HEARING MORLEY’S PUZZLES

The beautiful 1608 edition of Thomas Morley’s *A Plaine and Easie Introduction to Practicall Musicke* was a striking part of the Michaelmas term exhibit at the Christ Church Library. Indeed, “Sacred Music” and “Hidden Treasures” made it well worth a hunt through Morley’s treatise. The cruciform puzzle canon from Part III of the treatise is the sort of visual stimulus to attract both the musician and non-musician alike; likewise the scholar and the casual observer.

Morley’s treatise, first published in 1597 and then re-issued in 1608 (of which edition the Christ Church copy is one), became a leading theoretical work in Renaissance England and for many decades following. In the treatise, Morley lays out his material as a pleasant dialogue between a Master and two eager students. Following the practice of the time, Morley initiates his students into the old methods of solfege and sight-singing, and then into the study of counterpoint, a practice that within twenty years of the publishing of the treatise would come to be considered *prima prattica*, or old hat. In fact the model of learning sixteenth-century counterpoint is one that is still used today for learning the craft of musical composition.

Dating Wolsey’s Lectionaries

Among the most stunningly beautiful volumes housed at Christ Church is the *Epistle Lectionary*, a 16th century manuscript richly illuminated in the Flemish style. This large folio still sparkles brightly in all the colours of the rainbow and is - literally - heavy with gold. The book contains readings from the Epistles for a number of feast days throughout the year. Another *Lectionary*, containing the texts from the Gospels, illuminated in precisely the same manner and including the same selection of feast days, is now at Magdalen College in Oxford.

About the provenance of the *Epistle Lectionary* at Christ Church, there is only a brief entry in the *Donors’ Book*. This simply records that the manuscript was given by John Lante, in 1614, along with three printed medical books: “Magister Ioannes Lante Mag. in Artibus olim huius Aedis Alumnus DD: Hippocratis *Chirurgia*, latine, fol., 1544; Opera Rasis, 2 vols, fol.; Platerus *De Corporis humani structura et usu*, fol., 1583; Manuscript Cardinal Wolsey, fol.”

It is difficult to pinpoint the precise date when the *Gospel Lectionary* got to Magdalen College, but it must have arrived sometime by the beginning of the 18th century.
We can say this as the volume is mentioned by Thomas Hearne. Going further back, the Magdalen book itself offers precious information in the signature of one of its former owners, Samuel Chappinton. It appears that he, or another member of his family, were involved in rescuing volumes, deemed as too overtly Catholic, from Winchester Cathedral Library sometime around 1559, when the last Catholic bishop was deposed.

We know for sure that the Gospel Lectionary was at Winchester at the time because of another inscription in the book, the text of an oath taken in 1556 by Thomas White, who was standing in for his brother, John, the then newly appointed bishop of Winchester. For the period before this date, the manuscript is silent.

In spite of this however, circumstantial evidence places this manuscript, together with the Epistle Lectionary, in Henry VIII's library. Both, we shall see, point to Cardinal Wolsey, and, following the latter's fall from grace and death in 1530, the most likely fate for the volumes is to have ended up in the King's library. It is no secret that the monarch often appropriated books this way. A potential very interesting link, suggested by James Carley, between the Lectionaries' removal from the royal collection and their presence, all of a sudden, at Winchester could have been Queen Mary's wedding, which took place in the said cathedral on 25 July 1554.

One thing is certain. Without any doubt, these two impressively looking liturgical books were meant to work as a pair. Who commissioned them? To find the answer we needn't go further than the first illuminated page, for grafted into the texture of the borders (and some of the decorated initials) of almost every page of the manuscript, are a set of badges, arms, motto and initials. These heraldic insignia provide precise visual imagery directing us to the figure behind.

Firstly, there is the cardinal’s hat and mantling in lieu of helm and the cherub supporters bearing crosses. Then, on the shield, a more composite agglomeration of apparently disparate symbols: on the silver cross of the Ufford earls, the four blue leopards of the de la Pole earls, with the red lion of Pope Leo X in the middle; and, on a ‘chief or’, the Tudor rose between two Cornish choughs. On most folios these arms are impaled by those of the See of York: silver crossed keys on a red field surmounted by a golden crown. All these are specific elements chosen for their relevance in relation to the character and main affiliations of the owner, in this case, Thomas Wolsey.

Most of us now lack the formal training to translate the code with the same ease as the people who developed its vocabulary. Still, one thing we can be sure of. We can count on the fact that everything was charged with meaning. As the ultimate aim of heraldry was personal identification, there is no doubt, Wolsey wanted to be known. There is also no doubt, these were very special volumes for him. Beautiful and important, they were meant to carry his signature. They were to be recognized by anyone who had eyes to see as part of his legacy.

For an ambitious man who made his way to the top, legacy was crucial. Wolsey was educated at Oxford and elected Fellow of Magdalen. Chaplain to King Henry VII, he retained the royal favour with the next monarch, Henry VIII, being appointed Lord Chancellor. He was also Bishop of Lincoln, Archbishop of York, and created Cardinal in 1515. He narrowly missed being elected Pope, but, on the whole, there was nothing much for him to prove. So, having reached honours beyond imagination during his lifetime, he increasingly became more and more preoccupied with making his name last. By what means? Like many powerful people of his age, by

---

1 The volume mentioned by Thomas Hearne is described as follows: ‘a very curious MS call’d Cardinal Wolsey’s Missal; it is admirably well illuminated. T.W. is frequently in the Book’. See Remarks and Collections of Thomas Hearne, Vol. 6 (Jan. 1, 1717 - May 8, 1719), edited under the superintendence of the Committee of the Oxford Historical Society (Oxford: 1902), 194. Special thanks to Dr Christine Ferdinand, Fellow Librarian of Magdalen College, Oxford, who generously provided me with detailed information about the provenance of the Gospel Lectionary.

gaining respect and admiration as an enlightened promoter of humanistic values and a generous patron of the arts.

Wolsey cannot be ascribed a place in the introduction of humanism into England comparable to Cardinal Mendoza in Spain, who himself translated Homer, Vergil and Ovid.

However, his patronage of artists, as well as of humanists like Juan Louis Vives and Thomas Linacre, put Wolsey in a class of his own. His interest in Italian sculpture (visible in the decoration of Hampton Court) is well recognized. In architecture, his influence on Henry’s building activities is also taken into consideration.

