Greetings from the Librarian

For those of you who are long-standing readers of the Library’s newsletter, you will know that it has evolved from a short, fairly informal publication, first published in 2004, into a substantial bibliographical journal. You may also realise it has been some time since an issue appeared, as in the last years the Library has undergone some considerable upheaval. The loss of the much-loved Janet McMullin, my predecessor, was a difficult burden for the Library to bear, and she left very large shoes to fill.

In addition, pressures on space within College have led to the loss of half of the Library’s storage space which had to be vacated this summer, requiring the Library team to move in excess of 40,000 volumes; a task several years in the planning and by no means a small job!
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Rare Photograph Acquired by Christ Church

Charles L. Dodgson was a famous alumnus of Christ Church, better known to the world as Lewis Carroll. He graduated in December 1854 with an honours degree in Mathematics. Less well known is the fact that he was an early pioneering photographer in the new black art using the wet collodion method. This was invented, without licence, in 1851. Black art was a good description - the chemicals used in the process stained fingers black. Dodgson’s curiosity was aroused when he saw the photographic work of Reginald Southey who was studying medicine at Christ Church, and who had a camera from at least 1853. Dodgson watched and learnt until he was ready to purchase his own camera in May 1856, and with Southey’s help he went to London and bought the Ottewill 1853 folding camera. It was huge - about 300mm by 300mm by 450mm - but made portable since the case folded neatly into a “flat pack”.
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Detail from the Epistle Lectionary (Christ Church MS.101, fol.23r). This and its companion, the Gospel Lectionary (now at Magdalen College, Oxford) were commissioned by Thomas Wolsey. The two codices have been reunited virtually and are available online: www.wolseymanuscripts.ac.uk
Despite these challenges, the Library seems to be thriving once again, with ever-increasing student numbers using the space, and an unprecedented number of new books being added to the collection (almost 4,000 in 2017/18).

Upstairs, the Library’s digitisation programme is coming on leaps and bounds with over 100 items now freely available for all to see online.

A new catalogue of the Library’s pre-1600 Western manuscripts has finally been published, with more volumes in the series planned, and with a draft of the Hebrew manuscripts catalogue nearly ready. Cataloguing work on the major parts of the archive of Lord Portal’s papers is now complete, and work on the Alice collection has also almost been finalised.

Conservation work continues apace and we have been able to increase our time allocation with our conservators by 200%, thanks to the support of the College, which will allow us to continue the essential upkeep of the collections. A new Collections Care Assistant has been appointed to help with the ongoing programme of cleaning and preventative conservation work and is doing sterling work to help us look after the amazing books in our care.

This is really the tip of the iceberg when thinking of what the Library has achieved in recent years. We very much look forward to sharing our news and discoveries with you as the newsletter resumes its former publication schedule. We very much welcome your feedback, thoughts and comments on the content and would very much like to hear from anyone who may wish to submit an article on any aspect of the collections held here. Read on – and enjoy!

Steven Archer
Christ Church

Steven Archer is College Librarian. He joined Christ Church in September 2016 from the Parker Library, Corpus Christi College, Cambridge. His research interests centre around the impact of the tenth-century monastic reform movement on manuscript production in England, the social function of books in the medieval world, the interplay between script and print, and the survival of medieval libraries during the Reformation.
This “flat pack” consisted of rose-wood with brass hinges. Southey assisted Dodgson’s first attempts, and even gave him some of his photographic chemicals to get started. The whole process of preparing the glass-plate with appropriate chemicals, exposing the plate, and developing the image, could take as long as 30 minutes for each photograph, barring frequent failures.

"I hope to make progress in Photography in the Easter Vacation: it is my one recreation, and I think should be done well."

In time, Dodgson perfected the art and continued taking photographs until 1880 when the camera was put away and not used again. By this time he could use the services of professional photographers, now with premises in all major towns, for just a few shillings. For him, this aspect of his hobby had become a drudge.

His opus of photographs is estimated at three thousand images taken over a period of 25 years, but no more than a third of these have survived today. His photographs are highly prized and command enormous prices when they come up for auction, especially his photographs of children in which he is regarded as a "master" where other amateur photographers of his day often failed.

From time to time a photograph unknown to the world emerges from a family source, causing great excitement and interest. Dodgson took many different kinds of photographs: portraits of famous Victorian people; images of families and Christ Church colleagues; animals; topological scenes; skeletons; artwork; and numerous children. The photographs of children command the highest values. The long process of taking a photograph of a child, who had to sit still for upwards of a minute, was not attempted by many amateurs, but Dodgson had great success by making the time interesting -
ensuring that the child was comfortable in holding a pose - telling a story and keeping the child fascinated. In this he was particularly skilled.

In a time of great child-mortality, friends would sometimes ask Dodgson to photograph their child in case the worst happened. Children tended to be young (below the age of 2) and nude studies were typically requested. Dodgson obliged. Very few photographs of this type survive today. The Victorians saw children as innocent beings, and some even imagined them to be close to angels, unsullied by worldly matters. Dodgson may have shared these views.

He took a number of other nude studies, following the path taken by leading art-photographers such as Oscar Rejlander, Julia Margaret Cameron, Henry Peach Robinson, and Lady Clementina Hawarden, to name but four photographers who experimented in this style of image. Dodgson either received requests from parents for such photographs, or sought their permission to take nude studies of their children, always chaperoned. No more than 1% of his total output were photographs of this kind. More often he preferred children dressed up in dramatic costumes. Very few nude studies by Dodgson have come onto the market. There were no more than 30 produced, based on entries in Dodgson's Diaries. Up until now six were known - two in private hands and four at the Rosenbach Museum in Philadelphia, USA.

Another nude study has just emerged from an Oxford family, where it had remained for several generations. I was asked to give a valuation - a difficult task since this kind of image rarely appears at auction houses. I know the value of some high quality photographs of children that have been sold recently, and these made five-figure sums. My estimate was accepted by the family of the sitter, and with the generous help of an alumnus the photograph was purchased for Christ Church Library.

When I saw the photograph for the first time, I recognised Dodgson's style, and had a good idea of the girl's name, which proved correct. She was Annie Henderson aged 8. I had listed it in the Catalogue Raisonné which I produced in 2015 based on Dodgson's records. His diary entry for 18 July 1879 says: "Mrs. Henderson brought Annie and Frances. I had warned Mrs. Henderson that I thought the children so nervous I would not even ask for 'bare feet,' and was agreeably surprised to find they were ready for any amount of undress, and seemed delighted at being allowed to run about naked. It is a great privilege to have a model as Annie to take; a very pretty face, and a good figure..." This indicates that the request for a nude study had probably come from Mrs. Henderson.

We know that two or three pictures of the Henderson children were taken at this time. This one I estimated had Dodgson's image number IN-2604, although this number (or any other number) does not appear on the print. There is another image of the two girls, Annie Gray Wright Henderson (1871-1951) and her sister, Hamilton Frances Henderson (b. 1872), showing them as "two shipwrecked maidens" (possibly IN-2605). This is now at the Rosenbach Museum.

Both images have been over-painted by Mrs. Lydia Bond of Southsea whom Dodgson employed as a
photographic colourist, making them small unique works of art that could be displayed to admiring visitors. Dodgson probably kept a print for himself, but his Executor (his brother, Wilfred) was instructed to destroy them at his death so that they did not fall into the wrong. Only the family had the image, and it is from family sources that these kind of photographs have come to light.

The photograph (taken in Dodgson’s Christ Church studio) shows Annie resting on the grassy bank of a small stream, reading a book underneath a tree. It is a rural setting composed by Mrs. Bond, and very little of the original photograph remains except the prone image of Annie. Dodgson probably gave instructions about what he wanted, so the design may have been his.

Inscriptions on the verso of the “Annie Henderson” photograph

There is an inscription on the verso which states in Dodgson’s hand “Annie Henderson, Rev. P. Henderson, Wadham College, Oxford” to which Annie has added at a later date “Taken of me by Rev. C. L. Dodgson (Lewis Carroll) in 1878 at Christ Church. Painted on photograph for him. Annie G. Ruxton, June 8, 1927.”

Annie’s father, Patrick Arkley Wright Henderson (1841-1922), was an exhibitioner at Balliol, BA 1866, MA 1868, ordained deacon 1869, priest 1870, Fellow of Wadham College 1867, chaplain and tutor 1868, proctor 1876-77, sub-warden and later bursar 1881, and Warden (head of college) 1903-13. He was one of the first married tutors in Oxford when the rules governing the celibacy of tutors were relaxed. His wife was Ann Wood née Gray (1844-1899). They had five children: Annie Gray Wright, Hamilton Frances, Robert Wright (b. 1875), Lilian Janet Wright (1880-1966), and Jeanette (b. 1881). Annie was writing after marrying Mr. Ruxton and clearly made a small error in the date the photograph was taken.

This photograph of Annie is the only extant print and brings the total number of known Dodgson nude photographs to seven. Of these, four (preserved at the Rosenbach Museum) show three images of the Kitchin family (Beatrice and Evelyn) and one picture of the Henderson daughters. All are coloured. The two remaining photographs depicting Bertram Rogers and Benjamin Brodie (both the eldest sons of Oxford professors) are not coloured, and the latter, which was sold at auction in June 1983, is not located. There are five other known nude studies, all of which have not come to light, showing Beatrice Latham (aged 6), Ethel Haydon (aged 2), Lily Gray (aged 5), Gertude Chataway (aged 10), and Ada Smith (an artist’s model aged 11). There are a few semi-nude studies which were taken. Dodgson’s photographic opus was catalogued by him but unfortunately the catalogue is now lost. A reconstruction was made in 2015.

Edward Wakeling
Christ Church, 1981


TWO 'SPLENDID' EDITIONS:

The Zohars of Mantua and Cremona

The book of Zohar comprises a canon of Jewish mystical texts in Aramaic and Hebrew. Sefer ha-Zohar means ‘the book of Splendour’. Curiously, in both of Christ Church Library’s copies of the first edition (MA.7.11 and MD.6.21), a late 19th or early 20th century hand writes in pencil “this is a better copy than the other”.

The Zohar’s authorship has been long attributed to a second century sage Simeon bar Yohai and his disciples. Modern scholarship, however, contends that important parts of the Zoharic texts were composed and edited by a thirteenth century Castilian kabbalist, rabbi Moses ben Shem Tov de Leon (ca. 1240-1305). Daniel Abrams, on the other hand, claims that the 16th-century printers placed the various Zoharic works into a single literary frame of a running commentary to the Pentateuch. Until then there were only various unconnected manuscripts of esotericism.¹

The Zohar, or Splendour, is an expression of the beauty of the inner meaning of the Torah.² It is a kabbalistic commentary on the Torah, with homilies,

midrashic passages and parables, containing a comprehensive order of kabbalistic theosophy which includes cosmology, the soul, and the questions of good and evil.

Although the first Hebrew books had been printed in Italy from the 1460s onwards, due to the opposition from the rabbinic authorities, the editio princeps of the Zohar came to light only in the following century, between 1558-1560 in Mantua. Some rabbis and important kabbalists held that these esoteric texts were not intended for large audiences but with the papal bull of 1553 by Pope Julius III, ordering the public burning of the Talmud, the situation had changed. Jews were no longer permitted to own copies of the Talmud and numerous other texts. This dramatic change gave rise to the publication of less widely circulated texts, including the Zohar.

Since the reign of the Gonzaga family in Mantua, local Jewish life flourished culturally and economically. The advent of Hebrew printing in Mantua in the late fifteenth century had turned Mantua into an important Jewish scholarly centre in Italy. Several important kabbalists and rabbis resided in Mantua during the Renaissance period partly due both to the influx of Jewish refugees from Sepharad and its regular contacts with the Holy Land.³

In this light, therefore, it is perhaps not surprising that the enterprise to publish the Zohar was first undertaken in Mantua (Christ Church, MD.6.21). This happened from 1558 to August 1560.⁴ The permission to print was issued by the Cardinal Archbishop of Mantua and Jacobus Geraldinus (a baptised Jew), Commissarius appointed by the Pope who declared it not offensive to the Church.⁵ This decision, however, was soon overturned as the Zohar, too, became subject to enquiries by the Inquisition.

The three volumes on the books of Genesis, Exodus and from Leviticus through to Deuteronomy accordingly were printed at the press of a local Christian printer Tommaso Ruffinelli, involving a number of scholars.

The main editor of the Mantuan Zohar was Rabbi Immanuel ben Yekuthiel of Benevento who had made use of as many as ten manuscripts to prepare the text, selecting the two best, and finalising the text with a codex from Safed.⁶ The publishers were Meir ben Ephraim of Padua and Jacob ben Naphtali ha-Cohen of Gazzuolo; the former acted also as a proofreader and the latter also as a typographer. Rabbi Immanuel ben Gabriel Corropoli was another proofreader and Abraham ben Meshullam of Modena participated both as editor and proofreader.

³ See Giulio Busi, Mantova e la Qabbalah/Mantua e la Kabbalah (Milano: Skira, 2001), pp. 49-64.
⁴ The date of the publication, however, does not appear on the title page but elsewhere in the book.
⁶ During this project Rabbi Immanuel Yekuthiel of Benevento travelled to the Orient to acquire his manuscripts.
The title page of the Cremona edition has a decorative architectural frame with figures of putti in the bottom squares and cherubs at the top along the sides. Above the arch is the vignette of Akedat Yitzhak, the binding of Isaac, surmounted by an eagle, subsequently used in Venice, Padua and Cracow. (Bodleian Library, shelfmark X. I. 7. Th.).

The title page of the Cremona Zohar lists a number of additions compared to the Mantua edition; on the other hand, some of the texts, such as the Midrash Ruth were actually not included. In the introduction, it contrasts itself to the editio princeps and devalues the publication project in Mantua. Interestingly, different manuscripts were used for the Cremona Zohar, six altogether, and resulting from their textual differences, also the arrangements of portions of the respective texts vary in both editions. The Cremona Zohar, as a folio, printed in a single volume, with the text in two columns in square letters is also known as the large Zohar (Zohar gadol) or as the ‘Christian edition’ due to Vittorio Eliano’s role in the project.⁹

The printing of the Zohar in Cremona started later than in Mantua, dated to the Jewish year 5319, i.e. 1559; still, the printing was completed in haste in one single year.¹⁰ However, the book was not released for sale at once as the whole edition had been confiscated despite the imprimatur from the Inquisition on the title page, and a longer permission at the end of the book.¹¹ Thanks to its fortunate rescue by the apostate Dominican Sixtus of Siena and perhaps owing to its size, as well as dissemination, the Cremona edition became the preferred of the two editions for Eastern European kabbalists.¹²

At Christ Church there are two copies of the Zohar printed in Mantua¹³ and one copy of the Cremona edition.¹⁴ Below I will examine the copy-specific details of the editio princeps of the Zohar. The differences between the complete and incomplete copies are striking.

First, the complete copy with the shelfmark MA.7.11 used to belong to a Jewish owner, possibly even a number of owners as the writings in different hands are evident but since the name on top of the first free endleaf has been cut out, the identity of this owner remains unknown.

The second copy, that of volume one only, comes from the collection of Lancelot Andrewes and it is likely that it reached England fairly soon after printing.¹⁵ It certainly used to be part of the Old audiences in Northern Europe.

