instigate the Hundred Years War (1337-1453), which would put to deadly purpose many of the weapons featured towards the second half of Milemete’s kingly treatise.
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THE KNIGHT AND THE APPROPRIATED TOMB
In what has been called the Latin Chapel (because of the custom of using Latin in daily services up to 1648 and then from 1660 until 1861), on the North side of Christ Church Cathedral is a mediaeval altar tomb of some complexity. The chapel was built around 1330 and the tomb dating from the early fifteenth century is to be found adjoining the choir-aisle distinguished by a 6’6” effigy of a knight in English alabaster. The armour as depicted on the effigy is late fourteenth century indicating that it is earlier than the tomb on which it lies. An inspection of the jupon or surcoat upon the recumbent figure will indicate three garbs or golden wheatsheaves, in the Ashmole and Jenyns rolls of arms Sir John and Sir Roger Nowers (c. Edward III) are recorded as bearing azure a fess argent between three garbs or (a blue shield with a silver horizontal stripe between three garbs 2 & 1).

Thus it may be safe to assume that the figure represents a knight of the Nowers family and the fess on the jupon has probably become erased or simply obscured by the forearms of the effigy. The knight’s head rests upon an open-faced great helm bearing the crest of a bull’s head that has lost its horns. This again is the crest of the Nowers family. As to the identity of the knight it has been assumed to be Sir George Nowers who died in 1425 and was Lord of the Manor of Tackley near Oxford. However the
armour is quite wrong for this period even if the effigy was made in the life time of the knight.

There are suggestions that this Sir George was a companion of the Black Prince (1330-1376). The assumption as to the knight's identity must be wrong for, if the figure is that of Sir George, he would have lived through four reigns and been over ninety when he died. Michael MacLagan in the Friends Report of 1959 has suggested that the figure could be that of Sir John Nowers, father of George who died in 1386. This could be the Sir John whose arms are recorded in the Ashmole and Jenyns rolls. In his heraldic ‘Visitations of Oxfordshire’ of 1574, Richard Lee, Portcullis Pursuivant, recorded this effigy as being in Tackley Church. Over a hundred years later, in about 1660, Anthony Wood, who owned Lee’s manuscript, records the presence of the effigy in its present position in the Cathedral. Upon close inspection the effigy can be seen to have had a face lift as the protruding features could not have fitted comfortably within a great helm (cf. the face on the Black Prince’s effigy at Canterbury). Moreover the arms appear to be reconstructed and the legs betray evidence of not being part of the original figure.

One leg may be a plaster reconstruction but both feet seem to be cut into the back of what seems to be a collared greyhound. A greyhound is the crest of the de Gaynsford family (cf. Gaisford) and an inspection of the base of the tomb reveals a series of shields of the de Gaynsfords. It can thus be safely assumed that a de Gaynsford tomb has been appropriated to display a Nowers effigy. It is possible that the original effigy had been destroyed except for portions of the lower limbs and the recumbent greyhound, and the Nowers torso having become separated from the tomb at Tackley was superimposed. Several of the Nowers family are buried in the Cathedral and one at a later generation married into the de Gaynsfords family. The de Gaynsfords would seem to come from Hampton Poyle, near Tackley, and the various family alliances are indicated by the impaled shields in base.

The right hand impaled coat (reversed in heraldry to become sinister) would appear to indicate various wives who married into the de Gaynsfords. The shields in the illustration from left to right have been indentified as follows on the first shield the de Gaynsford arms impaled with what could be Darcy (argent an inescutcheon within an orle of cinquefoyles gules as born Sir Adomar Darcy at the Siege of Calais in 1345-48). The second shield impales what could be Damory (undyed of 6 gules and argent or possibly or, as born by Sir Richard Damory at the first Dunstable Tournament in 1308) (fig.1).

The third shield shows three greyhounds rampant sable on a silver (argent) field between a red (gules) chevron for Gaynsford but different from the Gaisford arms in the Cathedral porch, which shows the greyhounds running (courant) and the chevron sable. The fourth shield shows the Bassett arms (or 3 piles meeting in base gules, a canton ermine, as born by Sir Rauff Bassett, Baron Bassett in the Segar and St. George rolls of arms) (fig.2). The last shield displays the arms of Lucy (gules 3 lucies hauriant 2 and 1 argent, as born by Geffrey de Lucy, Baron Lucy in the Ashmole and Glover rolls) (fig.3). The shields on the other side are rather indistinct but there is a suggestion of a marriage of a de Gaynsford to a lady of the Nowers family.

Mark Turnham Elvins
Greyfriars Centre for Franciscan Studies
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Portrait of a Virtuoso
Dr George Clarke

‘From the toil of reading, or thinking, or writing, they had absolved their conscience; and the first shoots of learning and ingenuity withered on the ground, without yielding any fruits to the owners or the public.’

Even before the youthful Gibbon made his scathing criticisms, there were other observers who felt the intellectual life of eighteenth century Oxford was at a low ebb. The Abbé Prévost was an anglophile but he declared that there were few Oxford dons who roused themselves from their slumbers to apply themselves to study. ‘Les bons livres qui viennent d’Angleterre sortent rarement d’Oxford.’

Nevertheless there were serious and cultivated men in the university. They may not have been writing ‘bons livres’ but they were certainly collecting them and designing beautiful buildings in which to house them. One such was Dean Aldrich of Christ Church and another was his great friend and collaborator, George Clarke. These men were virtuosi; both were avid collectors and both left their collections to the college which held their affections. Above all, they were both, in Howard Colvin’s words, academic amateurs ‘who, Vitruvius in hand, had done [their] best to rescue the buildings of the university from the unlettered conservatism of the local master masons.

George Clarke was a fellow of All Souls from the age of twenty until his death fifty-six years later. But, unlike Aldrich, he also had quite an important career outside Oxford: among other offices, he acted as judge-advocate general for the last two decades of the seventeenth century; he was secretary to Prince George of Denmark (the husband of Queen Anne), and finally became a lord of the admiralty. But on the death of Queen Anne, he largely retired from public life to Oxford, although he remained member of Parliament for the university.

By all accounts, Clarke was an urbane and courteous man with many friends and it is easy to understand the sympathy between him and Aldrich. His loyalty to his old friend went beyond the grave: in 1732 he erected a monument to him in the cathedral and he defended his reputation against accusations that he had tampered with Clarendon’s manuscripts. In many ways, both Clarke and Aldrich resembled Pepys who described himself as being ‘in all things curious’ and as having ‘a liberal genius towards all studies and pleasures.’ It is a good definition of the virtuoso and the man of taste. Their love of music in convivial surroundings would have been a particular bond between Aldrich and Pepys while for his part Clarke had the remarkable Pepysian knack of blending, in an extraordinarily seamless way, business and pleasure, art and science. Like Pepys, he could happily break off from affairs of state to send instructions to his agent in Paris or Rome about the purchase of additions to his splendid collection of contemporary prints. Of course both he and Aldrich differed from Pepys in that they never married - nor did they leave any indiscreet comments on other relationships for posterity to discover and enjoy. But just as Pepys’s multi-faceted library bears eloquent witness to the width and variety of his interests, so also do theirs.