What is now less visible is the impact he had in the field of book history. After his death his great library was dispersed, his books sequestered or destroyed, and there are few records of his commissions. But there are many illuminations of liturgical books (incidentally, they are the only known Epistle and Gospel Lectionaries to survive as a pair in England).

The manuscripts contain the text of the readings for feast days only. Significantly, as far as saints go, several of them are associated with Wolsey’s offices: St Andrew (for Bath and Wells, where he was bishop), St Cuthbert (for Durham), St Hugh (for Lincoln where he was bishop) and St William (for York where he was archbishop).

The sequence starts with St Andrew’s feast (30 November), after which the days celebrated line up as follows: Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary (8 December), three Masses of Christmas (25 December), St Stephen (26 December), St John the Apostle (27 December), feast of the Holy Innocents (28 December), St Thomas Becket (29 December), feast of the Circumcision (1 January), Epiphany (6 January), Purification of Mary (2 February), translation of St Frideswide (12 February), St Cuthbert (20 March), Annunciation (25 March), six (of the eight) Easter Masses, Ascension, six Pentecost Masses, Trinity, Corpus Christi, William, Archbishop of York (8 June), Nativity of St John the Baptist (24 June), St Peter and St Paul (29 June), Visitation (2 July), translation of St Thomas Becket (7 July), Relic Sunday (July), feast of the Name of Jesus (7 August), Assumption (15 August), Nativity of the Blessed Virgin Mary (8 September), All Saints (1 November), Hugh, Bishop of Lincoln (17 November).

The Lectionaries end with the feast of the Dedication of the Church, the date of which is left open.

The selection of the feasts follows, as one would expect, the Sarum Rite. Despite this however, the Lectionaries reveal a few rather striking deviations.

There are three feasts which do not fit in, thus attracting attention to themselves, namely: St Frideswide, Relic Sunday and, as I mentioned before, the Dedication of the Church. Not the most widely-known feasts, by comparison. Their place of honour in the two Lectionaries suggests Wolsey’s involvement with in this particular commission.

The first of the three is intrinsically linked with Oxford and the University, of which St Frideswide is a patron saint.

The other two days chosen by Wolsey are not part of the Oxford University Calendar. They are however pointing in the precise direction of something very close to Wolsey’s heart, namely, Cardinal College (the present day Christ Church), a college its founder meant to be grander and better than any other.

How might Relic Sunday and the feast of the Dedication of the Church relate to Cardinal College?

Firstly and most importantly, along with all the other feasts celebrated in the two Lectionaries, they match exactly the feasts mandated in the Cardinal College’s Statutes of 1526.

It is exhilarating to see that, in terms of their choice of the sacred calendar, these two manuscripts were designed to mirror the Statutes.

This cannot be a coincidence. It is a matter of choice, and the one who made the choice had to be Wolsey, the founder of Cardinal College.

This is not the only instance where the manuscripts deviate from what is expected for what appears to be a good reason.

---


---

5 About the date for this last feast in the sequence, the calendars vary. In 1536 the English Convocation decided that it should be kept on the first Sunday of October. The manuscripts however were completed a few years before that and it is difficult to say whether the feast had in view the celebration of a particular church according to local tradition, or it simply is out of sync.
6 This started as a local modification of the Roman rite at the cathedral church of Salisbury, but was increasingly used in other dioceses. By 1457 it had been adopted by nearly the whole of England, Wales and Ireland.
7 Frideswide’s feast, present in the University Statutes, is celebrated on 19 October. An 8th century saint, Frideswide became the first abbess of a convent founded by her father. She was so closely associated with the town that Chaucer (in the Miller’s Tale) has John, the carpenter from Oxford, invoke her as his patron saint. Little is known of her and mostly all depends on a brief account by William of Malmesbury and two 12th century Lives. Shorter life: Trinity College, Cambridge, MS 605, fols. 247r-248v. Longer life: Bodleian Library, Oxford, MS Ashmole 43 (SC 6924), fols. 155v-157v. For other sources see: Saint Frideswide, Patron of Oxford, the Earliest Texts, ed. by John Blair (Oxford:Perpetua Press, 1988).
Another interesting example, this time regarding dates, emerges in the Epistle Lectionary, more precisely in the illumination for the feast of St Peter and St Paul.

The illumination contains “1528” twice organically grafted in the border. It is reasonable to believe that this is the year when the illuminator worked on the manuscript.

In contrast, the Gospel Lectionary is not dated, but it is generally assumed that the Magdalen manuscript was illuminated the following year because the arms of Winchester appear among Wolsey’s other heraldry and he did not officially obtain that bishopric until April 1529.

In a series of lectures delivered at the University of York, James Carley argues convincingly for an earlier date, given that the See of Winchester became vacant at the beginning of February and the King immediately granted it to Wolsey. It is also likely that the cardinal had known about this for quite a long time, as in a will, signed on 15 February 1528, Richard Fox, the old bishop, nominated Wolsey as a possible successor. If the manuscripts were prepared roughly at the same time, then chances are that while the Epistle Lectionary was being illuminated, the Gospel Lectionary was being copied.

However true this may be, dates, especially in the case of the Gospel Lectionary, are difficult to pinpoint and account for. One thing that caught my attention in this respect is the year (different from the logically inferred 1529) that the manuscript alludes to.

If we look carefully at the sequence of post-Easter feasts in the two Lectionaries, we are bound to notice that one particular day is out of sync, namely that of William of York, celebrated on 8 June. In the Epistle Lectionary, it falls after Trinity and Corpus Christi, whereas in the Gospel Lectionary, it appears after Trinity but before Corpus Christi.

Could this be an error of an absent-minded calligrapher? Possibly. But it is also possible that this is no mistake at all.

If we consider the 1528 manuscript, the date for Easter that year was 12 April. This would place Ascension (5th Thursday after Easter) on 14 May, Pentecost (50 days after Easter) on 24 May, Trinity (the Sunday after Pentecost) on 31 May and Corpus Christi (the Thursday after Trinity) on 4 June. In the above sequence, the feast of William of York on 8 June fits perfectly after Corpus Christi.

Repeating the procedure in the case of the Gospel Lectionary produces some interesting results.