¹⁹ Subsequently, the smaller Mantua edition is known as Zohar qatan (small Zohar).
¹⁰ The introduction of the Cremona edition alludes to the fact that type was set on Shabbat.
¹¹ Around that time more than 10,000 Hebrew books were burned in Cremona and even more were seized. Again, Vittorio Eliano was involved in this.
¹³ One of the copies, MD.6.21, however, is incomplete, including only the first volume. The shelfmark of the complete copy is MA.7.11-MA.7.13; Aleph system number for both copies is 20307334.
¹⁴ The shelfmark is MB.4.9. In this copy the book of Genesis is absent.
¹⁵ Lancelot Andrewes (1555-1626) was involved in the
Library at Christ Church - this knowledge we can derive from the staple holes on the fore-edge of the upper board on its 16th century English calf binding.

Although similar chainmarks cannot be found on the binding of MA.7.11, its early Christ Church bookplate reveals that this copy too may have belonged to the College’s Old Library. Still, this book must have stayed in Italy in Jewish ownership long enough to witness the hands and eyes of various censors, while in MD.6.21 there are no censors’ revisions. Below the colophon, on the last page in MA.7.11 we see the following censors’ inscriptions:

Visto per fr. Renato da Modena 1626
Revisto per fr. Luigi da Bologna, 1598, Inq.re di Modena 10 mese
Camillo Jaghel, 1613

As to the censored passages, these have not been restored for doing so was prohibited under the Inquisition (although it sometimes happens). But comparing the two copies at Christ Church - namely, the censored and non-censored - it is possible to identify the words and phrases that have been deleted. The Talmud was banned and burned for it allegedly contained sections that were offensive to the Christians and here too, the idea was to render illegible those words that contained notions which the Church considered heretical. As an example, in MA.7.11 the following Aramaic words (like the rest of the people/nations, 6 times expurgated), עמי (idolatrous nations, 19 times deleted), שכניה (Shekhinah, the dwelling of the Divine Presence of God, 3 times deleted), נגלה (in exile, 7 times cancelled) have been repeatedly crossed out as they either show the Christians in a bad light or pose controversial theological questions.

It is known that censors had indices which included both the books to be revised and also lists of passages to be deleted in those books.19 But how systematic were the censors actually in their work? To have a better idea of this, I will compare Christ

16 Renato da Modena was active as a censor ca. 1620-1626 in Modena, and Bologna.
17 Luigi da Bologna was active as a censor in Mantua, Modena, Ancona, Reggio, between 1596 and 1606.
18 Camillo Jaghel was active as a censor between 1611 and 1621 in Ancona, Urbino, Lugo.

19 Such index was also known as Index Expurgatorius or ספָר הָזְיָקֵק in Hebrew. Gila Prebor, ‘Sefer ha-Ziqqut of Dominico Yerushalmi’, Italia 18 (2008), pp. 7-302 [Hebrew] and idem, “‘Sefer HaZiqqut’ as a Source for Hebrew Bibliography’, Alei Sefer 23 (2013), pp. 63-80 [Hebrew].

Recto of the last leaf of volume 1 of the Mantua Zohar with the printed colophon and censors’ signatures. (Christ Church. MA.7.11, 251r).

An example of censor’s expurgations in volume 1 of the Mantua Zohar at Christ Church. (MA.7.11, 120v).
Church’s Zohar with the other Mantuan Zohar prints in Oxford - two copies at the Bodleian. The Bodleian copies are both complete and interestingly enough, one set comes from a former Jewish library, while the other used to belong to John Selden (1584-1654). Again, there are some remarkable differences between these two sets.

First, Selden’s copy had reached Oxford relatively early (considering its early Oxford binding and staple holes on the binding as evidence of chaining) and there are no censorship marks in any of these three volumes. In fact, on the verso of the title page there is an imprimatur from the Inquisition in Italian (dated to April 1558, Ferrara) that does not appear in any other Mantuan Zohar copies in Oxford!

David Oppenheim’s Zohar copy, on the other hand, has been subject to proper revision and on the last leaf (both on recto and verso sides) we have the following censors’ inscriptions:

Revisus per me Laurentini Frangueillii, 1575
Arr. da fr. Girolamo da Durallano, 1640
Visto per me fr. Renato da Modena, 1626
Revisus per mi. fra. Luigi da Bologna, februario 1599
Visto per mi Camillo Jaghel, 1613

Apart from the deletions in Opp. 4°.770 versus properly legible text in Selden’s copy, we can observe copious marginal annotations in both copies. Still, these are very different: in Opp. 4°.770, a previous Jewish owner has made corrections in Hebrew, while Selden writes in Latin, translating and expanding the Hebrew and Aramaic of the Zohar, delving into the notions of Jewish mysticism (merkavah etc.). It seems to be the case here that the Jewish and Christian owners of the same book never annotated one and the same passage.

Now, comparing the censors’ deletions in both Jewish-owned copies of the Zohar, MA.7.11 at Christ Church and Opp. 4°.770 at the Bodleian, it appears that although some of the censors were identical, they did not follow the same index as sometimes different phrases have been deleted in these books. On the whole, it seems that in Opp. 4°.770 longer and more varied passages have been expurgated than in MA.7.11 and only in a few instances do the deletions in both copies overlap. Again, the cancelled phrases in Opp. 4°.770 deal with so-called heretical passages or those that could be interpreted as theological polemics. For instance, words like idolatry; גוי (Gentile nations); עבודה זר (his soul) etc. have been rendered illegible.

The most striking difference, however, between the four copies of first edition of Zohar in Oxford, namely two at the Bodleian and two at Christ Church, lies in the layout, as well as in the wording of their prefaces. Why is that so? It seems that there are two formats of the printed Mantua Zohar, A and B, and all known copies fall into one of the two categories. Format A is older and there was only one known copy in the world until I carefully examined the two copies at the Bodleian. The text in copies of both formats A and B includes the same work and sentences but the

A rare imprimatur in Italian on title page verso of Selden’s copy of the Mantua Zohar, now at the Bodleian Library.

Their respective shelfmarks are Opp. 4°.770-772 and 4°.123-25, Th. Seld.

John Selden was an English jurist and scholar of English as well as Jewish law. He matriculated at Oxford from Hart Hall in 1600, but left the University without a degree. When Selden died in 1654, he left the Bodleian Library his large collection of books and manuscripts. Manuscripts in the Selden collection include codices dated between the 8th and 17th centuries, containing 364 shelfmarks. Languages of the material vary from Latin, English, Modern and Ancient Greek, Italian, French, Russian, German, Church Slavonic, Arabic, Old English, Spanish, Portuguese, Hebrew to Irish. The later addition to Duke Humfrey’s library continues to be known as the ‘Selden End’.

20 Their respective shelfmarks are Opp. 4°.770-772 and 4°.123-25, Th. Seld.

21 John Selden was an English jurist and scholar of English as well as Jewish law. He matriculated at Oxford from Hart Hall in 1600, but left the University without a degree. When Selden died in 1654, he left the Bodleian Library his large collection of books and manuscripts. Manuscripts in the Selden collection include codices dated between the 8th and 17th centuries, containing 364 shelfmarks. Languages of the material vary from Latin, English, Modern and Ancient Greek, Italian, French, Russian, German, Church Slavonic, Arabic, Old English, Spanish, Portuguese, Hebrew to Irish. The later addition to Duke Humfrey’s library continues to be known as the ‘Selden End’.

22 Laurentius Frangueillus was active as a censor in Mantua, between 1570-1579.

23 Girolamo da Durallano was active as a censor ca. 1640-1641 in Modena and Reggio.

24 There are altogether 38 instances of expurgated phrases in MA.7.11 and 37 occasions in Opp. 4°.770 where words have been expurgated.

25 I am indebted to Professor Daniel Abrams who has so kindly discussed the various formats with me. See Daniel Abrams, When was the “Introduction” to the Zohar Written, and Changes Within Differing Copies of the Mantua Printing”, Asufot 8 (1994), pp. 211-226 [Hebrew].
wording is different. Hence, also some of the page layout is different: in format A the introduction ends in the shape of a downward pointing triangle and as a square block in format B. The text was changed from A to B in rearranging the text in the plates and replacing the first few quires in the Introduction (except the title page and the wording of the text of Isaac de Lattes and the proofreader, which have no changes). These changes were probably made by the printers at Mantua who had adapted the version of the Cremona edition, but they failed to replace the printed sheets with the newly printed ones in some of the copies.26

In conclusion, these books, all copies of the first edition of the Zohar of 1558-1560, Mantua tell their different stories. Some of these we can reconstruct while examining such copy-specific details as their provenance notes and censors' deletions. But also the marginal annotations by their previous owners give us hints about how these books were used. From these marginal notes it becomes quite clear that Christian owners read the very same books differently from Jewish owners. Even the attitude towards the book as a physical object seems to be different as the same Zohar in previous Christian ownership has been bound in fine, expensive bindings, while the copies of Jewish owners come with less expensive bindings. While in the copies of Jewish owners we may often find random scribblings (perhaps by children to practise writing) those owned by Christian Hebraists are neat copies with annotations for the purpose of study in a fine hand. We can also see that those books that remained in Jewish ownership in Italy were censored whilst there are copies of the same edition with no censorship expurgations. I hope to have shown with these four copies of the Zohar that in the case of early printed books we cannot really speak of duplicates as each copy is unique.

Rahel Fronda
Christ Church & Bodleian Library

Dr Fronda is Deputy Curator of Hebraica and Judaica at the Bodleian Library. At Christ Church she catalogues and researches the provenance of early printed Hebrew and Oriental books. She is the author of Jewish Books and Their Christian Readers: Christ Church Connections (Christ Church, 2017).

THE ROMAN COLLECTION AT CHRIST CHURCH: EARLY COIN CATALOGUES

Edward Hannes’s catalogue, 1686

In the preface, dated 18 June 1685, to his monumental study of ancient weights and measures Edward Bernard specified ‘the Roman Collection at Christ-Church’, as one of the principal sources he used.1 This has been something of a puzzle in the past, since Christ Church has not been thought to have had such a collection until the early 18th century.2 However, the Christ Church Library Donors’ Book under the year 1686 records that ‘Ornatissimus juvenis Eduardus Hannes A.B. et hujus Aedis Alumnus D.D. Libr. Ms. a se ipso compositum, in quo omnia numismata quae in hac bibliotheca extant, recensentur et explicantur, secundum Seriem explicantur, secundum Seriem


26 I thank Professor Joseph Hacker for his valuable advice.
Abacorum in quibus reponuntur, and the catalogue has recently been rediscovered and identified by David Rundle. Although unsigned, the manuscript catalogue contains enough internal pointers to allow it to be identified as that made by Edward Hannes and given to Christ Church in 1686.

The title of the volume is: Ædis Christi Numismata. Quorum Duo sunt Aurea: Unum, plumbeum: 136, Ænea: 366, Argentea. Ex Argenteis Romanis, 27 sunt victoriatii; 3 sestertij; Cæteri autem, Denarij. The title is puzzling in several ways:

- the total amounts to 505, but this is 20 (or 27) more than the number of coins listed in the catalogue (see below);
- there is only 1 gold coin (VII-26, a gold solidus of Theodosius I), although two silver coins are described as gilded on one side (II-1, Caeser: ‘AR antic. deaurat’; III-38, Hadrian: ‘AR alter. part. deaur.’);
- the term ‘victoriatius’ must here be applied to the late Roman silver siliquae (of which there are 27 in the main catalogue, plus another among the incerti), rather than its normal application to the silver ‘victoriati’ coins produced in the Roman Republic, of which no specimens appear in the catalogue. Hannes shows that he himself knows this normal usage in his comments on I-33; I am not aware of any other contemporary use of the term in this way. It is not used in this sense by Edward Bernard (De ponderibus, p. 100), who correctly calls it the word used for a half denarius or quinarius. Hannes must have used it on the title page as a way of conveying the lighter weight of the late Roman pieces;
- the only lead coin seems to be the ‘quoddam Numisma Plumbeum inscript. Hebr.:’ presented by Edward Stradling and listed as one of the additions at the end of the volume (whatever it may have been);
- the 3 ‘sestertii’ perhaps include I-33, which we would call a quinarius; it is not clear which the other two are.

The catalogue sets out a list of the coins tray by tray (abacus), as described in the Donor’s Book (secundum Seriem Abacorum in quibus reponuntur). There were a total of 9 trays, and the largest number of spaces (loculi) in any tray was 99. This suggests a tray might have had either 9x11 or 10x10 spaces; probably the latter as it would explain why, after the gap in numbering at the end of the few Greek coins, the sequence resumes with number 11, as if starting a new row. Some of the trays may have had fewer ‘loculi’, as for example tray II, which had to accommodate some larger sestertius-sized coins. Trays with a hundred spaces would have been quite large, and presumably they would have been fitted into some sort of cabinet.

The catalogue has been digitised and is available online. See Christ Church Digital Library-Western Manuscripts; digital.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/inquire/p/cdbbc3ca-0a2b-4c78-b0b7-b1c17de222e7

The original listing comprised the following categories (with numbers of coins listed, to which a small number of additions were made):

| I | Nummi Graeci (1-6) |
| II | Nummi Ante-Caesariani R. seu Numi Familiarui’ R. om’es Argenti (11-43) (+4 additions) |
| III | Nummi Imperatorum a C. Caesare (1-42) (+2 additions) |
| IV | Nummi Imp. (1-63) |
| V | Nummi Imp. (1-80) |
| VI | Nummi Imp. (1-99) |
| VII | Nummi Imp. (1-99) (+1 addition) |
| VIII | Nummi Imp. (1-33) |
| IX | Nummi incerti (1-23) |

The number of coins listed for I-VIII was originally 478, to which a total of 7 more coins were later added, making a total of 485, still twenty short of the 505 totalled on the title page. The additional material from the 4 later donors on f.65r comprise only a further 4, but they were anyway added later. Presumably the explanation for the discrepancy is that there were 20 items in Abacus IX of...
miscellaneous coins' (Numism[ata] Miscellan[ea]), whatever they may have been. They were presumably not Greek or Roman coins, and a guess would be that they would have been later non-classical coins, for example English medieval and modern, thereby perhaps also accounting for the other gold coins; and perhaps also for the 2 small silver ones (the missing 'sestertii') and possibly also for the lead piece mentioned in the title.

The collection had a few Greek coins (6), but was mostly of Roman, and predominantly Roman Imperial coins of the 2nd to 4th centuries AD. The mints of the late Roman coins allow us to deduce that the coins were almost certainly gathered in Britain, since mint-marks of the western empire predominate (London, Trier, Lyon, Arles).

In addition, the group of 27 late Roman silver coins, ranging in date from Constantius II to Honorius, reflects exactly the composition and mint-marks of a late Roman silver coin hoard. Such silver hoards have been frequently found in Britain, and the presence of similar coins in the Cotton collection in the early 17th century looks like a group from a similar, or even the same, hoard.

One could believe that the bulk of the Roman imperial denarii may have a similar British origin, but that must remain more hypothetical. Roman Republican denarii are also found in large quantities in Britain, and indeed so are specimens of Domitian's silver coins from Lycia, the only Roman provincial coin in the collection (II-29). Only a very few of the other coins, such as the Greek coins, are likely to have emanated from further afield, but we know that there had been at least some Greek coins in Britain from the middle of the 16th century, e.g. in the collection of Roger Ascham.