Clarke’s library contains works on theology, history, military science and classical archaeology; there are magnificent maps like the hand-coloured eleven volume Blaeu atlas of 1662; his fascination with the new scientific ideas can be seen in an almost complete collection of Boyle, a 1638 Galileo and the first edition of Newton’s Opticks (1704); he was widely read in English literature and there is a fine collection of Elizabethan, Jacobean and Restoration dramatists; there are early editions of Milton, Donne, Herrick, Lovelace, Vaughan, a unique copy of an otherwise unknown poem by Marvell and an almost complete Dryden. Clarke numbered a good many contemporary writers among his friends – ‘donum auctoris’ is to be found on works by Pope and Tickell, Prior and Young.

The difficulty is to disentangle single threads from this interwoven mesh of interests. However, there is no doubt that architecture must take pride of place. In November 1716 Pope wrote to a friend, ‘I had the good fortune (in Oxford) to be often in the conversation of Dr Clarke; he entertained me with several drawings and particularly with the designs of Inigo Jones’ Whitehall’. Clarke had been acquiring about third of the drawings by Jones and his pupil

John Webb since before 1709, at least ten years before Lord Burlington acquired his set from Talman. He also managed to pick up many of the books known to have belonged to Jones, some fifty in all. Of these, far and away the most important is a copy of Palladio’s *I Quattro libri dell’ architettura* (Venice, 1601) – clearly Jones’s working manual because it is copiously annotated in his hand.

These buildings were part of his grand neo-Gothic design for the college which was largely realised by his friend Hawksmoor.

In addition to All Souls, Queen’s, Brasenose and Magdalen were all on the receiving end of his ministrations, to their great benefit and his considerable enjoyment – and, of course, Christ Church, where it was his design, not Aldrich’s, which was used for the great New Library.

Hawksmoor was his most constant collaborator, but he seems to have had some form of contact with every major architect practising in England at the turn of the century. He collected their drawings too as well as almost every important treatise on architecture in print during his life-time.

His other great passion was that aesthetic extension of architecture, garden design. It is a token of his fascination with the subject that even at a time of considerable anxiety about his political career he mentions in his autobiography going off to Longleat, ‘the new gardens were then making and we remained there, I think, about a fortnight, very much to our satisfaction […]’. It was a leisurely age. Longleat must have been of particular interest to him because it was modelled on that other famous Wiltshire garden laid out in the 1630s by Isaac de Caus at Wilton. De Caus was the protégé of Inigo Jones and his original designs for the garden were somehow included with the other drawings in Clarke’s collection.

Engravings of villas, gardens and fountains in the Italian style also abound in his library and French ideas on gardening clearly interested him greatly. Dezallier d’Argenville’s *La Théorie et la pratique du jardinage* appeared in 1709 and its English translation by John James in 1712. Clarke owned both versions: they contain fine plates illustrating the geometric French style with its embroidered parterres and elaborate quincunxes. The quincunx (i.e. the pattern of the five on dice) was a particularly pervasive symbol in the seventeenth century. It appears very early in garden history in Xenophon’s description of the plantations in King Cyrus’s garden at Sardis and, not surprisingly, Clarke had a copy of The Garden of Cyrus, Sir Thomas Browne’s fantastic piece of metaphysical embroidery on the quincunx theme. At the same time, Clarke seems to have sensed that the constraints imposed by the rigid formal garden were being resisted. In his copy of Henry Wotton’s *The Elements of Architecture*, which appeared as early as 1624, he has underlined the famous section on gardens which, while retaining a delight in aqueducts and other conceits, also makes a plea that ‘Gardens should bee *irregular*, or at least *cast into a very wilde Regularitie*’. Moreover in his print collection he clearly favoured painters like Nicolas Poussin and Salvator Rosa whose idealised
landscapes were slowly but surely to influence the new thinking about gardens. Voices urging a retreat from formality were growing more insistent. Milton’s rejection of ‘nice art in beds and curious knots’ in *Paradise Lost* Book IV was seized on by gardeners at the turn of the century. Clarke undoubtedly knew his Milton – though as a man of his time he was probably untroubled by the curious secularisation of the Miltonic Eden where Adam’s ‘happy rural seat of various view’ is transformed into an English country house and Paradise regained by creating a landscaped garden round it.

Clarke not only inherited Aldrich’s role in architectural matters but also in the associated area of the production of the Oxford Almanacks. Dr Fell had been involved in the wrangle between the Stationers’ Company and the University over the monopoly to print almanacks, which were highly popular and therefore an important source of revenue to printers - they also tended to be poorly printed and lack artistic merit. But when agreement between the parties was reached ‘with the “Oxford Almanack” Fell transformed a folk literature into a scholarly exercise designed to enhance the prestige of the University’. In fact he delegated the actual design of the almanacks to his young colleague Aldrich who was probably responsible for nearly all those that appeared from 1676 until his death.

Of all the colleges which benefited from Clarke’s generosity, Worcester undoubtedly stands in first place. As the years passed he grew increasingly disillusioned by internecine feuds within his own college of All Souls and in 1728 his distaste for this quarrelsome atmosphere drove him into a radical alteration of his bequests. His plans for Worcester College were already well advanced and it was this struggling foundation on the edge of the city that he chose as the recipient of his main benefaction. He not only left the college money for future building but he also left it his magnificent library. All Souls has never quite forgiven him, but Worcester on the other hand understandably refers to him as ‘almost our founder’. What is more, in addition to his own books, his bequest included those of his father, Sir William Clarke. The two collections are in many ways complementary: in the space of a generation they reflect the interests and preoccupations of two interlinked but very different worlds. However, it seems unlikely that George Clarke and his contemporaries realised this. Nearly two centuries were to pass before the full importance of William Clarke’s books and papers was recognised.

The formative years of George Clarke and Henry Aldrich were spent in a world which was trying to forget the horrors of civil war and its aftermath. Both men were royalist in sympathy – as a son of Christ Church, Aldrich could be no other and Clarke, though no Jacobite Tory, naturally felt an affinity for a king who was a connoisseur of the arts and patron of the architect he most admired. His father might have told him a rather different story – but he was only six years old when his father was killed. William Clarke is a more shadowy figure than his son. He was born about 1623. He was trained as a lawyer and acquired secretarial skills under John Rushworth, one of the under-clerks of the Commons. He became a member of the army secretariat and from 1647 to 1650 he was secretary to the General Council of the Army. He accompanied Cromwell on his Scottish campaign and remained in Scotland during the interregnum. He was with General Monck on his march south in January 1660 to restore a civilian government, a move which, whether intended or not, resulted in the Restoration. His association with Monck meant that he survived and indeed prospered under the new regime but was killed in 1666 during

Aldrich’s collection of engravings provided much of his inspiration – especially those of Raphael and his school. It is quite amusing to notice how the tone changed under his successor. Clarke was not above a little self-advertisement here: under his influence the character of the Almanacks changed from being
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the second Dutch war. He was forty three. But in the last few years before his death he had been organising his papers and books in a remarkably methodical way. He undertook the immensely tedious task of transcribing his rough notes and shorthand into fair copies, destroying the originals as he did so. Working chronologically, he had reached 1650 by the time of his death. In the form of original notes and drafts, contemporary notes and redrafts, they offer a running commentary on the internal life and organisation and increasing political importance of Cromwell’s New Model Army.