If we take 1529, when Easter was on 28 March, the confusion in the sequence remains in place. If, however, we consider 1530, then everything changes. In 1530, Easter fell on 17 April, so the succession of feasts is Ascension on 19 May, Pentecost on 29 May, Trinity on 5 June and Corpus Christi 9 June. This leaves the feast of William of York, on 8 June, between Trinity and Corpus Christi, precisely as in the manuscript.

What is the significance and whose idea was it to build a date such as this in the structure of the codex?

A manuscript is very much a collective effort, and the two Lectionaries under discussion are clearly no exception. Wolsey’s input as commissioner is fairly easy to identify, especially in his choice of the feasts. By making use of a known sequence of celebrations, could he have also played with dates of completion?

Is it possible that he had something specific in mind? Something he would have liked finalized by the end of 1530? Hard to say. Is it a coincidence? Or not?...

As to those who created the manuscript, very little is known with certitude. In spite of a year inscribed in one of the Lectionaries, the name of the illuminator does not surface anywhere.

---

The only thing one may assume with some degree of certainty is the sequence in which the illumination and the text of the manuscript were produced.

If we look attentively at how the text fits into the decoration, with occasional letters blocking the flow of the border, it becomes evident that the manuscripts were first handwritten, then illuminated.

J.B. Trapp has identified the calligrapher as Peter Meghen, the ‘one-eyed’ friend of Erasmus and secretary of John Colet who later became scribe to King Henry VIII. The style of illumination is immediately recognizable as Flemish, as is the bold upright hand of the famous calligrapher.

A detailed iconographic analysis would reveal a great more about the history of these fascinating and very well preserved volumes. At this point, let me just say that one of the artists who can be directly linked to the two manuscripts is Albrecht Dürer. References to him are, in effect, instrumental to identifying what function and place might Wolsey have had in mind when he commissioned the lectionaries.

However, this is another story…

Cristina Neagu

An Introduction to the English Short-Title Catalogue (ESTC)

Bibliographic catalogues come in many shapes and sizes and exist to fulfill various purposes. They can range from a manuscript list of a certain collection in a certain room of a certain library to vast databases attempting to encompass all known items in the universe.

The English Short-Title Catalogue (ESTC) falls somewhere in between these two extremes. It is a “niche” catalogue with a vast amount of material recorded in its bibliographic database.

The ESTC has two principal objectives. The first is to record the existence of every surviving letterpress item produced in Great Britain or any of its dependencies in any language, and, worldwide, in English, from 1473 to 1800.

The second objective is to record where every copy of each item is held. With these two purposes, the ESTC is intended to fulfill the functions of both a union catalogue and a bibliography. Additionally, as part of its function as a union catalogue, it also includes citations to microform and links to digitized surrogates.

The ESTC project was set in motion over 30 years ago. In 1978 Dr. Henry L. Snyder assumed responsibility for the ESTC in North America in partnership with the British Library. He was based at the University of Kansas at the time but moved the ESTC, early on, to Louisiana State University (1979-1986) and then to the University of California, Riverside, where it is now based. The original intention was to catalogue the letterpress material produced in the British Isles and North America in the eighteenth century, creating an electronic extension to the two printed catalogues of Pollard and Redgrave and Donald Wing which together only record items published through 1700.

The British Library created the base file by re-cataloguing its own holdings, some 150,000 items, while the American Antiquarian Society took responsibility for the North American imprints and Dr. Snyder and his team canvassed North America for additional items. In 1987, the scope of the catalogue was expanded chronologically backwards, to include items printed from the year 1473. This decision effectively provided for a single online catalogue of all pertinent imprints for the handpress era, incorporating and updating the information contained in the two printed catalogues.

The ESTC is currently a joint project of the Center for Bibliographic Studies and Research (CBSR) and the British Library and has grown to record the holdings of over 2,000 libraries, worldwide. The database currently stands at nearly 500,000 bibliographic records and over 3 million holdings. While the traditional mode of input for contributing libraries has always been the creation of manual reports, usually as photocopies of the title page, the history of the ESTC is sprinkled with creative tactics used to incorporate libraries’ holdings into the database.

The colleges of Oxford and Cambridge were canvassed in the 1980s for eighteenth century items. The team in charge of gathering the reports hauled hulking 1980s photocopiers (not the comparatively svelte modern numbers used these days) into college libraries, down narrow staircases and passages, praying all the while for a convenient electrical outlet. Later, using electronic access to the database, ESTC cataloguers worked onsite at the Huntington Library in San Marino, California for three years to catalogue the majority of that pre-1701 collection. Just recently, nine members of the Consortium of Research Libraries in the British Isles (CURL) along with eight other research libraries...
finished a two-year collaborative project with the ESTC. They entered or updated 38,000 pre-1701 ESTC holdings online and were, in turn, furnished with the relevant catalogue records for loading in the CURL database and the individual library online catalogues.

The ESTC currently employs the fruits of modern technology to allow contributors a level of access unimagined even ten years ago. Instead of the time- and labour-intensive process of photocopying and mailing sheets of paper to be matched and entered into the database by ESTC cataloguers, contributing libraries now have the option of matching their own holdings via the Internet.

Having obtained a username and password, a library can access and search the ESTC database with the item in-hand. When an ESTC record is found to match the item, the cataloguer can simply click a button to add a holding for that library. Items that cannot be found in the ESTC database can be reported by sending a digital picture and relevant information via email. Over a hundred libraries contributed in this manner in 2007. Christ Church Library alone added or updated 3,308 holdings in 2007 using this system.

Nothing near the size of databases like those operated by OCLC or Library of Congress, the ESTC conducts business within a narrowly defined scope that actually represents a fairly substantial chunk of material. And it is still growing. New items are added every day. The size of the database and diversity of items catalogued are attributable to the efforts of thousands of contributors from the world around throughout the course of the ESTC’s existence, who have provided the necessary details of their items to ESTC catalogers. Without them, the ESTC would not be a true union catalogue.

Virginia Schilling
ESTC / CBSR Project
UC Riverside, Ca., USA

Find more information about the ESTC at: http://estc.ucr.edu/. Free public search access of the ESTC catalogue is available through the British Library at: http://estc.bl.uk. Libraries with in-scope material who wish to contribute are invited to do so. Contact Virginia Schilling at: virginia.schilling@ucr.edu to request database access.