A later hand, identified as that of Charles Brent, has noted in the catalogue where several coins are missing, by writing 'deest' (occasionally 'desunt') opposite the relevant description. 39 coins, a little less than 10% of the total, are marked as missing in this way. The missing coins are often rarities (Diadumenian, Aquilia Severa, Aemilian or Flavius Victor), but many are also of common emperors (Tetricus II, Claudius II), and the gold coin remained present, as did many other rarer pieces (Sabina, Pertinax, Julia Soaemias, Jovian, Eugenius). This suggests petty pilfering or carelessness, rather than systematic and informed theft.

As MS 690 was superseded by Brent's MS 691 (aka Arch.Coll.9) in 1718, we can see that the erosion of such pieces continued steadily over the intervening 30 years, at an average of a little over one coin every year. As it is reasonable to suppose that much of the collection had been in Christ Church for some 70 years before Hannes's catalogue, a proportionate amount might also have been lost earlier.

Francis Godwin

The Donors’ Book records only one donation of coins to Christ Church before 1686: in 1619, ‘Reverendissimus Praesul Francisc’ Godwin Episc. Herefordiae huiæ Äedis quondam alumnus DD Antiqua numismata varia tam aurae quam argentea et aerea. It consequently seems a reasonable inference that the coins catalogued by Hannes were those originally given to the college in 1619. The coins would therefore represent the first acquired by any part of Oxford University, antedating Laud’s acquisition for the Bodleian Library (1636) by almost 20 years. The Laud collection was bigger, about twice the size of the Christ Church collection, and its scope was slightly broader, since it included more Greek (61) and Republican (155) coins, and it continued down to the then present day, thus including a number of modern British and European pieces, including some 30 of gold. The Laud collection had only 6 ancient gold coins, more indeed than Christ Church, but still a tiny number compared with the contemporary royal collection (over 800).

Francis Godwin (1562-1633) Bishop of Llandaff (1601-17) and of Hereford (1617-33) also gave Christ Church a copy of the 1601 edition of Occo, the standard reference book for coins at the time, and we also happen to know that he also owned a copy of Agustín’s Discorsi (1592). Godwin himself had an interest in the value of ancient coins in modern terms, as we can see from the two pages of ‘My Lord of Hereford’s Tables of Calculation with the reformation of such mistakes as were found in that copie which it pleased his Lordship to send mee’, which were published in the second edition of George Hakewill’s An apologie or declaration of the power and providence of God in the government of the world (London, 1630 edition). There, Godwin gave approximate equivalences of sestertii in ‘nostra moneta Anglicana’ (though curiously in slightly different amounts from those on Hakewill’s preceding page), from 1 sestertius (2 pence) to 20 thousand million (£15,829,333 6 shillings 8 pence). In turn this was followed by a table of equivalences with the Attic talent ‘quod valebat nostrae monetae Anglicanae

3 Christ Church Library, Donors’ Book, p. 53 (Anno MDCXVIII). It is, of course, possible that a few other coins were given but not recorded in the Donors’ Book, like the four at the end of MS 690.
4 Christ Church Donors’ Book, p. 55. Thanks to W. Poole for pointing this out. D.R. Woolf, in Social Circulation, p. 149, mentions Godwin’s enthusiasm for coins and other antiques.
5 Godwin’s copy of Antonio Agustin, Discorsi (trans. O. Sada) (Rome, 1592) was sold in the Patria Milne-Henderson Sale (Sotheby, 8 July 2016), lot 3.
6 In the 1635 edition (STC 12613) it was moved to the beginning of the work.
libras 190’ (which was worth 190 pounds of our English money).

Godwin had clearly done a lot of research for the tables of monetary equivalences published by Hakewill, presumably feeling that Budé was by then just too much out of date, being over a hundred years out of date. His tables may seem to us slight things, but perhaps did not seem so to contemporaries. Calculating the modern English equivalences of ancient coins was a regular activity of the 16th century, carried out, for example by Cuthbert Tunstall, Thomas Elyot and Thomas Smith. Godwin’s table seems to have had surprisingly long life: a much later commentator could still state 200 years later that he ‘established a claim to critical learning of a more general kind by a Latin dissertation on the value of the Attic talent and the Roman sesterce, annexed to Dr. Hakewill’s “Apology for Divine Providence”, printed in 1630’. I have not found a copy of a more extensive ‘dissertation’ (although 19th-century reference works refer to ‘A computation of the Roman Sesterce and the Attic talent’), and the reference was presumably the work in Hakewill’s book. There is no obvious sign that Godwin had studied the coins himself in detail (e.g. by weighing them), but his interests provide a context for his collection and its donation to Christ Church.

Godwin was interested in British history and its archaeological sources, and passed information about antiquities and inscriptions to William Camden for his Britannia. This is presumably the context in which he formed his collection of coins, and his interest in their equivalent values would have developed as a by-product.

Edward Bernard

The coins certainly did not sit unattended, just gathering dust or being stolen, for the whole period between 1619 and Hannes’s work of 1686. The Christ Church collection was one of the four (or five)

9 ‘I sent to a friend in London to take information from the mint-masters what was the present value of an ounce of silver with us, because the denarius being by general consent the eighth part of an ounce and the Sesterce the fourth part of the denarius, it consequently follows that as the ounce rises or falls in value, so doth the valuation of the Sesterce; Answere was returned mee that the kings price of the mint for silver brought thither is five shillings, but betweene man and man, five shillings and three pence’.


principal sources which Edward Bernard used for his work on ancient metrology. Bernard’s work on weights and measures was a massive compilation of information for the metrological terms used in ancient literature. It appeared in two editions: the first rather lost as an appendix in the form of a letter to Pococke’s Commentary on the Prophecy of Hosea (Oxford, 1685), and then an expanded and corrected second edition, which was published separately as De mensuris et ponderibus antiquis (Oxford, 1688), and dedicated to Pococke.

Both books have the same preface, in both cases dated 18 June 1685, but slightly revised and recast for the Latin version of 1688. In it Bernard set out his aims, acknowledging his deficiencies in not travelling and studying more material:

... The best means then left us for recovering the just Weights and Measures of Antiquity, is from the Staters of Athens and the Greek Islands, from the entire Stadium of Hercules, and the module of Minerva’s Temple in her own City: and amongst the Roman Remains, from sundry Exemplars of the Libra and its members, from the pavement of the Pantheon, the foot of Lucas Paetus in the Capitol, unhappily rejected by my renowned Predecessor [Greaves] in his Golden Treatise of that Foot, and of late well asserted by the noble Fabretti; from numerous patterns of iron gain’d in the Ruins of Italy: and from the rules of the Theatres, Amphitheatres, Temples, & Aqueducts, which have borne the strokes of time, of war and barbarity; as likewise from the Denarii of Consuls and of Emperors: & lastly from the Eggs of the Rabines, and from the Jewish Shekels, imprest with Jerusalem the holy, the very content of the Samaritans, yet in the antique and Samaritan character. But my addiction to the Archaeology of Fl. Josephus, who is yet a very good director in this matter, hath stoped my more curious pursuit of the best proof of ancient Measures, to wit the coynes reserv’d in the Cabinets of Christian Princes [1688 specifies Jewish, Greek, Roman, Carthaginian, Arabic, British and Gothic coins]: deferring that pleasant research to the Ingenious Mr. Patin, Morel, Hardvin, Foysvalent, and eminently to the Illustrious Fr.

13 ‘A Letter of Dr. Edward Bernard Professor of Astronomy in Oxford to Dr. Edward Pocock Regius Professor of the Hebrew Tongue in the same University’.

14 A copy was presented to Dean Aldrich by Bernard in 1688: Christ Church Library AF 7.10. (The 1688 book also included two additional letters, including the remarkable one from Thomas Hyde on Chinese measures, on which see W. Poole, ‘The Letters of Shen Fuzong to Thomas Hyde, 1687-88’, eBLJ 2015, Article 9.)

15 The Ovum Rabinorum is described on pp. 9-10 of the 1688 edition, a measure of capacity.
Spanheim, as the most considerable advantage of that Application: and together with Geography and Chronology absolutely necessary unto History, the largest, the most delightful and most useful of all our Studies. In the mean while, what I have seen, what I have weigh’d in this ancient and famous Seat of Learning, in the various Archives of the most Reverend and immortal Archbishop Laud, in the excellent Cabinet of Mr. Freke, [1688 adds cimelia Ashmolij], in the Roman Collection at Christ-Church and in the choice Study of the wise and learned Mr. Walker Master of University College, have sufficiently confirm’d to me the design and accuracy of the ancient Mints, in preserving the just and public Weights, far more precious then their own metal. But since the discourse on this Subject hath thriv’d under my hands, beyond the desire of an Usurer, and much beyond the stature of an Epistle, and also requires a more public dialect suitable to the argument: Accept for the present, (Venerable and belov’d) the annex Table and easy View of Ancient Weights and Concave Measures; which I now desire to introduce into your Learned and Pious Commentary, both in compliance to your command, and also for the convenience of the place.

Hannes’s catalogue now explains, and allows us to see, the importance for Bernard of ‘the Roman Collection at Christ-Church’, alongside the Laud and Freke collections in the Bodleian library, acquired respectively in 1636 (about 1000 coins) and 1657 (about 500 coins). We do not know the size or extent of Obadiah Walker’s personal collection. The newly-founded Ashmolean was added as an afterthought by Bernard in 1688, even though it had already opened its doors in 1684; though, to be charitable, this was perhaps too late for a book published in 1685. Ashmole had lost some 8,000 of his coins in the Temple fire of 1679, and, although he chose not to donate his surviving collection of 300+ gold coins to his new museum, the young Ashmolean’s collection nevertheless amounted to some 400 pieces, mostly silver and bronze, by 1686, when Robert Plot or (more probably) Edward Lhwyd listed it. We can see that the five Oxford collections were all broadly comparable in size and importance.

Edward Hannes

Hannes was only 24 when he donated the catalogue, and he is not otherwise known to have had any interest in coins. But from the descriptions he gives, together with the comments he adds from time to time, we can glimpse him at work.

Pagan has pointed out that it is likely that he compiled the catalogue when still an undergraduate or at best a very recent graduate. If so, it is reasonable to speculate that his compilation of the catalogue was not so much a labour of love but a task set him by the Christ Church authorities - and perhaps specifically by Bishop/Dean Fell who had a track record both of attempting to stimulate undergraduates to study and of trying to ‘encourage learning amongst those who remained at Oxford after completing their education and taking a degree’.16

Identifications
Hannes’s descriptions of the coins are reasonably accurate and quite full, although the ones for the imperial coins are less detailed than for the fewer Greek and Republican coins. He confused three coins of Caracalla with those of Elagabalus, an error noted later by Charles Brent, and, although the emperors are easy to confuse, all having the same name Antoninus, the high tribunician date on two of them should have alerted him.17 He also made a curious mistake when he muddled two coins of Augustus with those of Julius Caesar (II-3 and 6). True, the coins are inscribed only IMP CAESAR, but Hannes might have noticed the different portrait (as he was interested in portraits – see below), and he would have identified them correctly if he had made a careful perusal of Occo’s book, the standard reference book of the day for imperial coins.18 Godwin’s copy was in the college library, and on some occasions Hannes referred to it, for example when he says what Occo ‘erronee’ had said about a coin of Eugenius (VII-29). He also disagreed with Occo’s view that coins of Carausius (VI-68 to 71) were rare: ‘but not so’, he said correctly, ‘in Britain, his own country’.19

Reference books
Hannes referred to a number of other reference books, though not so frequently for the Roman Imperial coins. For the Greek coins he referred to Spanheim,20 and ‘Goltz. Magn. Graec.’,21 and for the

---

16 Pagan, in lītt. The quotation is from E.G.W. Bill, Education at Christ Church 1660-1800 (Oxford, 1988), p. 33; and for Fell, pp. 26-36. William Poole (in lītt.) has made the same observation, and also pointed out that Hannes was later a collector of manuscripts.

17 Hannes read XX on both; Brent gave XV and XVI.


19 There is also a reference to Occo for III-63 (a coin of Faustina), but it seems to have been added later.

20 Ezekiel Spanheim, Dissertatio de praestantia et usu numismatum antiquorum, either the Rome, 1664, or the Amsterdam, 1671, edition. Christ Church has a copy of the latter, presented by the alumnus James Poo in 1676: Donors’ Book, p. 181b.

21 Hubertus Goltzius, Sicilia et Magna Graecia: sive, historiae urbis popolurumque Graeciae ex antiquis nomismatibus, presumably either the Antwerp, 1618 or the Antwerp, 1644 edition. Christ Church had acquired the ‘Opera Goltzij’ = H. Goltzius, Romanae et Graecae
Republican coins he several times referred to Orsini's standard work, in two cases completing the the inscription on a worn coin from checking it there (I-15, 29). For one coin (I-33) a note was added referring to ‘Har duin de re monet.’, concerning the coin's weight.

Only a few books are mentioned for the Roman imperial coins, presumably because they were thought to be more straightforward. Mention has already been made of Occo, although it seems that Hannes did not use it much. For a coin of Galba (II-19) he referred both to Goltz for the obverse, and the Arschot catalogue to complete the inscription on the reverse. The Arschot volume was also used for a coin of Severus (IV-25), and Spanheim for coins of Philip I and Herennius Etruscus (V-19, V-34). For an interesting coin of Postumus (VI-86), Hannes referred to 'Oisel. T. 17.9.', and for the bronze coin of Otho, always a problematic if much prized coin (II-22), to 'Chifflet de Othen. aereis'. For Otho, he also made an interesting further comment to the newly-founded Ashmolean Museum; 'Habetur Otho aureus in Musaeo Ashmol. N. 450; idem paene quoad Impressa symbola, et Literas', and he also referred to the Ashmolean for two of the coins of Carausius (VI-68 and 70: habentur in Musaeo Ashmol. n. 740. 741). These three coins were all part of the bequest made to the Ashmolean by Thomas Braithwaite of Ambleside in 1684, and they duly appeared with the same numbers in the list of coins made in the Book of the Vice-Chancellor, compiled by Robert Plot and/or Edward Lhwyd in 1685-6:


The young Ashmolean seems to have received a lot of visitors to see its coins in the first two years it was open! So, in this and the other ways, we can see young Hannes at work, nipping over to the end of the Broad Street, and, back in Christ Church Library, sometimes referring to the books he would have had to hand there, even if he did not pay as much attention to them as he should have done.

Historical comments

Hannes makes a few, as when he interprets the names on Republican coins, e.g I-17 P Clodius: 'Non est ille Famosus Clodius, sed junior aliquis'; I-22 L Iulius Caesar: 'Forte is Lucius, cujus Caesar meminit Bell Civ. I 52(?); but often he rightly said we don't know who they were.

Metrology

Hannes had some interest in weights, and provided them for most of the Greek coins (I-1, 2, and 4-5), apparently to help him identify the denominations. He did the same for one of the Republican coins, a quinarius (I-33).

An interest at Oxford in weights is not surprising at this period, since Hannes was making his catalogue just after Edward Bernard had published his work on


I-1: Est autem Tetradrachmum, et pendit ½ unc. de Troy; I-2: Est tridrachmu', et pendit gran. Monetar. 216; for I-3 he did not record the weight, but he must have taken it, since 'est = superiori Attico'; I-4: pendit gran. 120 = 5 p[enny], w[eight]= I-5: Valet gr. 108.

I-33: Hunc numnum [a quinarius of Cato RRC 462/2] Harduinus de Re Monet, proponit pro certissimo Rom. ///// Victoriano (qui valet ½ denarij Romani Consularis). Videtur cusus eo anno, quo haec species pecuniae in usum adducta est per P. Clodiu' sed nunc pendit tantum 1 p.w.