The most exciting single item is undoubtedly the text of the Putney Debates in 1647, arguably the first demand in England for something approaching manhood suffrage. It is the survival of this manuscript which future historians were to regard as little short of a miracle. It lay undiscovered in a cupboard in Worcester with the rest of the archive (some forty-seven volumes) until the end of the nineteenth century when C. H. Firth, the future regius professor, stumbled on it. One can imagine his growing excitement as the full significance of the treasure-trove dawned on him. A century later, historians and political theorists are still discussing it.

We do not know where William Clarke’s own sympathies lay during the Civil War. Up to a point, he was clearly a survivor. And yet his extensive library contains a surprising amount of radical literature for a man who was merely a conformist. His remarkable pamphlet collection (some 6,000 pamphlets and broadsides bound into volumes roughly by subject) extends the themes of the manuscripts in the amount of Leveller material it contains. He has, for example, a whole volume devoted to John Lilburne whose angry rhetoric echoes through the democratic eloquence of the debaters at Putney.

William Clarke was certainly a dutiful civil servant but he was also a cool and intelligent observer who sensed that ‘the combination of radical journalism and pamphleteering, ideological zeal, political activism, and mass organisation that prevailed in England from 1646 to 1649⁶ was an astonishing phenomenon. He had a rare sense of the importance of preserving evidence and an equally rare knack for finding himself at the centre of events. He himself has dropped a hint that he was actually on the scaffold at the execution of Charles I.

In his copy of the famous pamphlet describing that momentous event, he has placed a small asterisk beside the phrase ‘a Gentleman that touched the Ax’ and in the opposite margin another asterisk with his own initials – ‘W.C.’ Considering the horrible fate of other men whose presence on that scaffold damned them as regicides, Clarke would hardly have wished to broadcast his attendance there - even though his function was simply to take down the king's speech in shorthand - but at the same time, part of him wished posterity to know.

It is a far cry from campaigns on bleak Scottish moorlands to Palladian villas basking in the sunlight of the Restoration, from soldiers arguing fiercely and earnestly about the rights of man in Putney to sophisticated virtuosi discussing questions of taste at Oxford high tables. Yet the bequest of the two Clarke collections to Worcester College has meant that both sides of the Civil War have found themselves under the same roof.

The Cromwellian and Leveller material preserved by William Clarke lies quietly beside the splendid Inigo Jones drawings collected by his son – the symbol of the royal patronage that was to cost Charles I (and his people) so dear. But one cannot help wondering if, when he showed the designs by Jones for Whitehall to Pope and other friends, George remembered – or even knew - the role of his own father when the royal actor played his last part in front of the Banqueting House and the curtain came down on the masque to end all masques.

Lesley le Claire
Worcester College

Crossing Borders
Hebrew Manuscripts as a Meeting Place of Cultures

The Bodleian Library's current winter exhibition showcases some 30 manuscripts from its Hebrew holdings.

Exceptionally lavish in their decoration and beautifully illuminated, these manuscripts give the visitor a unique insight into European Hebrew manuscript production, of which the Bodleian Library is one of the most notable custodians. That an equal number of Arabic and Latin manuscripts and early printed books are displayed next to the Hebrew codices only enhances the aesthetic enjoyment. They all are prime examples of medieval art and craftsmanship, yet their juxtaposition raises the exhibition to another level, far beyond that of simple artistic appreciation.

Exhibited together in this way the Hebrew, Arabic and Latin manuscripts tell the story of social and cultural interaction between Jews and non-Jews in both the Muslim and Christian worlds, an interaction which is mirrored in the blending of the elements inherent in the manuscripts, such as the writing styles, script types, decorative patterns and text genres. By importing elements of the host culture -

be it Muslim or Christian - these Hebrew manuscripts are proof of coexistence and cultural affinity, as well as practical cooperation, between Jews and their non-Jewish neighbours in the Middle Ages.

From scroll to codex
Interaction and cooperation, however, can only be established from the time that Jews adopted the codex as a book form. In the third century codices had already come into use and were in particular employed by Christians for spreading their message.

Hebrew books, however, continued to be written on scrolls or rotuli until after the rise of Islam, when the codex was no longer the hallmark of the Christian message. Only for liturgical purposes did the scroll (of which a beautiful specimen is displayed by courtesy of Christ Church’s Library) remain in use.

Illuminations
The most salient indication of cultural affinity is provided by the illustrations adorning Hebrew manuscripts. Jewish scribes frequently turned to workshops for the illustration of their manuscripts. It should not, therefore, come as a surprise that such manuscripts reflect the artistic features and cultural characteristics of those ateliers, which often do not comply with the text they are supposed to complement. A popular example is that of the hornpipe used at secular outdoor entertainments, which is totally inappropriate for illustrating the opening prayer for the Day of Atonement in a prayer book for the Jewish festivals.

Script
The most basic and unintentional similarity between Hebrew and non-Hebrew manuscripts is the writing style, one of the "imported elements" that reveals the origin of a particular Hebrew manuscript.

Jews in Ashkenaz (i.e. the Franco-German lands) used a style of Hebrew very similar to the Gothic script, whereas Italian Hebrew scripts were influenced by different forms of Latin script.

Examples of these types of handwriting are displayed in the exhibition. The fact that Jews in the Iberian Peninsula and North Africa were influenced by Arabic script is well-illustrated by an autographed draft of the legal code Mishneh Torah by Maimonides (1137/8–1204). The draft, with many corrections in Maimonides’ own hand, is from the Cairo Genizah.

It is remarkable that manuscripts illuminated by Jewish artists also reflect local, sometimes long-established cultural practices such as Islamic carpet decorations, which were still popular in Christian Spain long after Muslim domination had ended.

1 Cristina Neagu, The case of the Lost Torah’, Christ Church Library Newsletter, Trinity 2008, pp.4-5.
Intellectual transmission
Not only in an artistic respect were Jews part and parcel of the neighbouring society. On an intellectual level they shared narrative traditions, such as the famous *Kalila and Dimna*, for instance. This was a collection of Indian fables which was translated into Arabic and spread all over the Muslim world, including the Iberian Peninsula. From Arabic, the collection was then translated into Hebrew and also into various European languages.

Crossing Borders: Hebrew Manuscript as a Meeting-place of Cultures tells the story of the intellectual transmission, cultural exchange and practical cooperation, social interaction, and religious toleration between Jews and non-Jews in the Muslim and the Christian world during the late Middle Ages. The narrative brings to light how Hebrew manuscripts reflect the intellectual, socio-economical and cultural-religious context in which Jews lived and to what extent they shared and/or borrowed the culture of their neighbours and host countries.

Piet van Boxel
Hebrew Curator Bodleian Library

Tenants and the *Book of Evidences*

The most valuable estate was in Daventry, followed by Ipswich, Tonbridge, Wallingford, and Bayham in Kent. One of the smallest properties was Felixstowe, worth just £20 a year. If only Wolsey hadn’t fallen from grace just think what the combination of Ipswich and Felixstowe could have done for the college coffers in more modern times. But Wolsey did upset his king, disastrously, and Cardinal College only just survived in the rather bruised and battered form of King Henry VIII College. Legend has it that the place was left virtually destitute, with its endowment and riches stripped completely, but this is not true. Certainly it was a lot poorer than Cardinal Wolsey had intended, but it was still among the richest of the colleges in Oxford and only had to cater for a tiny
number of men who must have been rattling around in this huge building site like peas in a bucket.