Christ Church and the ESTC

Christ Church holdings are well represented in the ESTC database. As of the 22nd of January, 2008, there were 27654 ESTC records describing books of which Christ Church owns at least one copy.

Of these, 618 are unique items, items for which only one library is known to own a copy, and this library is Christ Church. It is quite an impressive number, but the picture is not so simple: of these 618 unique items, 599 have only one holding. This means the copy at Christ Church is indeed the only known copy in existence. But 18 have two Christ Church holdings, and indeed 1 record has three Christ Church holdings! This is to say that only three copies exist of a given title, and all three of them are at Christ Church!

This might not look so amazing once we know that this item is a form sent by William Wake to the priests in his bishopric during his period as Bishop of Lincoln, with three pages of questions and space for answer. On the contrary, it is almost a pity to think that only three answers made it back to the Bishop... or that the others have been lost during his life.

However, the 18 ESTC items of which only two copies are known, and both held at Christ Church, are more varied: from music (Tomkins, Thomas. Musica Deo sacra & ecclesiae Anglicane: or, Musick dedicated to the honor and service of God, and to the use of cathedral and other churches of England. London : printed by William Godbid in Little Britain, and are to be sold by Timothy Garthwait in Little S. Bartholomews Hospital, MDCLXVIII. [1668].) to accounts of the trial of a postmaster (The answer of captain Stephen Rich, commander of the state packet barques, and post-master of Dublin, to a scandalous information of Evan Vaughan, late post-master of the same city. [London : s.n., 1649]); or indeed, copies of works of the French émigré in London, such as Le philosophe chrêtien, ou nouvelle philosophie, tirée de la parole de Dieu. Livre premier. ... Londres : par J. Delage, & se vend chez J. Moetiens, & autres libraires françois dans le Strand, 1719.

Works in French published in London by the immigrant Protestant communities are rather frequent in the Wake collection, and often unique to it. While continuing my work on this amazing section of the library, I have come across several such books.

On some occasions, these books had not yet been reported to the ESTC, and were therefore completely “new” items. In the last calendar year alone, we have contributed to the ESTC catalogue the surprising figure of around 20 new items, previously unknown. In certain cases those were “simply” variant issues of
known editions, but in other cases, the work was completely unknown. Possibly the most striking was the Epitaphe, ou Eloge funebre de Jaques Abbadie: ministre de la parole de Dieu: docteur en théologie, & doyen de Killalow en Irlande. Venu au monde à Nay en Béarn. Décédé à Mary bone près de Londres, le lundi vingt-cinquieme jour de Septembre 1727. Agé de soixante treize ans: enterré dans le cimetiere de la paroisse dudit lieu, le jeudi suivant. A Londres: [... , 1727?], an epitaph in verse for a Protestant pastor born in France, who had lived in Ireland and had died in London aged 73. I am convinced that our collaboration with the ESTC will provide many other beautiful surprises.

Maria Franchini
Early Printed Books Project

**THE CASE OF THE MISSING TITLE PAGE**

The work of an Antiquarian Cataloguer has many affinities with that of a detective. Both are faced with mysteries which need to be solved. They both have to collect information and data about the case at hand, notice details which might be missed on first sight, and resort to strict logical deductions in order to arrive at plausible conclusions.

In several cases the clues will simply be circumstantial, and the power of observation and inference more necessary than ever.

Let’s consider the case of a volume held at Christ Church in the Wake Collection, at shelfmark Wd.5.10. In normal situations, the work of a cataloguer would be to gather information from the title page. But this volume lacks its title page.

The next step towards the identification of the work involves trying to ascertain what the title is through internal clues and the use of catalogues.

First of all I notice the language, English, and I look for a caption title, or a running title. On page 1 there is a caption title: “Memoirs of the life, writings, and conduct of Dr. Francis Atterbury, late Bishop of Rochester.”.

The “late Bishop of Rochester” was deprived of his spiritual dignities and banished from Great Britain in 1722, so this work cannot have been issued earlier than this date (had the wording been “the late Dr. Atterbury”, I would have postponed the possible date to 1732, the year of his death). Based on my experience of typefaces, I can affirm that this book is not later than 1800, and very likely not later than the 1750s.

With these data I try a search on the English Short Title Catalogue (ESTC), which includes records for all books in the English language published between 1470s and 1800. I choose a Boolean search, first for “memoirs AND Atterbury”, and then a cross search for “life AND Atterbury”. I hit 5 and 12 results, respectively. By eliminating those which are evidently not a match (e.g. volumes in folio format, when my book is in octavo format, or the books with less than the 144 pages displayed by my copy), I limit the choice to three titles, three editions of the same work, by Thomas Stackhouse, published in 1723, 1727, and 1732 with slightly different wording of the title.

I read through the records. The 1727 edition is said to be a re-issue of the 1723 edition with a cancel title page. This means that the publisher took the unsold leaves of the first edition, cut off the title page, printed a new title page and inserted it in the place of the previous one. All the other leaves inside the volume would have been printed in 1723. In situations like this, as I miss the title page, which is the only leaf published in 1727, I can happily identify my copy as part of the 1723 edition.

The third edition, the 1723 printing, is not said to be a re-issue, and has different pagination. However, its title states that an additional section was added: “To which is added, Bishop Atterbury’s vindication of Dr. Aldrich, Bp. Smalridge, and himself, ...”. This leaves the possibility that the ESTC was not correct (good detectives should always challenge and verify the information given to them), and that the main part of the work is again a re-issue of the 1723 leaves, with my copy lacking also the final, added section.

There is a link to a microfilmed copy for the first and the second edition, available online through the Eighteenth Century Collections Online (ECCO), but not for the third edition. I check both microfilms, meticulously comparing each page against my copy. Title page aside, the three copies are completely the same, apart from a very important detail: both the
comparing the text. I need to resort to logic.

Edition, so I cannot confirm or nullify this theory by not having access to a microfilmed copy of the 1723 edition, but a genuinely new impression. I do. This copy is part of the third edition, which would not be a re-issue, but a genuinely new impression. However, both the ESTC record and the microfilmed copy for this second edition clearly show that the other known copies of this edition have the dedication signed “Philalethes”, as it should be, given that this is a re-issue of the 1723 anonymous edition with cancel title page. The next logical consequence is therefore that this copy is part of the third edition, which would not be a re-issue, but a genuinely new impression. I do not have access to a microfilmed copy of the 1723 edition, so I cannot confirm or nullify this theory by comparing the text. I need to resort to logic.