Antiquitatis Monumentae priscis numismatibus eruta (Antwerp, 1644-5, in 5 volumes: Vol. IV was the Sicilia et Magna Graecia) in 1656. For the pentagram on the coin of Velia, he added a reference to 'Pier. Hieroglyph. I. 47' = one of the editions of Piero Valeriano, Hieroglyphica.

16 Fulvius Ursinus (Fulvio Orsini), Familiae Romanae quae repeririunt in antiquis numismatibus. The book went through several editions, but Hannes probably used the original Rome, 1577, edition, a copy of which Christ Church had acquired in 1614: Donors' Book, p. 36). On I-15, Hannes commented: Habet hunc nummum integre literaturam Ursinus.


18 He also used it to complete the inscription on coins of Domician (II-41) and Salonina (V-92).

19 Presumably to a part of the collected works of 1744-5, for which see above.

20 Jacobus de Bie, Joannes Hemelarius, Imperatorum Romanorum a Iulio Caesare ad Heraclioum usque numismatam aurea ... Caroli ducis Croi et Arschotani ... collecta (Antwerp, 1615). A copy had been acquired by Christ Church in 1617: Donors' Book, p. 52). There was also a later edition (Antwerp, 1627), but presumably Hannes used the copy in the library.

21 Jacobus Oisellis, Thesaurus selectorum numismatum antiquorum (Amsterdam, 1677).

22 Henricus Chifflet, Dissertatio de Othonibus aereis (Antwerp, 1656). No copy in Christ Church. A pencil annotation, presumably by Charles Brent, had added 'vide etiam Molinetum Sur les Medailles Padouans', a reference to the chapter on 'Les Medailles Padouans', Claude Du Molinet, Le cabinet de la Bibliothèque de Sainte Genevieve (Paris, 1692), pp. 92-188, where Cavino's dies had been published for the first time. Similarly a pencil note for Nero (II-4) had 'Nero. Vide Molinetum de Nummis Paduanis in Bibliotheca S. Genevesa; Nummus inter rariores habendus si non sit adulterinus', the remark he had copied into his own catalogue later (B AE 1-3).
metrology, discussed above, as part of which he had studied the Christ Church collection. Bernard (pp. 106-7) distinguished four sorts of denarius, listing them in their order of descending weight, rather than chronology – Gordianic, Consularis, Tiberianus, & Vespasianic. This explains why Hannes weighed one coin for each of the four periods, commenting on how well they did or did not fit with what Bernard had said:


Hannes did not take the question any further, even though he was presumably aware that the coins he was cataloguing were one of the important sources used by Bernard.

He added a few more weights, probably out of curiosity, one because it was big and heavy, and another probably because it was the only gold coin:


**Iconography and titles**

Hannes was also interested in iconography and imperial titles. He makes a number of suggestions, both plausible,26 and implausible,27 and once both.28 Some of the comments are incomplete, with an empty space awaiting a detailed reference.29

He seems to have had a particular interest in imperial iconography. Several of the empresses have their portraits compared with other media, using one of the books by Jean Jacques Boissard as a reference.30 He also demonstrates an interest in the development of the emperor's titles and iconography: the coin of Titus is the first in the collection to have a radiate head, although it had apparently been used for Divi (II-3) Commodus was the first to use Pius Felix Augustus (IV-15) Herennius Etruscus seems to have been the first to use Nob. Caes. (V-34) Selden [Titles of Honor, chapter 8] thought Constantine the Great was the first to have the diadem for daily use, as can be seen in coins 77 and 83 of tray VI] (VI-77; cf 83)32 Camden thinks none of the emperors took the title Lord in public inscriptions before Constantine the Great, as in coin 79. Camden's Britannia and from him Selden (VI-79).33

He makes a few other comments, concerning orthography, symbols, foreign alphabets, and suggesting that some coins were not coins, but little weights.34

**Charles Brent's catalogue, 1718**

Charles Brent (1683-1722), a Student of Christ Church from 1701 to his death, had been appointed the college's Librarian in 1713 and the Librarian's duties probably included responsibility for the Christ Church coin collection. It is probably safe to conclude that he was keener on coins than most of his predecessor or successor librarians.

Rundle has shown that the coins catalogued in Charles Brent's catalogue of 1718 were not his gift to

---

26 I-6 Gela: cites Pindar for Hiero's victory.
27 I-4: he interpreted A on Metapontum as standing for Athens (socia sua civitate); I-5 Velia: suggested Λ might be interpreted as remains of Α, standing for Athens. 28 VII-7 Magnentius [chi-rho] i.e. XP initiales literae nominis Xproσου [added later: allusione habita ad Χ*, Denarij nota retro(?)]. 29 IV-26: Dea Astartes Leoni insidens, ut describatur ab Apuleio, lib [blank] et a Pausan.
the college, as has been inferred from the inscription on the flyleaf: ‘Liber Ædis Christi Ex dono Car. Brent. A.M. A.D. 1718’, but the coins are mostly those already catalogued 30 years before by Hannes. Brent’s ‘gift’ was, like Hannes’s, his catalogue. Brent had given a few coins in 1717, but only three coronation medals, of Charles II, James II and George I.36

Brent’s catalogue is dated 1718, and it replaced the Hannes catalogue of 1686. Brent had previously worked on the Hannes catalogue, marking coins that were missing and adding a few coins and some comments. The new catalogue was, of course, more up to date than its predecessor, and it was rather more accurate, but less interesting than its earlier counterpart.

MS 691 (Art.Coll.9), 1r.
The catalogue has been digitised and is available online. See Christ Church Digital Library-Western Manuscripts; digital.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/inquire/p/50b4b99b-1fb7-4ce9-be13-d29f5530c0c8

Brent had clearly reorganised the collection, which must be why he produced the new catalogue.37 Hannes’s catalogue had followed an organisation of the coins by emperor, and, within each emperor’s reign he had had marked the coins as either being silver (AR) or bronze (AE).38 Brent, following these indications made by Hannes, had decided to divide the collection by metal, and the numbering of the trays shows that they were now housed in two cabinets (one each for silver and bronze):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abacus</th>
<th>Hannes</th>
<th>Abacus</th>
<th>Brent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6 Greek</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6 Greek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>42 Caesar-Domitian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>44 Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>63 Domitian-Faustina I</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>48 Silver, Trajan-Plus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>80 Faustina I Maximinus</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>48 Silver, Rius-Geta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>99 Maximinus Sabrinus</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>48 Silver, Siva-Philip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>99 Sabrinus-Constantius II</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>48 Silver, Geta-Philip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>33 Constantius II-Honorius</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>63 Silver, Philip-Salonna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>23 Incerti</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>59 Val.Honorius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>‘miscellaneous’</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>48 Bronze, Claudius I-II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 478+ [505] 489

As with the Hannes catalogue, the Brent catalogue summarises the collection at the beginning of the volume. The numbers do not quite fit with the details of his catalogue, but are very close:

Noy26s 26. 1718. Reperiuntur in Scriinis Nummarijis Bibliothecae Aedis Christi Nummi Antiqui in universum. 488. sc. 3 Aurei, quorum duo Laminiti42 5 Argentii Graeci 41 - Argentii Rom’ Consularis 2 Arg. Incerti 2 Argentii Rom’ Imp. 1 Aereus Græcus 126 Aerei Romani 488

The similarity of the totals between the 1686 and 1718 catalogues, however, disguises considerable changes to the collection. As noted above, Brent had marked 39 coins as missing in the Hannes catalogue, and three more were also unaccounted for in 1718.43 But a considerable number of new coins had also been acquired, although one cannot be too exact about the figure, given some of the uncertainties which arise in comparing the two catalogues: some coins which are probably the same are described somewhat differently, and many – perhaps all? – of Hannes ‘Nummi Incerti’ have been

36 Numismata tria Argentae ob Inaugurationes Caroli II Jacobi II & Georgii Mag. Britanniae & Regum solenniter percussa. A scrap of paper, bound into Brent's catalogue between ff. 60 and 61, has a summary list of coins and medals from Edward II to Charles II. It is tempting to think it might be a list of Brent's own coins, since it includes items similar in character to the three he presented, e.g. the medals of Charles II. But it does not look like his hand.
37 There are also a few later additions to Brent's catalogue: ff.61, 80: an additional 9 coins.
38 The distinction, though common, that works well enough for the earlier Roman coinage and that of the late 4th century, but which is difficult to apply systematically to the coinage of the later 3rd and early 4th century, when most of it was made from very severely debased silver. This sometimes makes comparisons difficult.
39 2 later additions, see above (f.61).
40 And one gold, Theodosius.
41 7 later additions, see above (f.80).
42 As in the Hannes catalogue, these are the gold solidus of Theodosius (Hannes VII-26 = Brent 8-48), and the plated coins of Caesar and Hadrian (Caesar: Hannes II-1, Brent 3-1; Hadrian III-37, Brent 4-32). Brent added fuller comments on the two plated coins, rather strangely suggesting that the cores of the coins were made of iron (one would expect bronze): (Caesar) Est hic Nummus ex ferro laminæ Aurea incrustato, cujusmodi omnis Antiqi & Rari; Aversa partis Lamina resciditur; (Hadrian) Nummus his est ex Ferro Lamina Aurea obducto, Aversa partis lamina resciditur.
43 Hannes V-98, V-96, VI-4
assigned new places, and others cannot always be tracked. With such caveats, however, it seems that 9 Republican and about 42 Roman Imperial coins had been added. There is no very pronounced pattern to the new imperial arrivals, though most of them were denarii of the second or early third century. They are probably the ‘Novem numismata antiqua quorum tria sunt argentea, caetera aerea’, given by John King of London in 1691 and the ‘Quadraginta circiter melioris notae numismata’ presented by the young Browne Willis in 1703. Despite the description of the latter as being ‘of a better sort’, Willis was much later reported as stating that ‘the Coins he gave to Christ Church were only Duplicates’, from which Thomas Hearne concluded, ‘so that I apprehend they are very inconsiderable’.

Brent had clearly used Hannes’s work in compiling his own catalogue. For example, in his descriptions of the Greek coins, he took over the following comments, more or less verbatim:

I-1 ΣΙ quae sunt literae initiales loci, vel Personae signantis
I-4 A forte pro Athenis socia sua Civitat:

For the Republican and early imperial coins, Brent did not always follow Hannes so closely, either in his descriptions or his comments, many of which are his own, such as when he made a fuller description and adds a reference to Plutarch for HI-14 = B2-5; or to Orsini for HI-23 = B2-16. He might add details not mentioned by Hannes, such as the control mark XXVIII on HI-27 = B2-23, and sometimes he embarked on relatively lengthy mini-essays, such as on Roman voting laws (HII-7 = B2-38), or, for the newly acquired coin of Augustus, or Gaius and Lucius Caesar (B3-7). But, as his work progressed, he added less material, and by the 3rd century coins there were almost no comments, although, unlike Hannes, he sometimes offered explanations for the 4th century mint marks.

In general, Brent added references to books as sparingly as Hannes had done. For the Republican coins, he too used Orsini, and for the imperial we find references to the Arschot catalogue, and especially to Oiselius, which Brent clearly found his most helpful reference. He was also able to use the new book by Vaillant.

Brent also seems to have been more alert to forgery than Hannes. For the sestertius of Nero depicting the port of Ostia, Hannes had made no comment, but Brent remarked, probably correctly, ‘Nummus inter Rariores habendus, si non sit adulterinus, v. Molinet de Paduanis’, repeating the pencil comment he had

---

44 VIII-2 = Brent Republican 12; VIII-1, 3, 7-9 = Brent Republican addenda 43, 44, 36, 37; VIII-17-18, 20-23 = Brent Imperial AE (Constantine) Abacus 3, 46-48, 43-45. For the last group, Brent explained ‘Tribuuntur his sex Nummi vulgariter ad Constantino Mag, ideoque ab Incertis his revocavimus’.

45 Donors’ Book, pp. 204, 226. The potential problem with this association, however, is that we do not otherwise know that Willis collected ancient coins, although Stukeley referred to a Roman coin from Berkhamstead as being in his possession: William Stukeley, Itinerarium Curiosum, (London, 1724), p. 109.

46 Hearne, Remarks X, p. 362, 12 December 1730: ‘Mr Willis hath told Dr West that the Coins he gave to Christ Church were only Duplicates, so that I apprehend they are very inconsiderable”; cf. Hearne, Remarks X, p. 351, 11 November 1730: ‘I was told lately that Browne Willis, Esq., gave a Collection of Coins to Xt Church Libray. What they are I know not’.

47 For the gold coin of Theodosius, he copied Hannes’s (rare) explanation that COM stood for Constantinopoli obsignata Moneta (HVII-26 = B8-48), though he also added ‘Nummus aureus, sed non eleganter exculptus’.

48 Jean Foy-Vaillant, Numismata imperatorum Romanorum (Paris, 1674 and later: one of the various printings of the 1690s seems the most likely edition). Brent cited it for silver of Galba and Domitian.
added in the Hannes catalogue.⁴⁹ For the false Otho, apparently not doubted by Hannes,⁵⁰ Brent had added, although rather tentatively, ‘qui videtur etiam esse adulterinus’.⁵¹

Both had some interest in the Roman-British emperors Carausius and Allectus. Hannes had commented on how the coins of Carausius were more common in Britain than abroad, while Brent explained Carausius’s coins with Pax, as ‘Referuntur his tres Nummi ad Pacem cum Diocletiano et Maximiano factam, qua etiam Britanniam adeptus est Carausius cum Augusti Titulo’,⁵² and interpreted another type as a naval victory won by Carausius over Maximian.⁵³

Other 18th-century coin acquisitions
Montagu Venables-Bertie, 2nd Earl of Abingdon (1673-1743) intended to give his collection to his old college, as noted by Hearne in 1718, but the gift never materialised.⁵⁴ It would have been quite a coup, as already in 1706 his collection was one of the few most important collections in Britain mentioned by Ezechiel Spanheim.⁵⁵ Abingdon’s friend William Stratford (1672-1729), Canon of Christ Church, gave his books to the college, but not, it seems, his rich collection of coins. A very important important acquisition, however, was the bequest of Archbishop William Wake (1657-1737). Wake was Archbishop of Canterbury from 1716 until his death, and his collection included both classical and English coins. Catalogues of his collection survive in the Ashmolean Museum, and were studied by Sutherland, who regarded the collection as ‘not of particularly choice quality’. In his later years Wake focussed particularly on English coins, telling William Stukeley that he ‘had been endeavouring to gather a perfect collection of our English Money, of all metals, from the Conqueror to the present times. I am almost perfect from King Henry VII (inclusive): but want several of the more antient reigns.’⁵⁶ He wanted ‘to finish a collection intended for the use of the publick when I myself must have done with it’. More specifically, ‘I intend both my books & coins for one of the public libraries in Oxford where I hope they may be of more use to others than they have been to my selfe, I am willing to make my Collection of both as perfect as I can.’⁵⁷

Andrew Burnett
British Museum

Dr Burnett is currently writing a book about numismatics in early modern Britain.

Note: The first collection of coins to be acquired by any part of the University were given to Christ Church in 1619, so 2019 marks the 400th anniversary of the beginning of the path which ultimately led to the Ashmolean Museum being the home to one of the world’s greatest collections of coins and medals.