Henry VIII wasn’t satisfied, however, and set to creating the unique institution of Christ Church - part college, part cathedral. An almost entirely new endowment was provided. Geographically, it was completely different from Wolsey’s. Where Wolsey’s had been focussed in Suffolk, Essex, and Kent, with a few outliers, Henry VIII’s gift was principally in the Midlands and the north-west, stretching from the Thames to the Ribble. There were bits further afield, in Devon, Yorkshire, Norfolk, Kent, and Wales. In total, Christ Church had an interest in 183 parishes.

Not only was the estate scattered to the four corners, it wasn’t just bits of land or urban houses. In fact most of the endowment was made up of rectories and advowsons, tithes and profits. It was these that were leased out, and it was up to the tenants to enhance the estates in order to make a living. The rents were fixed, and the only way that Christ Church benefited from improved land use or inflation was in the renewal fine that was imposed once every seven years based on a valuation made of each estate. Needless to say, this was unpopular but, on the whole, it was the tenants who were sitting pretty.

But what was it that the endowment had to pay for? Then as now, there were all the college buildings to pay for, including the cathedral. In 1546, of course, the place was only half-built, and all sorts of odd jobs had to be done in those first few months and years just to make the place habitable. There were still roofs to go on, and the eastern end of the cathedral, which Wolsey had left during his demolition of the old buildings, was closed in, first with a timber shuttering and then in stone with a grand east window. Maintenance was a constant burden, and the Treasurer was always having to remind the canons that work on their houses, unless it was structural, was to be met from their own pockets rather than from the college purse. The words MP and Treasurer was always having to remind the canons that work on their houses, unless it was structural, was to be met from their own pockets rather than from the college purse. The words MP and expenses come to mind... Still, it didn’t stop them trying it on fairly regularly.

There was also the body of Students. Nearly everyone who came up to Christ Church in the early years was stipendiary, and received a sum from the college every year which rose the more senior the men became. College officers received additional payments over and above their stipends; there were the college almsmen to care for, and an army of staff. The college was obliged by its covenants to give to charity and did so, generously, to all manner of causes, local and even international. The Dean and Chapter also made donations for the maintenance of parsonage houses, farmhouses, and churches throughout their lands. So, income was desperately important. Why, then, did the Dean and Canons feel that it was necessary in 1667 to compile the Book of Evidences? Quite simply, Christ Church had lost track of its estate. It wasn’t alone in this, by any stretch of the imagination. Most large landowners leased out their properties to tenants and then left those tenants very much to their own devices. Provided the rent came in on time and in full, the Dean and Chapter weren’t too worried.

However, the English Civil War, and the chaos it had wreaked on the countryside and on landholdings, prompted most of the Oxford colleges, and probably other landlords, too, to take stock. While they were doing this, and in the years to follow, all sorts of changes in the management of the land and its revenues came to light. Enclosures - which were muddled with the old open-field system, farming developments, tithe commutations, and less honourable activities including encroachments, the enclosure of commons, and even plain thievery.

Something needed to be done. Many landowners started to produce maps, which you would think was the most obvious way of confirming who owned what on the grounds, and getting some consensus in a community. Private landowners and even some of the other colleges, like Merton, Corpus Christi, and All Souls had been commissioning professionally-surveyed maps from the late sixteenth century. The first that Christ Church produced was in 1612, but that was of Oxford castle, rather than of a rural estate, although it was over yet another dispute over who owned what. Other than this, the earliest map was of a single field in East Claydon in Buckinghamshire dated 1697. It wasn’t until the second half of the eighteenth century that maps began to be drawn in any quantity.

So, the Book of Evidences was Christ Church’s response. However, wonderful though the book may be, it tells us very little of what was actually happening on the ground. It’s great theory, but not a lot of use when there is an argument over who owns what. And there was a lot of this, over many years.

But how had Christ Church lost track of its land, and what did it do to find it again? The statutes of Cardinal College and of King Henry VIII College (Christ Church had no statutes until 1867) laid down quite specifically how the estates were to be managed. Wolsey had even stipulated the type of bookcase the estate records were to be kept in. Progresses around the country to examine college estates were ordered by Henry VIII, and lots of the early leases make it an obligation of the tenant to wine and dine the dean and canons, or their stewards and receivers, their servants, and presumably to stable their horses whenever it was required. This was still a time when the monarch made regular trips round the country, descending on private houses and practically bankrupting many, so the arrival of large entourages of men expecting not...
only the up-front payment of rent but also to provide bed and board on top must have been expected but surely less than popular.

But the estates were widely scattered, and the dean and canons had other responsibilities, so it was generally left to local bailiffs to collect rents, or for the annual audit when the tenants came to Oxford to deliver them in person. The tenants, then, were left very much to their own devices, and many of these men were entrepreneurs, with an eye to improvement, embracing modern ideas or schemes to increase income.

In the middle ages and into the sixteenth century, sheep took over the country. Every farmer who could converted arable land into grazing to take advantage of the inflated price of English wool and cloth. But it became a real problem for sub-tenants, farm-labourers, and villagers who found themselves turned off their land and out of their houses to make way for the marauding sheep. More villages were deserted to make way for grazing than were because of the Black Death. It made sense to the landholders, especially those in the Midlands where there aren’t any major rivers, as sheep and cattle, along with geese, could be walked to market, or wool thrown onto the back of a cart. At Tetbury, local landowners had converted large areas of the countryside for grazing, and the vicar, who was a Christ Church man, complained vociferously. Where there was no grain, there was less tithe, and therefore less income for him, perhaps as much as £30 less each year which is the equivalent of around £47,000 today. In this case, the government stepped in and insisted that some of the land was returned, and a fine paid to the King.

Around the same time, in 1633, someone split on one of the freeholders of Easton Maudit in Northamptonshire. Sir Christopher Yelverton, said the spy, had made enclosures which were detrimental to college land. Now Christ Church only owned a small acreage of land in the parish, the rest belonging to Yelverton which put him in a very strong position. Sir Christopher’s father had been speaker of the House of Commons, and was a prominent lawyer, and some of his skills seem to have been passed on to his son. Yelverton took the offensive, extremely politely, pointing out that it was not his intention at all to damage Christ Church in anyway, he had acted entirely within the law and had, throughout the years, turned a blind eye to any encroachments that the tenants of the Dean and Chapter might have made into his land. The Dean and Canons’ response was most deferential, apologising for the appearance of jealousy over the enclosure, but requesting that Yelverton did nothing prejudicial to the college. Discussions over the next two decades resulted in generous exchanges of land to compensate Christ Church for its losses in the open fields, all fenced at Yelverton’s expense.

The enclosure of land often happened without the Dean and Chapter’s knowledge. Only if a tenant, or more often a sub-tenant, raised an issue, did the college get involved at all. The tenant in Hillesden in Buckinghamshire bought out the locals and enclosed most of the parish in the 1650s, soon after Parliament released him from prison - he had backed the wrong side during the Civil War.