This position is rather difficult to hold. The setting of the internal pages of the 1723 (and 1727) edition(s) is identical to the Christ Church copy, and I am fully aware that in the letterpress period it was virtually impossible to re-set a book in exactly the same way. This is to say that, if the Christ Church copy belongs to the 1723 edition, then this third edition is as well a re-issue of the previous, with a cancel title page and only that line modified in the main section, plus an added section at the end. However, the ESTC record for the 1723 states that, again, the dedication is signed Philalethes. And mine isn’t. I need further proof. I enlist the help of one of my trusted informants, a fellow cataloguer in the field at All Souls College, Oxford. From the ESTC holdings record I know they have a copy of this third edition. By checking her copy against the microfilms in ECCO, she can confirm that the third edition is not a re-setting, just a re-issue, in all but the title page and the addenda, four additional leaves at the end. Her taking is that it consists in unsold sheets from the first print run. This leaves me with the conclusion that my copy belongs to a variant edition of the work, not yet known to the ESTC, and more specifically, a variant of the first edition, as the following ones are simply re-issues. I can envisage two possibilities, a simpler one and a more complex. My copy might be an early proof, printed before the publisher/printer/author decided it might be wiser to publish the work anonymously. This does not explain how a not-anonymous copy of a work rather apologetic of the Bishop of Rochester made it into the hands of Archbishop William Wake, who certainly was not one of his supporters.

The second hypothesis is rather more long-winded. As it is more logical to issue something anonymously the first time, and then acknowledge its authorship once it has been well accepted, this might likely be a second edition. I can hazard the hypothesis that the second edition was printed using the same setting of type of the first edition, not yet distributed.

Dating is also to be considered: the known second edition was published in 1727. But this implies that the printer kept so much of his precious type locked in formes for an entire four years, a not very economically viable option. He then decided to reprint it, with a new, modified title page, and then halfway through the print he realized the dedication was still signed Philalethes, stopped the presses, made the change, and continued the print, allowing in this way the simultaneous existence of copies of the second edition with and without Stackhouse’s name at foot of the dedication. The loss of income from his tied-up capital, i.e., his types still locked in the formes, would not have been justifiable by the sale of a mere two editions of this work at distance of four years, unless it happened to be a bestseller. And if this were the case, many more editions would have been produced. The possibility of the 1727 edition being made out of unsold sheets from 1723 is more likely. If this is true (and indeed, it was confirmed by the comparison of the setting of type in the microfilms), it follows that it was the first edition to have a stop-press correction, or indeed that there exists a previously unknown, second, bibliographical edition with authorship statement. It is also viable to imagine that leaves for both anonymous and signed dedication were left unsold, and went on to form the bulk of the 1727 “second” edition. But we still have...
no certain proof to support any of this. And here is where the cataloguer-detective’s attention to details enters into the equation.

As we said, the Wake copy lacks title page. However, there is a faint trace of offset ink from the missing title page onto the facing page, an endleaf part of the binding, and not originally issued with the printed sheets. By comparing the layout of this offset with that of the 1723 and 1727 title pages, I can have a proof that my previous conclusions were correct: the offset title page ties in with the one dated 1723.

The offset is not very clear, but a big size capital “C” can be discerned. This can only be the initial of the word “conduct” in the 1723 title page, the 1727 title page having the word “conduct” in smaller font and the word “character” in front of it. Hence the conclusion, and the solution to the case: the Wake copy is part of the first edition, and a variant of it. Possibly an early proof, possibly a press-stop correction, possibly a second issue of the first edition. The work does not sell well, and it is withdrawn from sale. Four years later, and then again at the death of Atterbury, the publisher decides to issue it a further time, calling it “second/third edition”. Very likely, in an attempt to get rid of as much of the unsold stock as possible, he now uses indifferently leaves of both variants.

Therefore, there should be out there somewhere a copy of the “official” second and third editions of the Memoirs of the life and conduct of Atterbury by Stackhouse with the dedication signed, which would be the definitive evidence of the Wake copy being a stop-press variant rather than a proof. The ESTC can, now, modify all three records to account for this possibility, and make cataloguers aware of it.

Elementary, my dear Watson.  

Maria Franchini  
Early Printed Books Project

---

### Notes on the Orrery Collection (1)

The name ‘Orrery’ conflates a bequest and a location. The gallery of the Upper Library at Christ Church was built to accommodate the bequest in 1731 of the personal library of Charles, 4th Earl of Orrery, which has subsequently been enlarged with many books from other sources.

Orrery’s library is described by a modern biographer, Lawrence B. Smith, as follows: “Ranked among the finest in England, it consisted of over 10,000 volumes and included works in English, Greek, French, Italian and Latin, as well as a complete set of The Journals of the House of Lords. Shortly after his death in 1731 it was noted that the collection ... was valued “some years” earlier at £8,000.

In the Oxford DNB, the same author writes that the library ‘constitutes a comprehensive corpus of medical and scientific treatises between 1690 and 1730’; the collection is there estimated as ‘£10,000 worth of books’.

### The man

**Charles Boyle, 1674–1731, 4th Earl of Orrery and 1st Baron Marston; scholar, soldier and statesman**

Boyle was born on 28 July 1674 near Kensington, the youngest son of Roger Boyle, 2nd Earl of Orrery (1646–1682) and Lady Mary Sackville (1648–1710). He was brought up at the Sackville family seat of Knole in Kent. He matriculated at Christ Church in 1690 and became a favourite of Dean Aldrich, who called him the ‘great ornament of our college’.

His tutor was Francis Atterbury, Aldrich’s successor, and

---

11 The original Dictionary of National Biography gives Orrery’s year of birth as 1676. Most of the following account draws on the online version of the revised edition, the Oxford DNB.
Boyle (henceforth ‘Orrery’) succeeded as 4th Earl on the death of his brother in 1703. Between 1695 and 1699 he had represented Charleville, County Cork, in the Irish Parliament; he was M.P. for Huntingdon from 1701 to 1705. In 1711 he was created Baron Boyle of Marston in recognition of his military and diplomatic service during the War of the Spanish Succession. Orrery married Elizabeth Cecil in 1706. A son, John, later 5th Earl, was born in 1707; Elizabeth died in 1708. Orrery had four children by his secretary’s wife. As well as ‘Boyle against Bentley’, he wrote a play, As you find it (1703), contributed two verses to the Oxford and Cambridge miscellany poems (1708), and edited his grandfather’s plays, rewriting The general as Altemira. He became a Knight of the Thistle in 1704 and Fellow of the Royal Society in 1706. His Jacobite sympathies led to his imprisonment for seven months in the Tower of London, until his release on medical grounds in March 1723. Orrery died in August 1731 in London and was buried in Westminster Abbey.