Lord Portal Papers at Christ Church: LOOKING FOR SHOLTO

Christ Church is most fortunate in housing the archive of Charles Frederick Algernon Portal, later Marshal of the Royal Air Force Viscount Portal of Hungerford (1893 - 1971), known as ‘Peter’ to his family and friends, who was Chief of the Air Staff (CAS) from October 1940 to December 1945. The College is Peter Portal’s alma mater, and he was here from October 1912 until June 1914, following school at Winchester College. The advent of the First World War prevented the completion of his studies at Oxford.

I came to this archive searching for material on my late father, Sholto Douglas, similarly to become one of only seven Marshals of the Royal Air Force at the end of World War Two (WWII), and 1st Baron Douglas of Kirtleside, whose biography I am writing. He was born in the same year as Portal, and their careers were intertwined right up until the end of the Second World War. Sholto arrived at Lincoln College Oxford a year later than Portal came to Christ Church, having won an exhibition to Lincoln, which he later converted to a scholarship. The two men served with distinction in the Royal Flying Corps

⁴⁹ Hannes II-14; Brent AE 1-3.
⁵⁰ Though he had referred to Chifflet’s work: see above.
⁵¹ Hannes II-22; Brent AE 1-4.
⁵² Hannes VI-68; Brent AE 2-25 to 27.
⁵³ Brent AE 2-38.
⁵⁴ J. G. Milne, ‘Oxford Coin-collectors of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries’, Oxoniensia 14 (1949), pp. 53–63, at 59. Hearne, Remarks VI, p. 137, 9 February 1719/20: Being today at dinner with Dr Stratford of X..." to his Lodgings, where he shew’d me a great number of Medals, divers of wth I had never seen before, one of wth was a Silver one of Q. Eliz, ao 1561, with the Harp on the Reverse. There was also a silver one of the Queen of Scots, but her face not on it. But the scarcest & most valuable of all those he shew’d me was a large Brass Otho of my Lord Abingdon’s, lodged with the Dr by the Earl himself, as an Earnest that he, the 4th Earl, designs to give all his old Medals to Christ-Church Library.
⁵⁵ E. Spanheim, Dissertations de praestantia et usu numismatum antiquorum (London, 1706), p. 44: Huius quoque penus veterum nummariæ illustris in Anglia cultoribus, adnumerandi insuper ex eius Proceribus, Comites Winchelsey & Abingdonius (And, as regards the collections of such ancient coins made by distinguished practitioners in England, there should be added, from her Nobility, the Earls of Winchelsea and Abingdon).
⁵⁶ William Wake to William Stukeley, 2 February 1726/7.
⁵⁷ William Wake to William Stukeley, 10 June 1729. Surtees I, pp. 217-19. In both this letter and the previous one, he had asked Stukeley to help him fill the gaps.
during the First World War, for which they were highly decorated. They were together on the first course at the RAF Staff College at Andover in 1922, which also included other future senior RAF officers, among them Keith Park and Richard Peirse\(^1\), but “by far the outstanding student of our group was Squadron Leader C.F.A. Portal, who was known even then to all of us as Peter Portal”\(^2\), and as Winston Churchill wrote later, he was “the accepted star of the Royal Air Force”\(^3\). Sholto became one of Portal’s Commanders-in-Chief (C’s-in-C) shortly after he was appointed CAS, and they served together in these capacities through the rest of WWII. Due to this particular interest, I have not examined all the papers in this archive, but a good many of them. I learned much about my father, as I did about many other senior RAF officers who were his colleagues. As is so often the case, despite being engaged in a major conflict, these men were also involved in a great deal of intrigue and a complex web of relationships in the higher echelons of the RAF, and in the government, which at times threatened to interfere with the conduct of the war. However, within these records, I discovered also Peter Portal the man, the seemingly aloof, self-effacing leader who was a most loyal and faithful friend to those who gained his confidence, and who dealt with the conflicts around him with coolness and consummate skill.

With characteristic foresight, at the end of his time as CAS, Portal secured Cabinet Office permission to copy “such of his official correspondence as he wished, and he instructed one of his staff to select and copy the more important letters and memoranda exchanged during the war both between himself and Churchill, and between himself and the principal RAF commanders”\(^4\). These papers are all housed in this archive. Subsequently, near the end of his life, Portal added to these documents the boxes of personal letters written to him during WWII by senior RAF officers such as Sir Wilfrid Freeman, Sir Arthur Tedder, Sir John Slessor, and others including, of course, Sir Sholto Douglas as he was at that time, although my father seemed only to send Portal personal letters at moments of intense importance to him, so these are few in number, but none the less very revealing about both men, and so of great value to me in my search. Personal letters from Lord Mountbatten were also included in these boxes.

Portal’s large archive is structured in the following way:

RAF ARCHIVE

This archive is comprised of thirteen folders, the first six of which contain the extensive and at times fractious correspondence between Winston Churchill and Portal when he was CAS during WWII, in the form of Prime Minister’s Minutes and their replies from Portal, which largely determined the conduct of the air war. The two men sometimes disagreed strongly over strategy, Portal having to convince Churchill of the necessity of concentrating on the war in Western Europe and the Mediterranean, and over senior RAF appointments, including those involving my father. Nevertheless, Churchill was deeply impressed by Portal, at the very least from the time when he was C-in-C Bomber Command from April to October 1940, prior to his accession to the post of CAS, when his desire for independent offensive action by the RAF against strategic targets in Germany during the summer of 1940, and his “stimulation of research into better navigation aids” in order to accomplish this objective, appealed to Churchill\(^5\).

Also within this archive is contained Portal’s official correspondence with sixteen of the C’s-in-C and Air Officers Commanding (AOC’s) in the RAF throughout WWII. As my father held four commands (Fighter, Middle-East, Coastal, and British Air Forces of Occupation) during and after this period, it was a wonderful opportunity for me to view the extensive formal exchanges between the two men, always

---

\(^1\) TNA, AIR 2/252. List of officers shortly passing out of Staff College, 18.1.1923. Also in Portal Papers, Denis Richards Archive, III - Between the Wars, Folder C.


\(^5\) Denis Richards, Portal of Hungerford, Heinemann, 1977, p.x

courteous and respectful on my father’s side, and sometimes corrective on Portal’s. All of Portal’s numerous letters to his leaders seem to have been wise, considered, and show his enormous capacity to hold the reins of the disparate parts of the RAF, skillfully resolving any conflicts of interest that arose between them.

PAPERS USED BY DENIS RICHARDS FOR HIS BIOGRAPHY OF LORD PORTAL

This is an extensive and well-chosen collection of papers in sixteen boxes that are numbered chronologically, roughly according to the epochs of Portal’s life, although by far the largest number of boxes is devoted to World War Two, unsurprisingly. Richards has included the most pertinent records of Portal’s service career from the National Archives; not an easy task since, if Portal’s footprint there is anything like my father’s, he would appear in hundreds of documents. One of the most interesting and controversial files concerns the appointment of a new CAS in 1940, and contains an anonymous memorandum entitled “A Weak Link in the Nation’s Defences”7, which was circulated to influential people in the government, parliament, and in the RAF during the summer of that year8. The CAS at that time, and the main subject of the memorandum was Air Chief Marshal Sir Cyril Newall who was almost at retirement age, but who was also the victim of an orchestrated campaign that undoubtedly hastened his dismissal in October 1940, and crucially led to the appointment of Portal as his replacement. One of those to whom a copy of ‘A Weak Link’ was sent was a junior Member of Parliament, Irene Ward. In turn she sent the memorandum to Winston Churchill in August 1940 with a covering letter, in which she said that she had been “kept informed about the views of many people in the Air Force”, and that their “overwhelming desire” was that Portal should be appointed to succeed Newall as CAS, and that on no account should the post be offered to the current C-in-C of Fighter Command, Sir Hugh Dowding. She even went as far as to say that “the RAF would consider it a disaster” if the latter took place9. Churchill had recommended that Dowding succeed Newall as CAS a month prior to Miss Ward’s letter10, but pressure from many quarters within and outside the RAF, including those behind the memorandum, meant that this did not happen.

At the time that Richards wrote his biography of Portal, he could only speculate on the identity of the person who composed this memorandum, but the release of further documents has shown that the instigator was Wing Commander Edgar Kingston-McCloughry. He worked in the Air Ministry’s Directorate of War Organisation, and was “an up-and-coming military writer and theorist”11. He was also being cultivated by Lord Beaverbrook at the Ministry for Aircraft Production (MAP) as a source of information within the Air Ministry, and he seems to have colluded with McCloughry in the production of the memorandum.

One of the criticisms of Newall in this paper was that he was “not a master of strategy or tactics”12, which coincided precisely with the opinion of him held at the time by the “Father of the Royal Air Force”, Lord Trenchard. Although Newall was a champion of the strategic bombing13 favoured by Trenchard, and opposed the use of bombers in direct support of ground forces, at the beginning of WWII he realised that “Bomber Command was too weak to launch a strategic offensive against Germany”, and he succumbed to political pressure, allowing the command to be used in other ways that lost him Trenchard’s backing14. Trenchard was a determined advocate of independent air operations, and Portal not only shared his views, evident from his time as C-in-C Bomber Command, but unlike Newall, was also in a stronger position to implement them when he became CAS. Indeed, Portal was Trenchard’s “favourite disciple”15, and a powerful ally in support of this approach, which also meant that he successfully resisted attempts by the Army, in the person of Field Marshal Lord Alanbrooke in 194216, to establish their own Army Air Arm, and the Navy to appropriate Coastal Command to themselves. Indeed, Portal played a large part in the continuance of the RAF as an autonomous entity.

---

7 TNA, PREM 4/3/6, Appointment of Chief of Air Staff, 1.8.40 - 30.11.40. Anonymous memorandum “A Weak Link in the Nation’s Defences”. Also in list of papers used by Denis Richards housed at Christ Church.
9 TNA, PREM 4/3/6, Appointment of Chief of Air Staff, 1.8.40 - 30.11.40. Letter from Irene Ward to Winston Churchill, 17.8.40. Also in list of papers used by Denis Richards housed at Christ Church.
11 Ibid.
12 TNA, PREM 4/3/6, Appointment of Chief of Air Staff, 1.8.40 - 30.11.40. Anonymous memorandum “A Weak Link in the Nation’s Defences”. Also in list of papers used by Denis Richards housed at Christ Church.
13 Strategic bombing is a military strategy used in total war that advocates the defeat of the enemy by striking at and destroying their infrastructure and their centres of industrial production, thus weakening their morale and their ability to wage war.
The Richards Archive demonstrates also the extent of Portal's post-war interests and work, including his endeavours in the field of atomic energy, part of which was the development of a British atomic bomb. Portal was “one of the few leading figures in the country conversant with the broader aspects of wartime atomic energy”, and despite not wishing to take the post, “in March 1946, he became controller of production in the highly secret atomic energy directorate of the Ministry of Supply”. During a period of six years, he oversaw substantial research and organisational achievements in this field.17

In 1951, Portal was appointed as a director of British Aluminium Co. Ltd (BA), and in 1953, he became its chairman. In 1958, he resisted a hostile takeover bid of that company by the American-backed Tube Investments Ltd, but unusually for him, he did not win the battle. Following the appointment of his adversary to the chairmanship of BA, in 1959 Portal became director and then chairman of the British Match Corporation until his appointment as chairman of the British Aircraft Corporation (BAC), a post that he held from its inception in 1960 until 196918.

This assignment was a very difficult one and involved managing the association between, and increasing integration of, three very separate airframe manufacturers. Nevertheless, under Portal's direction, this was achieved, as well as the reporting of satisfactory profits, not easy in the aircraft industry of that time19. Portal held additional directorships in Barclays Bank, Commercial Union Insurance, Ford Motor Company Ltd, and later on, the Whitbread Investment Trust, and the family printing firm, Portal's, (which manufactured bank notes), to name a few.

He was also involved in wide ranging charitable work, with the RAF Benevolent Fund, the RAF Escaping Society, the King Edward VII Hospital Midhurst, the Nuffield Trust for Training Midhurst, the Nuffield Trust for the Forces of the Crown, and the Dominion Students Hall Trust (providing accommodation in London for overseas students), among others20.

LORD PORTAL ARCHIVE 2

This archive comprises five boxes of papers, marked A to E, donated by Portal's family to Christ Church. Contained within the boxes are folders of documents relating to public occasions and speeches, printed pamphlets on various aspects of military organisation and technical developments, Portal's 'War Notes', some written by German, British, and American commanders, and also a folder on 'Strategic Bombing'. Interestingly, there are further boxes of correspondence with Winston Churchill, as well as with the Secretary of State for Air during WWII, Archibald Sinclair, of whom Portal was a strong ally. This proved to be of value to Sinclair in the controversy over the manner of Sir Hugh Dowding's dismissal from Fighter Command, for which Sinclair was blamed, it appears unjustifiably. He and Portal built up a "relationship of trust and friendship", despite early differences in their preferences for different bombing strategies. Portal persuaded Sinclair to “abandon his initial preference for precision bombing in favour of area bombing”21, the strategy favoured by both Portal and Trenchard.

Portal's official correspondence with Tedder, 'Bomber' Harris, Slessor, Lord Beaverbrook, Lord Mountbatten, and other RAF, Army, and Navy Leaders, as well as letters concerning senior RAF appointments, are included in this archive. The correspondence is minutely detailed and reveals Portal's skill as a negotiator, but even more interesting are the personal letters sent to him by Slessor and Tedder. Encouraged by Portal, Tedder wrote regular and frank unofficial reports to him when he was C-in-C Middle East Command from 1941 to 1943, then C-in-C firstly of Mediterranean Air Command and subsequently of Mediterranean Allied Air Forces, from 1943 to 194422. Many of these letters are handwritten, and signed with the moniker 'Tirpitz'. This nickname was given to him possibly by Wilfrid Freeman, perhaps mindful of his naval interests. He made a study of the Restoration Navy of the seventeenth century while at Cambridge in 1913, and he attended the Royal Naval Staff College at Greenwich in 192223.

However, the most fascinating, and indeed controversial letters are those personal letters written by Freeman to Portal, which reveal a darker side of Freeman's character that is under-explored in the literature that I have read about him. Prior to Portal's appointment as CAS, Freeman was senior to him in rank (Air Chief Marshal), length of service, and experience, and the two had developed great admiration for each other when "Freeman was an instructor on the first RAF Staff College course in 1922 and Portal his ablest student"24. Within a week of becoming CAS, which included temporary


18 Ibid.

19 Ibid.

20 Ibid.


23 Ibid.

promotion to the rank of Air Chief Marshal (made permanent in 1942), Portal realised that he could not do the job without Freeman as his vice-CAS, to which post he was duly appointed. Freeman was to serve in that position until October 1942, and he was Portal’s most trusted confidant and adviser, continuing to be so even after he had ceased to be VCAS and had left the RAF altogether, returning to MAP, from which he had come. Slessor, who served Portal and Freeman as assistant-CAS (policy), quoted Portal as saying that Freeman “showed real genius in distinguishing what was right from what was merely clever; for finding the truth and exposing the superficial and specious”\textsuperscript{25}. Nevertheless, as these letters show, Freeman could be “cynical, critical, and intolerant”, despite being described also as “a cultured, civilised man with a warm and human understanding…” by some of his RAF colleagues\textsuperscript{26}. This latter opinion was shared by my father, who regarded Freeman as one of his closest friends. However, it is here in Freeman’s letters that I found the most serious criticisms of my father’s character, although not of his work, which have been revealed hitherto in my searches (“Douglas is at heart a cad, but a clever one”, and many much more disparaging comments). It is evident from the first volume of my father’s autobiography, Years of Combat, published in 1963, that he seems not to have known about the personal attacks made on him by Freeman in these letters\textsuperscript{27}, although he was aware that there was some opposition to him\textsuperscript{28}.