Buckinghamshire had been thoroughly trampled on in the 1640s, and Hillesden had suffered particularly badly. The tenant's house had been burnt to the ground during a minor skirmish when the church was besieged, and the land had been trampled by troops of both sides who had decided that the top of the hill overlooking the Vale of Aylesbury was a good place to have control over. Edmund Denton set to work as soon as he returned to make the estate profitable again, enclosing the open fields and restocking with Midland longwools. But the Dean and Chapter hadn’t a clue that this was happening. It wasn’t until 1714 when the vicar complained about the payment of tithes, that Christ Church had the slightest hint that anything had changed.

During the general re-organisation of land, the parsonage land, on which the tithes were paid, had become completely indistinguishable from anyone else’s. But the annual rent of £13 7s 4d was still being paid on time (c.£20K), and so no-one had taken any interest. Once told, though, the administrators went into overdrive, and volleys of correspondence were exchanged between Oxford and Buckinghamshire, and Oxford and London where the Dentons spent the season, and things were gradually sorted out to everyone’s satisfaction. However, if such dramatic changes went unnoticed so close to home, it is not surprising that more difficulties arose on estates further afield.

Map of the parish of Hillesden dating from 1847.
The Civil War, which had prompted the Hillesden enclosure in particular, served to remind the Dean and Chapter of their remoteness from their estates. Samuel Fell, writing on 5 September 1646, to Gerard Langbaine in some desperation, said “We are all behouldeng to yu for yr care in the businesse of our rents, we are notoriously abused by our tenants combining wth our county committees..... If we faile here we must laye our keyes under the doore and be gon.” It is not uncommon to find among the correspondence in the archive that rents did not come from tenants further away, or in especially war-torn areas, could find themselves unable to pay, or used the situation as an excuse not to.

Lord Clifford, for example, pleaded inability to pay the rent on the Yorkshire estate of Long Preston as all his lands were in the hands of the rebels. “Wee durst not send fyeve pounds not fyeve myles from the Castle [at Skipton] no way this long tyme, the Rebells haue layen round about us in that manner, they haue come by 3000, one way and as many another to take this Castle but they never came within a myle of it for dread of my Lord’s ordnance”, said the earl’s agent, Robert Robottom. Lord Clifford’s father, the earl of Cumberland, died in 1643, and the estate was inherited by the earl of Cork. The Dean and Chapter were anxious to receive the rent on the property, but the earl insisted that, willing though he was to pay his dues, he too was unable to get cash through the rebel lines. Cork wrote to the King asking him to persuade Christ Church not to seek forfeiture of the estate. Charles, who was, of course, resident in Oxford at the time, piled on the pressure, explaining that the earl’s inability to pay was occasioned by “this publique Calamity and Distraction”. It can’t have been easy for the Treasurer to ignore the king’s wishes when he was standing in front of him; far harder responding to a letter. But the king did have a go at helping the college out, too. He issued a general letter to the college tenants, authorising the payment to a designated rent collector, to protect tenants from having to make a dangerous journey to Oxford, and to ensure that the Dean and Chapter received its dues.

After the Civil War, estates management by the Dean and Chapter was at least as efficient as it had been before the war, if not more so. One thing that changed significantly, nationwide, was the taking of court records in English, rather than in Latin. The most important job, though, was bringing in all those arrears that had accumulated. In November 1649, Dr Mills, the Treasurer, was charged with the task of bringing in all the arrears of rents and other payments due from Lady Day 1648 until Michaelmas 1649. So much was overdue, that charges and allowances would not be met unless something were done quickly. Mills was given a letter of attorney under the Common Seal, granting him absolute “power to abate and compound with the tenants for the same”. The Dean and Chapter were evidently confident in Mills’s ability, and his honesty; his pay for the extra work would be “such residue and surplussage of the said revenues profits and advantages to keep and detain in his hands to his own proper use without accompt for a recompense of his care and pains to be taken in that business”. For the first two years after his appointment, Mills held courts of survey in those Christ Church manors where there had been some difficulty in the collection or assessment of arrears, including South Stoke where there was a dispute over the management of Abbots Woods, at Little Compton, at Maids Moreton, and at Church Cowley. Poor old Mills also had to deal with the formidable Mrs Smith of Great Torrington in Devon. The Dean and Chapter had suffered a long-running battle with her since 1640 when they battled over the site of a new barn, and then over who was to pay the vicar and where the curate was to live, the Smiths being reluctant to fund anything, regardless of the terms of their lease. In June 1651, the Dean and Chapter decided to confront Grace Smith face-to-face, and sent her £5 so that she could travel up to Oxford. It didn’t work, at least not for several years, and Mrs Smith remained a thorn in the Chapter’s side until at least 1659. She even had the nerve to ask for a scholarship for her son in 1652 - a request that appears to have been met, unsurprisingly, with a blank refusal.

But even then, there was still no effort to take control of estates.

Into the eighteenth century, estates were still causing some headaches, East Walton in Norfolk among them. There were six manorial lordships in one parish which was a bit of a problem, and the lands were all intermixed and muddled. Following on in the tradition of the old progresses, one of the canons, Thomas Tanner, who had business and church interests of his own in the county, determined that he was going to sort everything out. He went in, all guns blazing, storming the offices of the Swaffham attorney who acted as Christ Church’s steward. He demanded, in the name of the Chapter, that he be given all the manorial court rolls and another essential documentation. Co-operation was not exactly forthcoming, so Tanner called a special manorial court, and softened up the tenants with a little beef and some thick ale. Such underhand measures worked to a certain extent; the tenants certainly responded, and tried hard, with the help of the documents that Tanner had managed to extract from the lawyer, including a fifteenth century terrier of the estate that had to be translated first, to help disentangle the mess. Tanner brought all the papers back to Oxford, so that the Chapter could work on them together, but disaster struck - somehow all the
boxes containing Tanner’s papers and books fell from his barge into the Thames where they lay for twenty hours before rescue. The Northampton Mercury announced with true journalistic relish that there were seven wagon-loads of material and between 200 and 300 volumes of manuscripts. Everything had to be taken to pieces and hung out to dry on washing lines. Many of the papers still show the signs of their immersion in the no doubt less than savoury river water. It was 1900 before the disputes over East Walton were finally sorted out.

Fifteenth century terrier of the East Walton estate.

East Walton was not, unfortunately, the only property in a state of confusion. The major changes in agricultural practices across England during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries particularly caused many such cases to be uncovered as landowners struggled to determine the extent of their holdings in order to reap the full benefits of new methods and of enclosure, this time by Act of Parliament and administered by professional commissioners.

The eventual employment of professional surveyors and land agents meant that the Dean and Chapter became increasingly aware of potential improvements that could be made to their properties. Richard Davis, who was surveyor to the king, said of Aldsworth in Gloucestershire, in 1782, that the simple two course husbandry in the open fields would be greatly improved after enclosure. The farmers were already leaving half the land fallow to recover, but Davis suggested that the introduction of turnips and grass into the sequence would improve soil nutrition and provide winter fodder. He was right: in 1771, Christ Church’s estate in the parish was worth £116; the enclosure took place in 1793, and, by 1821, the value had risen to £584.

But the new professionalism was not always popular. The Marquis of Rockingham, for example, Christ Church’s tenant in Wath-upon-Dearne in Yorkshire, complained vociferously about the surveyor sent to revalue his estate for his renewal fine. William Young had, according to the marquis, valued the estate ridiculously high - about £235 more than his own estimate, and had made ‘flippant’ suggestions about his use of the land for stud horses rather than for arable. One of the townships of Wath was Wentworth, where there was a famous race-track.