The library

How did the collection start? Orrery described his literary routine as an undergraduate in a letter:

‘My Bible and Euclid take up my morning; Caesar and exercise, Lysander and some French, my afternoon.’

According to Smith, he attracted the attention of London booksellers while still at Oxford as a result of his efforts to acquire an extensive library. As early as 1692, the renowned printer and Kit-Cat Club founder, Jacob Tonson, supplied him with a newly-published copy of Dryden’s controversial Cleomenes which sadly appears not to have come with the bequest. Orrery hired another London bookseller, Thomas Bennet, to arrange the collation of the Phalaris manuscripts in 1693.

Early ill health spurred Orrery’s interest in medicine. Eustace Budgell, Orrery’s last secretary and uncritical biographer, recorded that ‘The Lord Orrery, had so strong a Genius for Physick or Medicine, that he bought and read whatever was published on that subject; employed several Persons to send him an Account of Drugs and Herbs in foreign Countries; and prescribed, with Success, to many of his Friends, upon several Occasions.’

But he did not collect indiscriminately: rather he ‘had generally speaking, but one good Edition, seldom or never more than two Editions of the same Book’. Orrery undertook no Grand Tour but his diplomatic postings to the Low Countries and Jacobite missions to Paris may have offered opportunities to purchase foreign books directly.

The seriousness of his scientific interests is difficult to gauge, as next to no information survives in the form of correspondence or annotations. In particular, it appears that he was never an active participant in the Royal Society, despite his Fellowship.

But collecting is itself an expression of interest and Orrery’s will shows pride in ‘having with great expense and trouble made a large collection of useful books, and of mathematical instruments, machines, optical glasses of value which I have carefully preserved for the benefit of posterity’.  

13 Handwritten note by the 5th Earl in his copy of the Epistles of Phalaris (Om.8.7a): ‘His Tutours were Dr Atterbury, since Bishop of Rochester, & Dr Robert Freind Master of Westminster School.’ The Oxford DNB confirms that for Atterbury, Boyle’s education ‘became his particular care’.
14 The Oxford DNB gives the date as 31 August in Orrery’s own entry and 28 August in that for his son; 28 August matches the date of his son’s letter in The Orrery papers, London, 1903, Vol. 1, p. 95.
15 Smith, p. 16. McGarvie (The book of Marston Bigot, Buckingham, 1987, p. 79) states that Orrery’s ‘own copy of The Life of Lysander is in the British Library’: this is presumably the translation in MS Add. 10388, ‘with the addition of some verses and speeches by Lord Orrery, and some memoranda respecting him, in the handwriting of his son, the Hon. John Boyle, 1730’ (http://www.bl.uk/catalogues/manuscripts/).
16 Ibid., p. 455.
17 Ibid., p. 19.
18 Ibid., p. 16.
19 Smith, pp. 486–488.
21 Budgell, p. 255.
22 McGarvie, p. 78.
The inventory of the bequest includes books published in 1731 (e.g. Ol.4.17), implying that Orrery continued collecting up to his death.

The primary challenge in Orrery’s particular case is how to assess, fully and reliably, the extent to which his intellectual, literary, and scientific pursuits were little more than casual diversions designed to fulfil the outward maintenance of a dilettante’s reputation, or engaged in genuinely and conscientiously’, in the words of Smith, who nonetheless concludes that ‘if Orrery was a relative failure in his own literary and scientific contributions, he should receive credit for his enlightened generosity and zeal as a collector.

Where did Orrery keep his books? His library appears to have been divided between addresses in town and country. Orrery’s son was born at his ‘house in Glasshouse Street, Westminster, on 2 January 1707’, and Orrery is reported as renting lodgings in this street from 1717 until his imprisonment in 1722; in particular, his biography at the Royal Society cites an address in the adjacent Vigo Lane in 1718.

He inherited the estate at Marston Bigot in Somerset in 1714, which he used as a summer retreat, and later bought a home nearer London, Britwell House in Burnham, Buckinghamshire. His last home was in Downing Street, Westminster.

There were certainly books in both country houses. The grounds at Marston were laid out by the landscape gardener Stephen Switzer, who dedicated his *The practical fruit-gardener* to Orrery. In his magnum opus *An introduction to a general system of hydrostaticks and hydraulicks* (1729), Switzer writes as part of the conventional prefatory apology: ‘the greatest Help that I had being out of the Library (tho’ as yet unfinished) of my very worthy learned and noble Friend and Master, the right honourable the Earl of Orrery, at his seat at Marston in Somersetshire: But that noble Lord’s collection in that Place being far short of what he intends, I could not be fully supply’d there.’

Orrery’s will mentions both homes in his request that ‘all the books and instruments from his houses at Britwell and Marston’ be left to Christ Church ‘to be kept in a separate room for the use of students’.

Detail of the library in town, meanwhile, is provided in Budgell’s account of the events surrounding the bequest to Christ Church: ‘The Legacy left them by the late Lord Orrery, is indeed a noble one: I can speak of his Library with the more Certainty, as I had a constant Access to it, and a Key left for me, whenever he went out of Town. He had three large Rooms filled with Books. In the first Room he ranged his French and Italian Books, and in the second, his English: The third and innermost Room, which was much the largest, was filled with Greek and Latin Authors. He had likewise, a fine Collection of Mathematical Instruments.’

This division into three rooms is confirmed by Wright’s inventory of the instruments, which refers to their locations in ‘the Small Room’, ‘the Next Room’ and ‘the Great Room’.

In 1722, Orrery’s then secretary Simon Swordfeger admitted that the Jacobite conspirator Philip Neynoe ‘had used Orrery’s personal library on several occasions to assist with articles for The Freeholder’s Journal; this presumably took place in London. It would be interesting to know who else was admitted to the library.