Freeman’s vilification was not reserved only for my father. In one letter, he referred to Sinclair as being “too weak”, and then said “if so, then let’s get rid of Sinclair”, not something that a senior RAF officer should be contemplating for an elected representative of the people, but surely not the first or last time this has happened! At first I wondered whether Portal did solicit Freeman’s opinion, primarily because there does not seem to be any record of Portal’s private letters to him, complicated by the fact that Freeman’s personal files are missing. However, Denis Richards wrote that Freeman and Portal dined together regularly on Monday evenings, on which occasions Portal asked for Freeman’s views on the filling of higher appointments within the RAF, and on the politicians with whom he had to deal\textsuperscript{29}. Despite Freeman’s caustic and unflattering comments concerning his former colleagues, Portal seems to have managed to guard his independence of opinion somewhat, and he maintained good relationships with both my father and Sinclair throughout WWII and afterwards, though the course of my father’s career was undoubtedly affected by Freeman’s judgements and their effect on Portal.

\textbf{LORD PORTAL ARCHIVE 3}

This contains more boxed material donated by the Portal family to Christ Church, and is the archive least examined by me. It contains correspondence on Public Affairs during WWII and afterwards, which concerned political matters discussed with both Trenchard and Sinclair. Atomic energy development, mostly post-war, features in this correspondence.

Also in this archive, there is post-war correspondence on books and films written and made by others, in which Portal either appeared, or for which his opinion was sought, as well as letters involving charity appeals and voluntary bodies. Portal had a wide range of interests, which included concerns as disparate as his old school Winchester College and the Royal College of Physicians, and then there was his lifelong interest in hawking, at which he became adept even as a teenager, writing paid articles on the subject in The Field by the age of sixteen\textsuperscript{30}. Other contents of the archive include letters concerning ceremonial occasions in which he took part, the texts of all his speeches, private correspondence with family and friends, about his hobbies, and on his financial affairs. Finally, there are documents pertaining to his foreign and British Orders and Medals, and his personal bound notebooks dating from his time as a schoolboy at Winchester up until WWII, including his Flying Log Books.

—\textit{o0o}—

So, what of Portal the man? The very extent and frequency of his personal communications notwithstanding, he was said not to be congenial, almost always taking his lunch and supper alone during the fourteen or fifteen hour days that he worked when he was CAS\textsuperscript{31}. Freeman’s biographer, his nephew Anthony Furse, paints a picture of Portal that borders on the unattractive, describing him as “unsociable, aloof by nature, intellectually arrogant and intolerant…He went through life like a lone wolf”, writing further that he “had a patrician reluctance to explain things that were obvious to him, and was sometimes ruthless and quite unreasonable to those who failed to interpret his unspoken wishes”.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{27} Sholto Douglas, \textit{Years of Combat}, Collins, 1963, p.68.
\item \textsuperscript{28} Portal papers, Denis Richards Archive, VII - WWII, Folder Vlla. Handwritten letter from Douglas to Portal, marked ‘Sholto Douglas - tribute’, 11.5.45.
\item \textsuperscript{29} Denis Richards, \textit{Portal of Hungerford}. Heinemann, 1977, p.220.
\item \textsuperscript{31} Denis Richards, \textit{Portal of Hungerford}, Heinemann, 1977, p.175.
\end{itemize}
Furse writes that nevertheless, Freeman was determined to make “a close friend of that exceptionally austere man”32, and it seems that he succeeded, their relationship of trust being invaluable to the conduct of the war during the two years that they worked closely together. However, it is also possible that this unflattering portrait of Portal was drawn in order to accentuate the esteem in which Furse held his uncle.

In fact, Portal was characterised by his modesty, Trenchard writing to him in October 1943; “Though you never are, you ought to be a proud man. It is wonderful what you and the people under you have done”33. Portal wrote after WWII that he was “completely surprised” at his appointment as CAS, and that his first thoughts were “serious doubts” whether he could “tackle the job”34. There is a rather amusing, but somewhat implausible anecdote of Freeman persuading Portal to accept the position during a two-hour drive around Hyde Park in October 1940, when Freeman’s trusted chauffeur, Davies, drove the car, and bore witness to this conversation35. Certainly, Portal’s dependence on Freeman is evident in a letter to Churchill in 1942, saying; “I feel more than ever in need of your continued help and support now that I have lost the services of Freeman as VCAS”36, and for Freeman’s successor, in opposition to Churchill’s wishes, Portal felt that he must have Tedder, with whom he had a similarly close relationship. This request was made despite Tedder’s expertise and competent command in the Middle East, which was the reason for Churchill’s reluctance to move him from that theatre. In the end, Portal did not have his way, and Tedder remained in the Mediterranean for another year, after which he commanded the airborne part of the invasion of Europe in 1944. However, these incidents illustrate that, as aloof as Portal may have seemed, he was in real need of the support of his most trusted confidants.

Nevertheless, Freeman still found Portal “damnably difficult”37 at times, and I came away from my immersion in this archive and in my father’s writings wondering whether in fact my father managed to reach a certain place in Portal’s heart that Freeman didn’t. Was it their mutual experience of Oxford before the First World War, which Freeman did not share, having gone directly to Sandhurst from school? Intellectually, it seems that my father and Portal were quite alike, and my father displayed at times a similar intolerance of those who were slow to understand him, even though he was a much more sociable character.

Despite occasional differences of opinion, in the second volume of his autobiography, “Years of Command”, my father refers to Portal’s quiet and wise counsel and his unfailing support, even when my father became embroiled in controversies over fighter tactics, and over the invasion of the Greek island of Cos, championed by Churchill but eventually a failure, partly due to the unwillingness of the Americans to support that strategy38. My father quotes General H Arnold, the Chief of Staff of the United States Army Air Corps, known as ‘Hap’ Arnold, in his assessment of Portal; “…he was one of the most brilliant of the British Chiefs of Staff. He had a remarkably agile and logical mind. He was far-sighted in his military planning, and on the many problems we had in common we worked extremely well together”39.

The highlight of Portal’s life was undoubtedly his time as CAS during WWII. He contributed fundamentally to the higher strategy and direction of the war, and was steadfast in his adherence to the basic plan that he had agreed with the other British Chiefs of Staff, which ultimately brought victory, despite an impressive array of dissenters at times, including Churchill and the American Chiefs of Staff. He emphasised the primacy of the war in Europe and North Africa over that in the Far East, and “the waging of a bombing offensive against Germany to the point where her capacity to resist invasion by the allied armies would be fatally weakened”40. Alanbrooke joined Portal in “convincing the Americans that the return to France would have to wait until 1944”41, which ensured the success, however hard-won, of the invasion of Europe that began with D-Day.

Towards the very end of the war, in April 1945 when he was C-in-C Coastal Command, my father invited Portal to a special evening that he had planned for him at Coastal Command headquarters, which included a tour of the tracking and operations rooms, the viewing of a short combat film showing the activities of Coastal Command’s strike squadrons, followed by a party in the mess to meet members of

39 Ibid., p.135.
41 Ibid.
staff, and finally dinner at my father’s house. Portal accepted this invitation with enthusiasm, and said that the programme was exactly what he “would like best”, and fortunately, in my own personal archive left by my father, I have a pictorial record of a happy occasion when both men knew that the war was finally coming to an end.

A joyous evening at Coastal Command Headquarters, 1945. From left to right, Harold Kerby, Sholto Douglas, Peter Portal, & Aubrey Ellwood.

A few days after that event, on the day after VE Day, my father received a personal letter from Portal that, because of their long association, he always valued very highly. In this handwritten note, my father said that Portal “showed a touching understanding of my position”. I have included this exchange between Portal and my father in this article because it is a moving indication of the character of each man, and the depth of their friendship. This is what Portal said in his letter to my father:

“This is just a personal note, written in haste and quite inadequate, to try to express to you a little of the deep gratitude which I feel towards you for your tremendous personal contribution to the achievement of the Service in the war. From my point of view no one in the whole of the RAF has given in fuller measure, personally or officially, the support and loyal co-operation without which I could not have carried on. I am very conscious of the fact that your great talents might have been used more fully, but it is rarely possible to arrange all things for the best. As it is, you have done magnificently every job entrusted to you, and I do most sincerely thank you.”

My father’s handwritten reply is equally affecting:

“My dear CAS

Thank you very much indeed for your charming letter, which I appreciate more than I can say. I know that in some ways things have not worked out particularly fortunately for me, nor in fact as you yourself intended. All the same I count myself as extremely fortunate to have been selected in time of war for three such fine commands as Fighter, Middle East, and Coastal - and now for N W Europe. (I can’t say that I am looking forward with much relish to this last job; but I much appreciate the honour of having been picked for it). May I say in all sincerity how much I have appreciated working under you as CAS? What I have always felt - and I think all RAF Commanders have felt the same - is that any problem, trouble, or grievance that was put to you would receive calm, cool, and unbiased consideration: and that the answer I got would almost certainly turn out to be right, even if at the time I may not altogether have agreed with it. It is an immense help in one’s job to have such confidence in the judgement of one’s chief, and indeed it is the inspiration of loyalty. I need hardly say how grateful I feel to you personally for all that you have done for me - at times, I imagine, in the face of opposition. With all good wishes to you now, Sholto Douglas”

First page of letter from Sholto Douglas to Peter Portal (11.5.45). Annotations in turquoise ink by Denis Richards.

Katharine Campbell

Dr Katharine Campbell is currently working on the first biography of her father Sholto (Marshal of the Royal Air Force Lord Douglas of Kirtleside).

---

42 Portal papers, RAF Archive, Folder 8, Correspondence with C-in-C Coastal Command, 1945, Letter from Douglas to Portal, 12.4.45.
43 Ibid., Letter from Portal to Douglas, 13.4.45.
Lord Portal Papers at Christ Church

MORE THAN BOMBING POLICY

Christ Church remembers Portal from the large portrait of him in the Great Hall; but the Library remembers him as a benefactor who never forgot the importance of history, even when history was in the making. There is little doubt that, as those of you who have seen the film The Imitation Game set at Bletchley Park will know, most secret papers and coded encrypts were burned after the war. This was not exclusive to Bletchley Park, and yet Portal must have felt a keen sense of history to realise the importance of the documents he had created and collected. Lore says that he kept them hidden under his bed and in his attic. They were not declassified officially until 1996, and the only person allowed access to them was Denis Richards who wrote a biography of Portal1 (Portal of Hungerford). There must have been an element of ego in Portal’s retention of the papers - a tell-tale characteristic of an air force pilot! Portal alleged that he had permission to keep them, but it seems likely that those who allowed this did not realise that he had not even burned the item stamped “DESTROY BY FIRE AFTER READING”. No wonder they were hidden under the mattress.

Air Chief Marshal Charles “Peter” Portal is well-known as the man who built up the bomber section of the Royal Air Force in the lead-up to the destruction of Dresden. While this is accurate, it is perhaps unfair or too blinkered. There is a lot more to Portal than this, revealed within the collection of papers in the Library. While there is indeed a vast quantity of correspondence between the chiefs of Bomber Command as shown in an earlier article on Portal written by Richard Worrall in 20112, there are also many letters and memoranda from Portal explaining the technicalities of the day-to-day workings of the RAF to Prime Minister Churchill. Fighter Command is the subject of a huge amount of the correspondence, as is Coastal Command; Portal spent much time fighting for the RAF to keep control over this rather than the Navy.

Yet all of this pales into insignificance when one reads of the battles between the Royal Air Force and the Army Co-Operation Command, a name that seems at times almost ironic. The sheer amount of effort to keep these two forces working together seems to have been, at times, Portal’s full-time job. In spite of the frustration and the effort, that cooperation was managed.

Going through the letters addressed to Portal, we can read of a great many clashes and disagreements between the men of the Allied Command. Air Marshal Arthur Harris and Marshal of the Air Force Hugh Trenchard in particular seem to have had their disagreements with the entirety of the Command. The most striking point to take home from the Portal Papers is exactly that; there were constant arguments, debates, changes of mind and opinions throughout the War and that this was allowed and encouraged with only the occasional rebuke to act as a reminder of protocol. The men involved came up with plans and were allowed to argue the pros and cons of each debate. A human life is a precious thing and, despite the Portal Papers being filled with statistics, tables and graphs, Portal’s constant reminders to Churchill and others tell us that the commanders and strategists were always mindful of the human cost of every decision they made. Throughout the entire war, Portal reminds Churchill about why there must be more men crewing an aircraft than is needed for just one aircraft - that men need a rest at times and must go on leave, lest they get battle-weary, not forgetting that the aircraft themselves must be repaired at times as well3.

3 The first instances being in 1940 in the October-December minutes from the Prime Minister.

Watching an exercise in 1941 or 1942. From left to right: Lindemann, Portal, Pound and Churchill.
incendiary ammunition was legal and why, due to the nature of it being incendiary and not explosive. It could not, therefore become an excuse for Hitler to use illegal weapons in retaliation, such as gas which was still considered a very real threat in 1940. The in-fighting amongst these men continued over Operations TORCH in the North African campaign; BODYLINE (later CROSSBOW) which provided reconnaissance about the V-2 rockets which led to BIG BEN to counteract the V-2 threat; DIadem which was a major offensive in the Italian campaign at Monte Cassino; and of course, OVERLORD for D-Day. Some of the papers record wonderful little tête-à-têtes in which Portal stands up for commanders against Churchill; in 1940, Portal defended Air Marshal Arthur Longmore saying that the man is not as rude as he seems but is extremely effective in getting his men to work hard and well in battles; and then Marshal Arthur Tedder, criticised in 1941, even though he had just overseen the evacuation of Crete, was defended by Portal to Churchill so effectively that Tedder was to become Deputy Supreme Commander at SHAEF (Supreme Headquarters Allied Expeditionary Force) second only to General Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Last, but definitely not least, Field Marshal Bernard Montgomery, who was famously disliked by many of the Allied commanders, was evidently appreciated by Portal as a friend. On the eve of D-Day, Monty sent a handwritten letter thanking Portal for his kindness during the time they have known each other, often in difficult circumstances. Montgomery felt that Portal was always behind him. It is a touching letter from a man who realised the significance and the possibly personal finality of D-Day.

Contrast all of this with German High Command and its operation. It is well-known that many of Hitler’s inner circle suggested or conducted policy merely to please him or to get the upper hand over each other.

The weekly Bomber Command Digests include reports on the morale of the German people, specifically the mood in Berlin. These are often scathing diatribes against the German High Command, sometimes from the Press, which reported that the people did not want a repetition of 1918, and that Goebbels had eclipsed both Hitler and Goering by taking control of the Party and seemed to have more responsibility towards the welfare of the people. Sometimes these reports of German morale came from student manifestos telling the people of Berlin that Hitler had lied to them from the beginning and that Hitler and “his confederates” had sought the “destruction of all personal freedom, all freedom of thought and all moral principles of the German people. The eyes of even the most stupid German have been opened by the terrible blood-bath in which they endeavour to drown all Europe in the name of... the German nation.” The report does not say from which student manifesto this came, but it was in 1943 that Sophie Scholl was executed by guillotine for her work as a student activist alongside her brother Hans for distributing this sort of leaflet by the White Rose organisation. Nearer to the end of 1943, the general report says how the German government needs to mete out “a number of executions and other heavy penalties” to destroy the defeatists and “rumour-mongers” so that their Home Front did not collapse. This was how the Nazi command dealt with people who disagreed with them and throughout the papers, there are little notes and references to reports from those who had access to German High Command which include tantalising bits of information about how the people did not get on with each other and how it was always tense as no one dared to raise their voice to the Fuhrer, even when he was wrong. The Allied command as shown in these revealing letters may look somewhat chaotic, but the consideration shown in the Portal Papers of the value of human life, for a good strategy and for one’s allies, reveals a leadership that is prepared to take criticism and challenge.