The argument really seems to have got going after a letter to Christ Church’s solicitor, James Morrell, from the vicar of Wath, John Rowley, suggested that Rockingham had been taking tithes to which he was not entitled, and had been enclosing common land in ever-increasing quantities. Those stud horses evidently needed lots of grazing. When this land was added to the common that had already been enclosed to provide incomes for two new chapelries in the area, in Swinton and Wentworth, the losses to the vicar’s income were substantial. The dean at the time, Bagot, strongly conservative and a terrible snob, made sure that he was directly involved with the negotiations with Rockingham and offered a concessionary rate, down from the £693 suggested by Young to a mere £600. There was more blustering from the indignant nobleman, but Bagot won and Christ Church received £600 on 1 July 1778 which was duly distributed between the Dean and Canons, the Dean receiving, as usual, twice the amount allocated to his colleagues. John Rowley, the vicar, was still not happy; he requested that his name be entered in the memorandum book “in large characters (that I may not be overlook’d)” for the first vacant benefice.

Similar stories can be found throughout the archive but it was not only the principal tenants who could be difficult. Sub-tenants, too, were often reluctant to help the landlord’s stooges; to them, Christ Church’s primary tenant appeared more of a landlord than the Dean and Chapter ever could, and they were unwilling to appear to be siding with the wrong party. The devil one knew was a far safer gamble. Canon Tanner in East Walton resorted to bribery but Christ Church often relied on its only ‘man on the ground’, the local vicar, to supply relevant information to the surveyor. Some of these men, too, were unhappy about alienating either their flocks or the resident of the big house nearby.

Not that that stopped them moaning about all sorts of things directly to the Dean and Chapter. One particularly troublesome vicar was the Reverend Marah from Little Compton in Gloucestershire who wrote to the Dean with a desperate account of parish life. When he took over the parish in 1857, said Marah “was a band of musicians in the gallery: clarinet, fife, bassoon, etc. The band sang when and what they liked, and gave out their own psalms, hymns, and anthems. The young men in the belfry, which is open to the nave, laughed, talked and drew on the walls....” “Offices of nature” were performed “openly and unblushingly”, and the
local women apparently dried their knickers on the hedges. Poor Reverend Marah was “terrified at the approach of Lady Visitors.”

But that’s a digression! New methods of farming caused problems for the Dean and Chapter, but these could and were dealt with by adopting a new professional attitude to land management. Eventually, maps began to be produced which made everything so much clearer. Once a map had been made, landlord, tenant, sub-tenants, and the vicar - sometimes with a government commissioner - could all sit down together around a table and thrash things out.

One of the really important sources of income for the college, as well as for the tenants, was timber. It was in demand for industry, house building, and ship-building but, unless it was carefully managed, the college woods were open and easy targets for abuse. Most tenancies included a clause which reserved timber - the large standing trees - for the use of the college. Christ Church’s ‘home’ wood was at Chandlings, sometimes known as Chandence, on the edge of Bagley Wood then just over the county boundary into Berkshire. The terms of the lease of the wood were stringent: the tenant, who paid £6 per annum as rent, was allowed underwoods, coppices, and hedgerows which had to be left to for a minimum of seven years between each cutting. For the profit he gained from these, the tenant was obliged to maintain all the woodbanks and ditches, and to replant any trees which were cut down at the request of the Chapter. Usually, the profits from timber were divided between the Dean and Canons. The size of these windfalls made management of the timber in all of Christ Church’s estates vital - almost every lease of the Chandlings estate includes a plan with the numbers of timber trees and, on occasion, additional maps were drawn. Now, everyone could see exactly what was there, and what wasn’t.

A terrier of woods and arable land in the parish of Abbots Wood, dating from 1726.

Abbots Wood in South Stoke, with its five separate coppices named after Dean Sampson and four of the early canons was another valuable timber estate, and a couple of the prettiest maps in the archive show exactly how it was laid out. Christ Church also held the manor, and the woods were leased with the manor in the same manner as any other property. In 1646, the tenant, Richard Hannars, requested a warrant to cut 30 loads of firewood, as part of the entitlement of his lease, but also suggested to the Dean and Chapter that the wood on the copyhold lands of the manor was being wasted and that a professional woodman should be appointed. Four years later, the college decided to do just that. An agreement was drawn up between the Dean and Canons and John Wheeler of Turkdean that, for a consideration of £300, Wheeler would manage the woods in trust for Christ Church. The tenant was obliged under the terms of the covenant to manage the woods efficiently, and to leave twice as many standard trees per acre as statute required.

It was in Wheeler’s home village of Turkdean that the value of timber was graphically demonstrated at about the same time as he was taking control in South Stoke. The Dean and the Treasurer had visited the estate, of which Christ Church was rector, in 1640, and both men had observed that there was likely to be trouble between the local freeholder, William Banister, and Christ Church’s tenant, William Dewey, over wood on the common. Sure enough, Banister went to court claiming that he had ‘casually lost’ a load of timber worth £50 at Cirencester market, and that the wood had come into the possession of Dewey who refused to give it up. Dewey denied the charge, but Banister continued to argue that the wood was legally his as it had grown on the waste in Turkdean and he was lord of the manor. At this point, Christ Church put their oar in, claiming that the rectory was also a manor given to them by Henry VIII, and proving it by producing court rolls from the Oseney abbey records. The same archive showed that it was the Dean and Chapter who had planted the trees, and that the plaintiff’s alleged manor did not exist. But Banister found contradictory documents, apparently showing that a manor had belonged to the collegiate church of Holy Trinity at Westbury. Somebody’s documents must have been faked, or mistranscribed, or conveniently mistranslated, but the Gloucester Assizes eventually decided in favour of Christ Church and Dewey. The rights to timber, turf, and quarrying on the common were confirmed to the Dean and Chapter. Theft, however it was disguised, was not, fortunately, a common way that Christ Church lost bits of land!

So surveys and maps became far more commonplace, undertaken and produced by professional map-makers. The maps of Butlers Marston, for example, were made specially for the enclosure of the parish, and the one for Chadwick records the effects of the enclosure showing changes and rationalisation of land ownership,
defining which pieces of land paid tithes and which were tithe-free, and placed all glebe land in identifiable parcels. Over two hundred years, Christ Church’s property gradually changed from tithes and other profits to physical land, making control much easier.

The experiences of surveyors were not always happy, and could sometimes take years to come to a successful conclusion. Two men, John Dugmore was sent to Norfolk to assess all the college estates there, and a local man from Bideford, Pridham, was commissioned to survey Great Torrington in Devon, both in the 1790s. They could not have had more different receptions. Dugmore surveyed Upton in Norfolk in March 1798, enclosure was suggested in August, and the Bill read for the first time in February 1799. Pridham, on the other hand, had a terrible time, squashed between the rock of the Dean and Chapter and the hard place of the college’s principal tenant, Lord Rolle. The farmers were unwilling to let him near their land, fearing increased rents, and Rolle, in spite of pestering for a renewal of his lease, did not want the goodwill between him and his leaseholders disturbed. It took thirty years for all the arguments to be sorted out.