Owen Massey
Worcester College

---

23 Smith, p. 454.
24 Ibid., p. 512.
25 McGarvie, p. 80.
26 Smith, p. 271.
27 Royal Society Sackler Archive (http://www.royalsoc.ac.uk/).
28 McGarvie, p. 84.
29 Budgell, pp. 254–255.
31 Smith, p. 381.
Christ Church Library holds one of the books presented to Archbishop Wake by Nikolaos Maurokordatos, hospodar (prince) of Walachia (1680-1730).

It is the first bilingual edition of the prince’s own work, *Peri kathekonton* (*De officiis*), a moral treatise focusing on practical, common duties, printed in 1722 in Leipzig by Thomas Fritsch (publisher) and Johann Georg Schniebs (printer). A second edition was published in London soon after, in 1726, by Gyles Fletcher (publisher) and Samuel Palmer (printer), and is available in the Bodleian.

Maurokordatos was the first in a long line of Phanariote Greeks directly appointed by the Porte as rulers of the Danubian principalities.

An erudite and a polyglot (formerly a dragoman, i.e. interpreter-cum-diplomat at the Divan), he sought to emulate the Byzantine tradition of splendour in courtly affairs, and pursued his literary and cultural interests in a sustained and knowledgeable manner. His library was impressive.

A significant bibliological discovery was made there by the prince’s secretary, Stephan Bergler, who found the introduction and the first three chapters of Eusebius of Caesarea’s *Demonstratio Evangelica*, or *Proof of the Gospel*, among the Athonite manuscripts which Maurokordatos collected.

Stephen Bergler (also known as Stephan Bergler, Stefan Bergler, or Stephanus Berglerus) is a fascinating and elusive figure of the Renaissance. Born in c. 1680 in what is currently Brașov, central Romania, which would then be known as Kronstadt, Transylvania, he was educated in Leipzig as a classical scholar and historian and went on to work in the publishing trade in Leipzig and Amsterdam.

While in Amsterdam he edited the works of Homer (together with Johann Heinrich Lederlin) and the *Onomasticon* of Julius Pollux for Officina Wetsteiniana, i.e. Wetzstein’s printing house. His 1707 edition of Homer was criticized by Alexander Pope as being ‘not altogether so close’, and ‘particularly taking a Latitude in the Epithets’.

Such liberties may well be due to the editor: little is known about him, but contemporaries agree that he was a strong-minded personality, likely and willing to get involved in scandals scholarly, political, or otherwise.

It is perhaps this curious blend of intellectual refinement, adventurousness, cantankerousness and obstinacy that made Maurokordatos choose Bergler
as his secretary; the prince was equally paradoxical, a brilliant bibliophile as well as a cruel ruler, judging by the number of tortures and executions that he ordered. In Leipzig, Bergler worked as a proofreader for Thomas Fritsch, for whom he translated Maurokordatos's *Peri kathekonton*. Bergler was also involved in major editorial work in Amsterdam, where he contributed to Fabricius's *Bibliotheca Graeca* and Sextus Empiricus.

Whatever the merits of his Homer as appreciated by Pope, Bergler's scholarship and diligence were put to good use in the translation of *De rebus Constantinopolitanis*, by the Byzantine historiographer Genesius (he worked on the editio princeps of 1733), and of Alciphron's epistles, published by Thomas Fritsch in 1715, with notes and commentary also by Bergler.

This edition of Alciphron's letters, with the Greek original and Latin translation juxtaposed, is available at Christ Church.

Apart from being a competent translator, editor and commentator of classical texts, Bergler was a contributor to the Leipzig-based *Acta Eruditorum*, a scientific and philosophical monthly which also published Leibniz, Newton, Bernoulli, Christian Wolff and Laplace.

The latter part of Bergler's life is somewhat of a mystery: he converted to Catholicism, and is said to have died sometime around 1740 either in Bucharest, while still in the service of Maurokordatos, or in Constantinople. The date is uncertain; however, 1740 is the year of his last known work, an annotated edition of Aristophanes, published in Leiden by Samuel and Johann Luchtmans, and edited by Pieter Burman with a commentary by Bergler and Karl Andreas Duker.

Oxford libraries, Christ Church in particular, hold a respectable number of books translated, edited, or prepared for print by Stephan Bergler. Perhaps there is enough material to warrant some new insights into the life and work of many such as him, who chose to subdue their flamboyant personality and perform the tedious, unrewarding, and often unrecognized tasks of translation, annotation, and prepress in the early days of printing.

Ioana Costache
Lady Margaret Hall

References:

HEARING MORLEY’S PUZZLES

Whether one’s own students are quite as eager about sixteenth-century contrapuntal bits and pieces as Morley’s readers is perhaps better left unexplored.

While Morley writes in a learned and literate style, one of the charms of the work is the glint of humour and wry criticism that creeps into his prose. The opening address “To the curteous (sic!) Reader” begins with as many flowery periods as one might expect in such an introduction.

However, anyone who has tried their own hand at a comparable project may be excused an involuntary cheer at coming upon the following from Morley:

“But as concerning the booke it selfe, if I had, before I began it, imagined half the paines and labour which it cost me, I would sooner have beene perswaded to any thing, then to have taken in hand such a tedious piece of worke, like unto a great Sea, which the rather I entered into the more I sawe before me unpast…”

Morley’s taste for exquisite name-calling is perhaps slightly reminiscent of various Shakespearean epithets, and I will frankly admit that I wish that I were bold enough to call a critical colleague a “malicious caterpillar”.

I notice with some interest that these pages appear as reading and discussion topics for various upper forms and college classes, and so hope that some student is industriously trying to convert “caterpillar” or “ignorant Ass” into suitable text-message script.

The cruciform canon which is so eye-catching falls near the end of Part III, which treats composition, and moves from the strict rules of species counterpoint to the no less strict but more enjoyable fields of free counterpoint.

Toward the end of Part III, the Master (Morley himself) opens up the floor for questions from
Polymathes and Philomathes, who ask to see examples of canons. Canons are without a doubt rather a parlour trick for any composer; a canon is a strictly imitative piece, in which each part plays against exact reflections of itself.

This is much harder than it might sound, as a simple cut-and-paste operation does not ensure musical correctness.