The Portal Papers are a wonderful reminder of a democracy at the very period of our history when democracy was at its most vulnerable. The rebukes and childish bickering that occur within the papers show the Allied forces working together in spite of all differences.

Elizabeth Piper
Christ Church

Elizabeth Piper has a background in the Royal Air Force and works on cataloguing the Portal Papers at Christ Church.
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4 RAF Archive, PM Minutes Jan-Mar 1941, items 31-31a.
5 Portal Archive 2, Box A, Folder 5, Item 5 - letter from Montgomery to Portal dated 6-6-44.

6 RAF Archive, File 13, Weekly Bomber Command Digests, 13th June 1943
7 Ibid.
8 RAF Archive, File 13, Weekly Bomber Command Digests, 26th September 1943.
Let me introduce to you a little-known work by the Lady Eleanor Douglas (1590–1652), *The Excommunication out of Paradice*. The conventional expectation would be to read the relation of a recent cataloguing discovery. To learn of an early printed work that has not been experienced by human senses for 300 or more years or, at the very least, one which was never encountered by any of the 20th century’s roving bands of bibliographers. I would now emphasise the descriptor ‘little-known’, because that turns out to be the important detail in this introduction. In this case, I am highlighting one of Lady Eleanor Douglas’ prophetic pamphlets which, while remaining unknown to larger bibliographic enterprises, was, nevertheless, temporarily unearthed, even cited in research, and then left to sink, anonymously, into the depths of the Library’s holdings, once again obscured by both time and its uncatalogued surroundings.

In the early 17th century, an age when it was still widely considered inappropriate for a woman to voice strong opinions outside of the silence of her station, let alone to print and publish writings about politics or liturgical matters, Lady Eleanor Douglas did both, speak loudly and publish. From 1626, she deemed herself a prophetess, and she sought ever after to make her voice heard. She was twice married, first to Sir John Davies (d. 1626) and later to Sir Archibald Douglas (d. 1644), and though both husbands attempted to quell her fervour, even to the extent of burning her manuscripts, her inner fire was only ever stoked. Consequently, her life was punctuated repeatedly with censures and jail sentences.

Whether or not Lady Eleanor can truly be credited with the prescience which she professed is debatable. What she is certainly due, and of what prescience befitting, she was perfectly aware). In the early 17th century, an age when it was still widely considered inappropriate for a woman to voice strong opinions outside of the silence of her station, let alone to print and publish writings about politics or liturgical matters, Lady Eleanor Douglas did both, speak loudly and publish. From 1626, she deemed herself a prophetess, and she sought ever after to make her voice heard. She was twice married, first to Sir John Davies (d. 1626) and later to Sir Archibald Douglas (d. 1644), and though both husbands attempted to quell her fervour, even to the extent of burning her manuscripts, her inner fire was only ever stoked. Consequently, her life was punctuated repeatedly with censures and jail sentences.

In 1647, Lady Eleanor published *The Excommunication out of Paradice*, a rebuke of the late George Villiers, first duke of Buckingham and favourite of James I, whose 1628 assassination she claims to have predicted. She maintained that Charles I had kept bad council early in his reign and that Villiers should not have been kept close following James’ death. She generally resented his favour and believed Villiers’ political machinations abroad throughout the Thirty Years War to be traitorous. Douglas’ animosity towards Villiers was plain, and her writings attacked him frequently.

The known edition of this pamphlet was first cited in the 1945 edition of Donald Wing’s *Short-title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland, Ireland, Wales, and British America, and of English Books Printed in Other Countries, 1641-1700*, designated as Wing D1987.

“THE | Excommunication | OUT OF | PARADICE. | By the Lady Eleanor.” | [rule] | Gen. 3.[24] | So he drove out the MAN. | [rule] | [S.I.: s.n.], Printed in the Year 1647.

16 pages; quarto.

The entry listed only two holdings, one at the British Library and one at the Bodleian Library. The same entry in the 1972 edition added three further locations, The Folger Library in Washington D.C., The Houghton Library at Harvard, and one copy here at Christ Church. The Bodleian Library copy was microfilmed (and is now viewable on the Early English Books Online (EEBO) website), and, eventually, Wing D1987 was added to the English Short Title Catalogue (ESTC) as ESTC R18875. At this point, there was no reason given to believe that Christ Church’s copy differed in any way from the four other extant copies.

*The Excommunication* is a simple setting, unadorned by engraving of any sort. No historiated initials, no engraved head- or tail-pieces; no running titles; only a scant head-piece composed of a single row of type ornaments graces the beginning of text. On the verso of the title page, it bears, like others of her works from this time forward, a dedication to Oliver Cromwell.

A 1992 biography by Esther S. Cope, *Handmaid of the Holy Spirit: Dame Eleanor Davies, Never Soe Mad a Ladie*, has become a primary, authoritative source on Lady Eleanor. Theresa Feroli, in the introduction to *Eleanor Davies* in the series *Early Modern Englishwoman: Printed Writings, 1500-1640*, goes so far as to define Cope as Lady Eleanor’s biographer. In 1995, Cope compiled a volume of Douglas’ pamphlets, reproduced from the original texts, for the Oxford University Press series, *Women Writers in English 1350-1850* which brought Christ Church’s copy of *The Excommunication* briefly to the world’s attention as something unique (See Figure 1). In the pamphlet’s introduction, she notes that the
Christ Church copy is significantly longer than the copies held by the other four libraries. She also asserts that it is a more fully developed version of those copies, but she does not expand on this point, nor was the Christ Church copy mentioned again.

When I recently found *The Excommunication* at shelfmark, B.138 (5), in Christ Church’s Hyp collection of pamphlets, I had first thought it to be a rather exciting discovery. It had obviously received no special treatment in the English Short Title Catalogue, being listed only as another copy of Wing D1987.

> “THE | Excommunication | OUT OF | PARADICE, | By the Lady ELEANOR.”
> [S.l.: s.n., 1647?]
> [2], 30 pages; quarto.
> Collation: A-D⁴.

From a bibliographic perspective, and contrary to Cope’s assertion, I purport that this is an early edition of *The Excommunication*, a proof copy, as it appears to be very much a work-in-progress, indicating that the ‘later’, known edition received a substantial edit prior to its publication. Furthering this notion is evidence provided in Douglas’ own hand. As seems to be the case with many surviving copies of Douglas’ pamphlets, this pamphlet is replete with annotations (See Figure 2), and with the assistance of Dr Georgianna Ziegler of the Folger Library, I was able to identify this distinctive script as Lady Eleanor’s.¹

The substance of the text, though having been heavily digested, is relatively consistent between editions (See Figure 3). The very first sentence is a representative example of the treatment received by the whole text:

> “Forasmuch as these, a stranger to former ages, the adversary acknowledging no less, for any such under age, namely, Babes, knowing not good from evil, to be baptized; thought good to publish these, shewing the Ark Baptisms figure, (Pet. 3.) admits no new custome in Churches such, witness at MANS estate all of them saved by water; Moreover, his three sons, though married all, yet had none till after the flood born unto them, (Gen. | 10.) Thus did not Noah, which prefer their own...

¹ The Folger copy of *The Excommunication* is bound in a sammelband with 44 other tracts, all written by the Lady Eleanor and compiled by her daughter, Lucy Davies Hastings, Countess of Huntingdon. This album, of special importance for its provenance, is bound in contemporary vellum and was purchased by the Folger in 1962 from a dealer in Guildford who wrote of the volume’s pamphlets, “Many have manuscript corrections probably by the authoress.”

² The title page has two additional annotations in Lady Eleanor’s hand, both of which are also present, nearly word for word, on the title page of the Folger copy. The first, just below the title reads: “As since thes deliverd to the Howse – | Ecce Homo: The Lo: Maior[,] | Alderman Adams & Alderman [illegible]”. The second, at the foot of the title page, reads, “Besides the samedaye (September [21?]) a | woeman going out of ye Abey: By the | doore shutt against Her: Had her | Brains beaten out:”

³ The title pages of *The Excommunication* out of Paradise, Christ Church copy at B.138 (5). (Right) The title page of the Lady Eleanor’s *The Bill of Excommunication*, Wing D1979, ESTC R37758, held at the Folger Shakespeare Library, Washington D.C.
30 traditions, That | according to all that the Lord com-| manded him, so did he.

From the Christ Church’s edition to the more common edition, this is resolved to:

“The Ark, Baptisms express figure | (Pet. 3.) No such custom admits| in Church, of those knowing not good | from evil, to be Baptized; witness at | mans estate all of them saved by wa-| ter: where his three sons, though | married all, yet had non born unto them | till after the flood, Noah that according | to all the Lord commanded, so did he.”

The first page of text of The Excommunication out of Paradise. (Left) The known edition, ESTC R16875, image from Early English Books Online. (Right) Christ Church’s ‘proof’ copy at B.138 (5).

Was this abridgment from 30 down to 16 pages the work of Lady Eleanor, or was this an editorial decision on the part of a printer or publisher, and, regardless, was this drastic revision a consideration of the content, or was it merely a matter of cost? If the latter, the decision could well have been Lady Eleanor’s. Unlike men, the majority of women in the Early Modern era who had their works published paid for the work themselves, and Lady Eleanor was no exception. All of her publications were self-funded. She even travelled as far as Amsterdam in search of printers who would take the work. Thus it is not a surprise to find her so active in the process, from beginning to a final edition.

It is also not necessarily a surprise to re-discover this preliminary state of The Excommunication after Lady Eleanor Douglas’ biographer gave the pamphlet its first passing notice. This could be interpreted as potentially embarrassing, but libraries, particularly those the size of Christ Church Library, have the duty of care for so much information born of so many ages, that to learn of something which subsequently slipped through the cracks is neither unpredictable nor unprecedented. Rest assured, this ‘new’ find is now safely recorded in the English Short Title Catalogue, not only as ESTC R504588, but as a permanent contribution to the scholarship of Early Modern women writers, for easier accessibility by the readers of Cope’s biography, and as a reminder that collaboration between scholars and librarians is beneficial to all.
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FRAGILE RELICS:
‘Cardinal Wolsey’s Porridge Bowl’
and the Biographies of 16th Century
Chinese Porcelain Objects

In 1907 a porcelain bowl was donated to Christ Church Library as ‘Cardinal Wolsey’s porridge bowl’. The note accompanying it mentioned that it was ‘procured from Miss White of Hove in 1907, whose grandfather was Edward Wolsey, last member of a branch of the Wolsey family.’ The bowl has not been previously published or researched. The decoration, shape and mark are identical to those of the ‘Walsingham Bowl’ in Burghley House, one of the earliest dated and documented pieces of Chinese porcelain to enter England. The relation to the ‘Walsingham bowl’ places the Christ Church bowl in a group of bowls traditionally dated between 1580 and 1645. This dating unfortunately moves the production of the bowl outside of Wolsey’s lifespan. However, it opens up a conversation on the mystique of Chinese porcelain, in particular those objects associated with the great figures of the Tudor age.

Porcelain bowl donated to Christ Church Library.

This article shall be an endeavour to shed some light on what the Christ Church bowl is, what it is not, and what kind of factors would have led to it being presented to Christ Church as ‘Wolsey’s porridge bowl’.

KRAAK PORCELAIN: GLOBAL BY DESIGN

The Christ Church bowl belongs to a type of Chinese porcelain called ‘Kraak’ which was mass-produced specifically for export from the mid-16th century to the mid-17th century and distributed throughout Western Europe, north Africa, South Africa, the Middle East, South-East Asia and North and South America.1 It was made in the traditional Chinese porcelain ceramic centre of Jingdezhen, which was at first traded to Europe by the Portuguese in the mid to late 16th century, then by the Spanish as part of the Manila Galleon trade, then finally by the Dutch until the mid-17th century.

Kraak porcelain shares a thin and light body with dishes made for the Chinese domestic market, but distinguishes itself through several common features. These include decoration split into panels, foliated rims, a glaze with a blueish tinge that tends to fray at edges, and imperfections in the glaze and body even in the finest pieces. Although rough by the standards of the contemporaneous imperial blue-and-white pieces, next to which it sometimes has the misfortune to be displayed in Western museums, Kraak porcelain nonetheless proved a highly successful trade product. It was amassed in great numbers by several generations of Medicis, while in Portugal it was embedded in sumptuous ceilings like that of the Santos Palace, and was collected heavily in the imperial collections at the Topkapi Serai in Turkey and the shrine of Shaykh Safi al-Din Ardabili at Ardabili in Iran.2 It was particularly prized in the Netherlands and northern Europe, where heavy local earthenwares and stonewares could hardly compare to the light, luminous Chinese porcelain.3

Bowls of the same design as the Christ Church bowl were produced over several decades between the end of the 16th century and the middle of the 17th century, with examples extant in the Ardebil Shrine in Iran,4 the Hessian State Museum in Kassel, Germany, the Groninger Museum in the Netherlands and the Danish National Museum in Copenhagen.5 The UK boasts three bowls: one in the Victoria & Albert Museum (336-1884) and two mounted examples, one in the Fitzwilliam Museum (OC.4A-1938) and another, referred to as the Walsingham Bowl, in Burghley House. The latest example of this design has been recovered from the Hatcher Junk, a shipwreck dated to around 1643.6

Whilst displaying differences in execution between the different examples, the decoration follows the same design with fan-shaped panels with compositions of birds and flowers underneath a band of horses in a flying gallop over waves on the outside, and a central panel depicting a mountainous

6 Rinaldi 1989 p. 147.
landscape in the central medallion, surrounded by a band of flaming pearls in the cavetto, and a band of rolling mountainous landscape on the inner rim.

Maura Rinaldi argues that the lesser quality of the decoration in the Hatcher Junk example shows a deterioration in the quality of the craftsmanship over the history of production of this design.7

A comparison between the Christ Church bowl and the Walsingham bowl does indeed show a more careful hand in the painting of the latter, which following Rinaldi’s reasoning would place the Christ Church bowl at a later point. However, in lack of firmly dated archaeological examples, the exact chronology of this type of bowls remains uncertain.

What is certain upon observing the different examples is the sense of playfulness of the painted design, most likely the product of several hands producing at high volume in a workshop. The small sailing boat in the Burghley example is replaced with a much bigger junk, and the sequence of high vertical cliffs and rounded rocky outcrops varies between different examples of the bowl. As suggested by Lothar Ledderose, individual craftsmen working in the workshop could have taken turns to add such features (which Ledderose calls “modules”) as cliffs or huts to the bowls, in a process that ensured both a quick turnover, and variation in the designs.8

Kraak porcelain typically showcases a decorative programme that draws from Chinese visual culture, but also appeals to a wider, global market due to its reliance on universally comprehensible natural imagery. The Wolsey bowl is no different. The watery landscape depicted in the central medallion would have alluded to a Chinese audience to the idealisation of the simple life of fishermen and farmers, seen as the pastoral antithesis to the literatus’ struggle with political realities. Detached from their original context, these landscape representations became, in the European imagination, a shorthand for China itself, translated into a land of whimsy and fantasy.