Binsey, on the western edge of Oxford, was another estate enclosed at this time. Richard Davis had commented, in 1800, that both the arable and grass were in a terrible state because of the constant flooding by the Thames. Eighteen years later, another surveyor, Richard Crabtree, and Richard Gee, a tenant, were in agreement over the state of the open fields; productivity was low as the land had no time in summer to recover from the winter flooding. Richard Gee explained that his thirty-two acres were divided into eighty dispersed pieces, only two of which were as large as an acre - the old open-field system had been partly to blame for the long-standing confusion over Christ Church’s land-ownership nationwide. Meat cattle were grazed on the land, but it could really have done with an early wheat sowing. Additionally, one eighth of the land was taken up by headlands. The system of common fields, with the land divided into innumerable strips, meant that there could be no real attempt at drainage unless the whole parish was enclosed.

Most unusually, the Dean and Chapter took an active interest in the enclosure of Binsey; perhaps because they were lords of the manor, perhaps just because it was close at hand. In 1819, the tenants of the parish agreed to surrender their land to the Chapter, and allow them to reallocate. As was often the case, tithes were to be commuted for land. A couple of the tenants complained at the fines required by the new leases that were issued, and other battles, concerning bridges, ditches, roads, and fences, can be followed in the estates correspondence. The whole procedure was superintended by the deputy Treasurer. Christ Church was evidently anxious not to lose sight of, or potential income from, its land again.

New-fangled maps and surveys came into their own for other reasons besides determining ownership of land. During the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, industrial development and urban growth meant that chunks of land were taken for first canals, then railways, and then all the building that came around them. Compensation was the order of the day!

The Dean and Canons were not old-fashioned men and embraced these new ideas rapidly, especially if there was a chance of profit. The spread of the canal system across the country caused considerable interest and, before long, land in Oxford and Northamptonshire was being sold to both the Grand Junction Canal Company and the Oxford Canal Company. Not only was income derived from sales, but shares in the companies were purchased, doubling the college’s chance of making money in the new venture. Tenants who were ousted from lands sold were compensated accordingly; Mrs James in Thrupp was given half of the proceeds. Similar arrangements were made for tenants on land needed for the new railways that spread rapidly across the country from the 1840s. In Oxford, the railway was not popular with the University for some time; the sudden proximity of London could have a detrimental effect on student morality, but the greater fear was potential damage to estates. In 1846, the
proposed branch between Oxford and Cowley from South Hinksey would be “injurious to Cowley, separating Church Cowley from Temple Cowley” but it would also, said the petitioners writing to the House of Commons, obstruct the flood waters in wet seasons and cause problems for the neighbourhoods. Considerations that modern developers might take into account! The Dean and Chapter made sure, though, that any monies received from compulsory purchases were placed into a special account and any dividends were to be paid to the tenants until the end of their term.

And so, from not knowing much about their land-holdings in the seventeenth century, the Dean and Chapter, by the end of the nineteenth century, had grasped fully the monetary value and investment worth of their estate. Maps didn’t solve everything - in the last few years I’ve spent many a happy hour trying to track down the ownership of roads, field ditches, and hedge-lines, or the whereabouts of long-demolished barns. But they did make a big difference, especially when combined with more contact and better relations with all our tenants.

Judith Curthoys
Christ Church

An Important Milestone
Early Printed Books Project

Friday 26th February 2010 has proven to be a bit of a landmark in the history of cataloguing the Early Printed Books held at Christ Church: a little after midday, with Janet McMullin witnessing this important moment, I proudly put back on the shelf the last volume of the Wake Collection to have been catalogued.

After years of work, began by Mark Purcell in 1995, continued by Will Hale from 1999 to 2003, resumed in 2005 by Elizabeth Mathew and Francesca Galligan, and finally by myself from January 2007, the largest named collection held in the Library, accounting for about a sixth of the whole Early Printed Books at Christ Church, is accessible in its entirety via the Oxford University online catalogue, for the benefit and enjoyment of scholars and researchers all over the world, with the only exception of material which requires even more specialized expertise: 4 early printed maps and atlases, 80 to 90 issues of periodicals, 13 books in uncommon foreign languages, and the 14 books which unfortunately have been lost to the Library over the years.

The Collection boasts 7586 physical volumes, of which several contain multiple works (e.g. collections of pamphlets). An impressive 8776 records in OLIS catalogue today bear a Wake shelfmark, the not so striking difference in numbers being due to the presence of several multi-volume sets, which account for 1 record each no matter how many volumes each of them encompasses. If instead we count the virtual barcodes attached to each item in the collection, the total reaches a neat, round 11,000 items!

Not all of these volumes were actually part of the Bequest (for instance an almost complete set of Migne's Patrologia Latina and a small collection of sermons by Pusey have been inserted in more recent years under Wake's wide-brimmed hat) and, due to shuffling and re-shelving of volumes, several of Wake's books are to be found in other parts of the Library. However, the detailed work carried out involved the consultation of previous Wake manuscript catalogues, and I can confirm that the vast majority of volumes in what we call his Collection did indeed belong to the Archbishop.

During the three years I have dedicated to Wake, I grew to know him and his family; I had glimpses of his character and habits, felt close to him and grew fond of him. I will miss him. The completion of the cataloguing of this section of the library is however just a drop in the ocean, or indeed, just the beginning. Several other named collections still patiently await their rescue from obscurity and for their riches to be offered to the world.

Maria Franchini in the room housing the pamphlet collection.

From this Monday I will start in earnest my work on another section of the library holdings, the Pamphlets Collection held in the room on the third floor of the Library known as Hyp. This extremely interesting collection consists of between three and four thousand pamphlets given in 1722 by Lewis Atterbury, brother of Francis, Dean in 1711-13, as well as part of the bequest of Dean Henry Aldrich (1648–1710), which includes a collection of Quaker tracts he bought from Francis Bugg (1640–1727), the main Quaker controversialist of the time. I expect as much satisfaction and enjoyment from this collection as Wake gave me.

Maria Franchini
Early Printed Books Project
Among the volumes linked to the Allestree collection is a very special, but also very battered book: Johann Remmelin’s *Catoptrum Microcosmicum*. The volume dates from 1619 and was printed in Augsburg by David Franck. Previously flaps had been used on fugitive sheets from the beginning of the sixteenth century. Vesalius’ 1542 edition of *De humani corporis fabrica* contains one leaf with anatomical details intended to be cut out and mounted on an adjoining woodcut. Bartisch, in his *Augendienst* (a volume published in 1583) uses flaps on two woodcuts of the eye. But Remmelin’s was the first full-scale anatomy to attempt to show all the significant internal structures as they would appear in dissection through the medium of lifting engraved flaps.

The copy at Christ Church is the first authorized edition. What distinguishes it from other editions is the fact that it contains more engraved flaps than are present in any of the subsequent ones (140 of them, to be precise). They are all part of 3 full-page engraved plates. Although the plates had been issued in 1613, and the text was published on its own in quarto format in 1614, the 1619 is the earliest recorded edition which has the author’s consent. Given the importance of the book and its present poor condition, we have invited Victoria Stevens to look at the volume, assess the level of damage and discuss what could be done to restore it.