The broader category of fugue, where the following imitative parts may or may not change, has in itself been a benchmark of a master composer; Beethoven, Brahms and even later composers felt that to introduce a fugue into a symphonic movement was to present the final proof of compositorial authority.

The canon is more difficult to arrange and, once composed, can be difficult to perform. Simple canons such as “Frère Jacques” or “Great Tom” (about the bells of Christ Church) are easy enough to sing, with each subsequent singer echoing the previous entrance.

But the more complicated canons required singers to wait varying lengths of time before entering, and even to enter on different pitch levels. This is not so hard to fathom when one is reading a full score, but reading in open score was not yet standard in the late 1500s. Most music of several parts was in fact given as instrumental music is today, in separate parts, with no “conductor’s score” to be seen.

Canons presented an additional twist, since each voice sings the same material. In an inadvertently paper-saving practice, canons were usually printed as a single line melody, and each singer would be required to decipher necessary details such as which clef to choose and what rhythmic values to use in interpreting the single line. Morley himself mentions that this challenge “…manie times caused divers good Musicians sitte a whole daie, to find out the following part of a Canon: which being found (it might bee) was scant worth the hearing.” (Morley, 104).

The cruciform canon, then, is an example of a visual puzzle that works out to a musical composition. Many canons, Morley explains, come with obscure directions (“dark words”) on how to interpret the one or two lines given.

The example preceding the cruciform canon is one by Platensis, or Pierre de la Rue. In fact, this canon uses only letters marked above and below the music to tell the voice parts where to begin and end. I struggled with the original notation to see if I could work it out, and I had in the end to resort to the resolution given by Harman in his 1952 Norton edition. The result is a four-voice canon, divided into voice pairs of cantus-altus and tenor-bassus.

Musicians may be interested to know that it turns out to be a pleasant enough example in a hypo-Lydian mode. The canon is shown resolved below, up to the entrance of the bassus.

The cruciform example is Morley’s own work, and it was worth the fun of working it out. Morley admits that it would be difficult to resolve the puzzle without instructions. Interestingly, the quatrain printed around
the canon is of little help in working out the practical canon. He therefore instructs in the subsequent text that the horizontal bar of the cross is a two-voice canon between tenor and bass; strangely, this arm is upside down.

With the proper clef in mind, the bass voice sings the printed rhythm while the tenor uses the pitches set to dotted minims. In other words, the pitches of each part remain the same relative to each other (although the two voices are a twelfth apart); the bass voice displays normal rhythmic variety (isorhythmic, in a way) while the tenor is strictly homogeneous (or metrical, if you like).

Likewise the vertical post of the cross contains the printed cantus, while the alto sings semibreves using the same relative pitches (likewise a twelfth below what is printed). The resulting double canon is a beautiful musical example, no less so for the layers of rhythmic complexity required by the resolution of the two canon pieces. Harman points out a gratuitous unresolved (and therefore stylistically inexcusable) dissonance in the cantus (see m. 4 in the transcription); such a small flaw does not detract from the enjoyable density of the example, in contrast to the rather plodding canon by Pierre de la Rue (above). The tenor voice uses note values that generally contradict the regular pulses laid down by the other three voices, yet in fact around m. four the dotted minims begin to exert influence on all the parts and there is a beautiful temporary shift of metre reminiscent perhaps of Josquin. (In fact, the “error” in the cantus is, I think, almost, if not quite, understandable as an imperfect imitation of a similar passage in Josquin’s “Ave Maria…virgo serena”.)

The complexity of Morley’s task can further be appreciated if one considers the geometric progression that must have occurred during composition. Both printed cross-pieces were composed to fit with each other, but each at the same time had to match with its unwritten partner. A correction in one of the printed parts would have necessitated a bewildering number of crucial adjustments in the unwritten partner’s working-out, the other printed arm as well as its partner. Morley thus has given us not only a learned treatise, but also a puzzle that is a satisfying challenge to the musical scholar and a delight to both the ear and the eye.

Dr. Kristen Hansen
Columbus State University, USA

Many thanks to Cristina Neagu and the staff at Christ Church library for the opportunity for a satisfying rummage through the original Morley—much more fun than a modern edition!
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Noticeboard – New Books in the Lewis Carroll Collection

Christ Church Library has a large collection of editions of the “Alice” books in languages other than English.

A number of translations were published during the author’s lifetime, with his blessing: German and French in 1869, Swedish in 1870, Italian in 1872, an abridged Dutch version in 1875, Danish in the same year, and Russian in 1879. Dodgson was sufficiently proud of the German edition to present a copy to Princess Beatrice. It was bound specially for her in full green morocco, and is now in the Windsor Castle Archives. Other languages followed quickly, and today the “Alice” stories can be found translated into most languages of the world. Christ Church has copies of many, but by no means all, translated versions, mostly acquired by gift.

A considerable number of our eastern European editions were given to us by J.S.G. Simmons (1915-2005), who was Slavonic Librarian at the Taylor Institution from 1949 to 1969, and Librarian of All
Souls from 1970 to 1982. Many of these editions are hard to find outside their country of origin, and many have interesting illustrations.

Most western illustrators of “Alice” seem to find it difficult to shake off the influence of John Tenniel, but the eastern Europeans are less inhibited, and as a result their editions often have some delightfully quirky illustrations.

We have very recently been given some new translations to add to our collection. Some Romanian translations with colourful illustrations were donated by Maria Neagu, and just before Christmas a Russian version was given to us by Mikhail Kizilov, a student from Merton. He had visited the library on Alice’s Day in July, on which occasion he had pointed out a few transcription errors in my showcase labels, and promised to bring me a “better” translation than the one which was exhibited. The copy which he has presented to us is a translation by Boris Zakhoder, with illustrations by G. Kalinovskaya (Moscow: Detskaya literatura, 1975).

We are extremely grateful to him for his generosity in adding to our collection, particularly such interesting and obscure versions. We are always happy to receive new or differently illustrated editions of the “Alice” books. I would dearly love to add a full Welsh translation to our collection: at present, we have only a very abbreviated picture-book version. If anyone can help me to acquire a Welsh translation, please get in touch with the library!

Janet McMullin

Newsletter

Illustrations for this issue from material in Christ Church Library collections. ‘Alice’ drawing by Mirosława Modrzesewska. Original photography and design by Cristina Neagu.
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