Victoria is a conservator at the Oxford Conservation Consortium. The Consortium is a collaborative conservation centre formed by a group of four Oxford colleges in 1990. There are now 12 members: Balliol, Corpus Christi, Jesus, Magdalen, Merton, National Trust, Queen’s, Middle East Centre Archive (St Antony’s), St John’s, Trinity, University and Worcester. The Consortium has the specialists and the facilities needed to provide comprehensive programmes of collection care. These include preservation activities as well as complex conservation treatments on individual or multiple items.

Aware that items in need of repairs have very different requirements, I ask Victoria what are the main problems with this book and what would she recommend we did about it? There are always a variety of treatments possible, from simple cleaning and in-situ repair, to rebacking, even rebinding in some cases.

The main problems are the combination of ingrained surface dirt, very softened paper, particularly around the edges, caused predominantly by water damage. The parchment cover is water damaged as well. This explains the huge distortions and the stain. There is also considerable loss of paper caused by water having softened the material and resulting in it breaking down. Looking at the volume attentively, one is bound to notice the deep undulations at edges of the cover which are not only bad in themselves, but are causing abrasion damage to the text block. The text block has been damaged by water and is stained with localized softening or mould damage,
particularly to page edges. There is considerable surface dirt, particularly to first and last few pages, and many edge tears to each page. The good news is that the fold back diagrams are in very good condition with minor creasing only. Regarding what best to do to repair this volume, the first thing one would need to do is clean all surfaces, both those covering the text block (particularly the lines and edges) and the parchment. This is done using a brush, latex sponge and an eraser. Once cleaning is done, we would have to locally humidify and flatten the creasing to page edges and diagrams. The areas of the covering parchment that are causing damage to the text block also need to be locally humidified and flattened.

I wonder what makes parchment such a difficult material. It is noticeably far less inert than paper and certainly prone to all sorts of distortions.

Parchment is the untanned raw skin of calves, sheep and goats which undergoes a controlled drying process. The raw skins are soaked in a solution of lime – calcium oxide or hydroxide – to remove the hair and dried under tension on a frame. As they are stretched and dried the flesh is scraped away from the outer layers of skin. Frequently, the parchment is pumiced to get a smooth hard surface suitable for writing and may be filled using a lime based paste to smooth and whiten the surface to make it suitable for writing. It is extremely hygroscopic – it absorbs water from the atmosphere – and if wetted will revert to its pliable skin-like state.

The main preservation issues with parchment are its ability to absorb moisture and its attractiveness to vermin and insects as a protein rich food source. The volume we are holding is a very good illustration of how distorted parchment can get in conditions of extreme humidity followed by non-controlled drying. Luckily, as I said, we can revert some of the distortions by locally humidifying and flattening it.

I am curious to find out how local humidifying is done.

This can be accomplished by sandwiching the parchment in Gore-Tex capillary matter (which is like a web of moss-like structure of plastic fibre). Gore-tex has controllable pore size and can block out many liquids, including liquid water and many conservation chemicals. Water vapour can still pass through the pores though, so it is possible to hydrate the parchment and remove a crease without introducing liquid water. Once the parchment relaxes, one can manually strengthen the tension areas. After this the cover is to be control-dried in order to keep the surface as flat as possible. As I said, allowing it to dry in the air would cause huge distortions (like the ones we see in the binding of this particular volume).

May I just say at this point that, once the cover has been flattened, the volume needs to be stored in a box which provides some light pressure. This way you could prevent the parchment from returning to its distorted state.

Next stage in the restoration would be resizing. Size, in this context, is what gives paper its characteristic crackle and also some impermeability to printing ink. Without size all paper would be like blotting paper. In handmade rag papers of the pre-industrial period each sheet was tub sized by being dipped in a bath of warm gelatine. In the machine made process, size was added to the pulp before it was formed into the paper sheet– known as internal, or engine sizing – and from the early 1800s alum rosin sizes were used. The problem here is that these are inherently acidic sizes which gradually degrade the cellulose fibres of the paper, particularly in conditions of high humidity. Chalk and china clay as well were added as fillers to enhance the paper’s ability to be printed. China clay produces very fine smooth art papers suitable for detailed printing and also is frequently used to form the pages of photograph albums. In preservation terms, moisture, light and, to a certain extent, heat accelerate the breakdown of the cellulose. High humidity is particularly damaging, as it can make degradation agents mobile causing discoloration and deterioration of the sheet. All of the paper additives are made mobile in the presence of moisture. Furthermore, insect and microbial pests are attracted to additives in the paper and in particular to size, and this is especially so in poor environmental conditions.

Returning to your book, both the parchment cover and some of the pages were clearly stained by water. When paper gets wet, size is lost. This means that the structure loses its long chains of cellulose. As a result, paper is no longer as strong as it used to be. It also becomes prone to bacterial attacks. Therefore it is essential to re-strengthen the paper by resizing the weak areas. As to what type of size would be best, we tend to go for a cellulose ether
consolidant (methylhydroxypropylcellulose, or MHPC, in industrial methylated spirits. Finally, only after all this is done, would we start to repair edge tears using a thin repair paper and wheat starch paste.

I enquire whether these repairs will involve filling-in the missing areas?

Sometime we would do that. The majority of mending tissues are made from Japanese tissue. As a rule, modern conservation practice is not to try to replicate what is gone. You would want to stabilize anything which might be lost. Say, you had a page where one of the leaves was torn in such a way that the material would be vulnerable to further breaking. You wouldn’t want to reinstate the page as it was but you would fill-in those areas which are extremely vulnerable.

How long would it take for a book like this to be repaired and stabilized?

An approximate estimate of time for this work would be 10 days at a cost of around £200 per day. The importance of the object and the complexity of the project make this a specialised repair, and an experienced book conservator will be required to do the work. Because of the nature and condition of the volume, there are a few limitations to what we can do. The softness of the pages and their fragility may mean that effective cleaning is difficult to achieve. The parchment may be difficult to flatten successfully and permanently.

One final word. When undertaking this type of complex conservation project, a well equipped studio and the added advantage of having a supporting network or team of conservation colleagues makes it easier to achieve the best possible result for the object. Having to deal with a wonderfully exciting volume such as Remmelin’s ‘Catoptrum Microcosmicum’ would be truly a dream project.

Christ Church Library Music Catalogue. By John Milsom. Design and programming by Matthew Phillips (http://library.chch.ox.ac.uk/music/).

It has long been recognized that the library of Christ Church, Oxford, holds one of the most important collections of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century music in the world. [...] With the appearance of John Milsom’s online Christ Church Library Music Catalogue, researchers have at their disposal for the first time a detailed, accessible, and wide-ranging guide to the collection, prepared to the highest bibliographical standards and presented in a format that incorporates concise and lucid descriptions of each item and comprehensive itemization of manuscript sources. [...] Like the catalogues of Hiff and Arkwright that it supersedes, Milsom’s catalogue is the product of years of work by an individual scholar. It is clearly important that this online resource is recognized as the scholarly peer of its forerunners, and heir to all of the connotations of authority and longevity conferred upon them by their appearance in printed form. [...] John Milsom and the Catalogue’s designer and programmer Matthew Phillips, has set a high standard for other institutions to follow. One can only hope that the custodians of other great collections of manuscript music around the world, many with published catalogues that are similarly long overdue for replacement, will rise to the challenge sooner rather than later.