Somewhat less easily translatable to European eyes, yet still iconic for this type of ware are the motifs of the flaming pearls present in the cavetto. They feature prominently on a related bowl decorated with deer on the outside in the National Museum in Bangkok.9 To a South Asian consumer, this motif may have been familiar as an attribute of Vishnu, the Hindu god, a symbol of sovereignty, as well as a Buddhist symbol representing the Wheel of Law set in motion by the Buddha’s enlightenment.10

Just as bound up in the history of intrepid intercontinental material exchange is the motif of horses caught in a flying gallop over waves. This motif stems from early 15th century porcelain, to the reigns of the Yongle (r. 1402 - 1424) and Xuande (r. 1425 - 1435) Emperors. The arrival at the Chinese court of two successive gifts of a giraffe from the Sultan of Malindi (now Kenya) and a white elephant (held as an omen and symbol of good government) in 1414 and 1415 sparked a fashion in representations of auspicious animals frolicking among waves, said to be imitating the murals of a temple in Nanjing dedicated to the Daoist goddess of the sea.11

The motif of fantastic creatures over a turbulent sea, and in particular its version featured on the Christ Church bowl which spotlights the much-cherished Chinese symbol of the horse, seems to have had a strong association with Tibetan Buddhism. The National Palace Museum in Taipei holds fourteen stem cups from the 15th century decorated with a

7 Ibid. N.6.
10 Rinaldi 1989 p. 140, 146.
motley array of fabulous creatures frolicking among waves alongside inscriptions in Tibetan of Buddhist mantras, with the earliest cup of this type excavated archaeologically at Zhushan dating from Yongle reign (1403-1424).  

Like the flaming pearl, the horse motif occurs in other porcelain designs, notably alongside bead motifs in a set of ten small bowls in the imperial collection at the Topkapi Saray in Sitanbul (Rinaldi 150). But the juxtaposition of horse and flaming pearl motifs could also be taken as a meaningful choice, rather than a haphazard juxtaposition of decorative motifs, as the horse carrying a flaming pearl is a popular symbol of Buddhist enlightenment in both Chinese and Tibetan Buddhism. A late 15th century porcelain jar in the Museu Nacional de Arte Antigua in Lisbon (no. 6710 Cer) is decorated with a horse galloping over waves carrying on its back a luminous pearl bearing the character for longevity at its centre.  

A 16th or 17th century pair of funeral figures of a deer and a horse bearing flaming pearls in the David W. Dewey collection attests to the popularity of these motifs in the period.

THE TRENCHARD AND WALSINGHAM BOWLS

The Christ Church bowl gives us an opportunity to consider how the earliest pieces of Chinese ceramics to have entered England have an ability to create their own mythology.

Porcelain was a prized curiosity in Elizabethan England. Whilst in Portugal and Spain Chinese porcelain was abundant enough to serve as utilitarian tableware, at court as well as in high ecclesiastical settings, inventories of plate and jewels from 1574 [Harley MS 1650 and Stowe MS 555] list only seven "purseline" or "pursleyen" vessels in the royal household. An enticing note in a list of new year gifts for Elizabeth I mentions a white porcelain "porringer" given to Queen Elizabeth by William Cecil in 1588. However, the object cannot be identified among the small number of Chinese porcelain pieces that are known to have entered the United Kingdom in the 16th century.

Unlike Spain or Portugal, who obtained their porcelain through direct trade, late 16th and early 17th century Chinese porcelain entered England quite haphazardly and through often surprising routes. Some were brought in by Englishmen trading in the Levant, while others, even more excitingly, were alleged to have been acquired through the capture of Portuguese and Spanish trade vessels by English privateers.

One infamous example is that of the "Trenchard Bowl", currently in the collection of the Victoria & Albert Museum. The bowl is decorated with flowers and fishes painted in underglaze blue cobalt and bears mounts of exquisite craftsmanship struck with the London hall-mark and the date letter for 1599. The bowl is traditionally said to have been gifted to the Trenchard family by Phillip Archduke of Austria, who was hosted by the family upon being driven ashore by a storm at Weymouth in 1506. However, as Phillipa Glanville has demonstrated, both the mounts and the style of the bowl postdate the year of the Archduke's visit, and the written account of origin of the gifts can only be traced back to Hutchins' 19th century History and Antiquities of Dorset.

Equally shrouded in 16th century mystique is the previously mentioned "Walsingham Bowl". Adorned with sumptuous gilt bronze mounts with Elizabethan engravings, the bowl is recorded in an 18th century inscription to have been a christening gift from Elizabeth I to the family of Sir Francis Walsingham (ca. 1532-1590).

The association of the bowl with the Elizabethan court took another turn in the wake of 20th century archaeological discoveries connected to the infamous sea captain and privateer Sir Francis Drake (1540–1596). Efforts to locate Sir Francis Drake's encampment on the North American coastline led to findings of 16th century Chinese shards in Drake's Bay. These have been connected to Drake's sojourn in the area to raid Spanish ships trading between Asia and Spanish outposts in the New World. The presence of Kraak porcelain shards similar to the Walsingham Bowl amongst the finds has led to the suggestion that the Walsingham bowl was originally part of a Spanish cargo looted by

---

13 Matos, Maria Antónia Pinto de, and Denise Patry Leidy. 2016. Global by design: Chinese ceramics from the R. Albuquerque Collection, p. 246.
15 For contrast, see Krahe, Cinta. 2016. Chinese porcelain in Habsburg Spain.
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18 "The bason inclosed herein, was given by Queen Elizabeth, when she stood, Godmother, to my great grandfather Walsingham and was given to me by my Aunt, ye Lady Osborne, (granddaughter to ye said Walsingham) as being the only male heir of ye family left, so that my children may be christened in it, as all her family were before. 1731." From Burghley website, citation.
Drake and subsequently presented to Queen Elizbeth I upon his return.20

The “Walsingham Bowl”

Although the validity of the connection of the Drake’s Bay shards to Francis Drake has been disputed,21 this added connection to Sir Francis Drake elevates the bowl to a witness to a particular moment in Elizabethan history. The Trenchard Bowl and the Walsingham bowls are "transformed" by both their finely crafted mounts and the documentary evidence from Chinese objects into artefacts of Elizabethan history.

A third example of mounted Chinese porcelain will further illustrate this process of transformation.

THE TUDOR EXHIBITION AND THE VICTORIAN OBSESSION FOR RELICS

On 1 February 1890, a 16th century Chinese porcelain flask made its way to the pages of the Illustrated London News.22 The object, a Wanli period (1572 – 1620) pear-shaped bottle decorated with underglaze blue painted trees and birds, as well as silver-gilt mounts, takes pride of place in the middle of a hand-drawn illustration of various “Relics from the Sixteenth Century” from the “Exhibition of the Royal House of Tudor” taking place at the New Gallery in Regent Street from early 1890 until 6 April 1890. Other objects featured in the illustration include “Henry VIII’s shoes”, a white feather tippet “taken from the shoulders of Anne Boleyn”, and another vessel presented as “Katherine Parr’s Jug”. The exhibition, whose organisational committee included Arthur Evans and Edward Burne-Jones, contained a staggering number of works (exceeding 1500 according to the catalogue, including almost 500 portraits), some lent from the Royal Collection, but with a large number of works provided by private lenders.23 The catalogue specifies that “The Committee can accept no responsibility as to their [the exhibits] authenticity.”24 The exhibition itself deserves a full-length study on its impact on the Victorian public’s perception of the Tudor Age, its role in the emergence of the modern phenomenon of the loan exhibition,25 and the wealth of articles written on it in the current press. For the purpose of this article, it will suffice to note two points.

---

20 The curator of the Burghley collection, John Culverhouse, has pointed out in conversation with the author that it was Oliver Impey who first established the connection with Drake during his research on the Burghley House East Asian porcelain collection. Although not published in any catalogue, the information is published in the catalogue entry on the Burghley House Website, accessed 2018.


24 Ibid.

25 Buchanan, Alexandrina 2007 “Show and Tell: Late Medieval Art and the Cultures of Display” p. 125
The first is that the portraits served as the highlight of the catalogue as well as the reviews of the time, with a review in the January 18th issue of the Illustrated London News discussing the extent to which different portraits of Elizabeth I "tally with our floating ideas Elizabeth's character and appearance."  

The second point is that the exhibition distinguished in its catalogue, as well as its layout, between objects with purely documentary relevance ("Plate", "Coins and Medals") and "Relics" with a connection to specific historical personages. The Illustrated London News review notes that "the personal relics, articles of dress and ornament, and other possessions or memorials of distinguished royal or other individuals living in the Tudor reigns are not the least interesting part of this exhibition." Thus, our porcelain flask (inventory number 934, "Four pieces of Nankeen, blue and white china, with silver-gilt English mounts, circa 1570, from Burghley Collection") is displayed not among the "Plate", but in a case titled "Relics of Queen Elisabeth", along with "a piece of wood of one of the Armada ships" (no. 970) and "a PURSE, which Sir Francis Drake is said to have had in his possession when he sailed around the world." Even though the catalogue lists it only as one of four pieces of "Nankeen" (a current term for blue-and-white porcelain, erroneously assumed to have been traded through Nanjing), leaving the connection to Elizabeth ambiguous, its location in the exhibition presents an interpretation of the circumstances of its importation as not merely an accident in the history of trade, but as an Elizabethan phenomenon. Its presence in the exhibition and in the Illustrated London News illustration elevate the flask to the status of "Relic". 

As Alexandrina Buchanan has shown, the interest in the "relics" of historical figures is by no means a Victorian phenomenon, but an important element in the way collectors and the public at large related to the historical past since at least the early 17th century. What is noteworthy about the 1890 Tudor Exhibition, however, is that it took place at a time when mass media could readily amplify its impact through reviews and illustrations of its exhibits, spreading the image of the porcelain flask as an Elizabethan relic. The presence of the exhibition and its objects in the paper also contextualises it in a culture that craved a personal contact with historical figures through material culture. In the same issue of the News as the drawing of the porcelain flask, an article derides a family for claiming they owned a table that "may or may not be of Elizabethan date, and Shakespeare may or may not have used it among the furniture of his house." 

Somewhat mocking in tone, the article describes the owner “hearing his grandmother say that she purchased it from a woman who had bought it at a sale at Shakespeare's house in Henley Street. This evidence,” the anonymous journalist continues, "will satisfy those who like to believe in it, and will amuse those who do not." While the short fragment attests to the same scepticism that led to the disclaimer at the start of the "Tudor Exhibition" catalogue, it captures the prevalence of people's desire to identify such relics among their possessions.

WOLSEY'S RELICS

Returning to the Christ Church bowl, its donation in 1907 took place not only at a time when the Tudor Exhibition was still in living memory, but also at a time when other "relics" of Cardinal Wolsey were gifted to the college. One item from the exhibition ended up being presented to Christ Church: a red Cardinal hat said to have belonged to Cardinal Wolsey. Another gift, whilst not exhibited in the 1890 exhibition, is the "List of the Household of Cardinal Thomas Wolsey", a 16th century roll given to the college after the death of its last private owner, Rev. Francis Hopkinson (1810-98), who was among the lenders to the Tudor Exhibition.

27 Exhibition p. 192.
28 Ibid. note 26.
29 Exhibition p. 192.
30 Exhibition p. 195.
31 Buchanan 2007 p. 126.
33 See item 1185 in the Exhibition catalogue on page 222.
34 See n. 23.
The exact history of the Christ Church bowl cannot be drawn with any precision before its arrival at Christ Church in 1907. However, a look at its “relatives” among early porcelain pieces to have arrived in 16th and 17th century England and their later reception, helps shed light on how a porcelain bowl could have plausibly gained the guise of “Cardinal Wolsey’s Porridge Bowl.”

Beyond this somewhat amusing moniker lies a fascinating process through which a Chinese-made object has become appropriated into a specifically Victorian narrative of the glory of the Tudor period. Despite its dating not matching the lifetime of Cardinal Wolsey, the bowl’s similarity to the “Walsingham Bowl” and other related Kraak bowls set in European mounts enabled its abduction into “Tudor” material culture. That being said, through the label connecting it to Wolsey, the status of the Christ Church bowl as relic becomes amplified: first as a reference to Sir Francis Drake’s pillering of the porcelain on the Spanish ships (turning the bowl into a veritable symbol of Elizabethan mercantile expansionism), and secondly as a personal “relic” of Wolsey. Anachronic and yet unquestionable in its physical presence, trivial and yet bound up in a global narrative, “Wolsey’s Porridge Bowl” gives us a glimpse of the myriad of meanings such transcultural objects are open to accruing.
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Eighteenth-Century Coffee Houses, ‘New Libraries’ and Christ Church

When I started putting this issue of the journal together, my aim was to highlight the depth and variety of research conducted on the Christ Church collections.

This is not only a library housing a huge number of books, documents and a diversity of objects, but also, crucially, an environment actively geared to promote and encourage exploration and inquiry, a place committed to developing new tools for research and devoted to disseminating knowledge. At present this involves a great deal of effort channelled into creating detailed catalogues of the varied collections, implementing a comprehensive programme of digitisation, setting up exhibitions, organising conferences, series of talks and concerts and publishing.

Overall, ‘Special Collections’ at Christ Church Library is a hive of activity now. And, to our delight, we realise that the more we delve into its history, the more we see that we happen to follow a long-established model. This model is perfectly illustrated by the college’s ‘New Library’. However, the latter is not going to be the focus of this article.

The final piece in this issue aims to dwell on a small discovery and, perhaps paradoxically, the importance of the coffee house in the emergence of the library being seen as a creative workshop, not only as a repository of knowledge.

The 18th-century vision of the coffee house as a centre for cultural exchange and learning, complements the concept of connoisseurship, offering one of its ideal formats. This may appear as a rushed statement. What one expects to hear are remarks along this line: “The decay of study, and consequently of learning, are coffy houses, to which most scholars retire and spend much of the day in hearing and speaking of news […]”.¹

These words come from one who had experienced coffee houses first-hand from the very beginning, Anthony Wood. One of the most learned, indefatigable and prolific writers of the time, Wood never had an official base in the university. He was, however, given free access to its archives and thus did become over the years the incomparable historian of 18th-century Oxford.² He is an inexhaustible fount of information and he talks a lot about coffee houses in his diaries, from documenting their arrival on the scene to analysing their effect on their beneficiaries. So, we should indeed take him on faith. Returning to his statement, apart from the note of exasperation, what Wood also conveys is that, inevitably, coffee houses were indeed frequented by “most scholars” and that they encouraged topical discussions.

With their relaxed atmosphere and relative cheapness, coffee houses (especially during the second half of the 17th-century) remained the haunt of the well-educated and commercial elite.³ This is well documented. Samuel Pepys made extensive notes about his visits to coffee houses in his diaries. There, he says, he was able to pick up gossip, listen to debates or simply make useful trade connections. By 1664 Pepys was visiting his favourite coffee houses near London’s Royal Exchange more than three times each week (and often twice a day).⁴ The intellectual nature of the coffee house also overflowed into the literary world. At Will’s Coffee House in London, for instance, poet John Dryden is known to have spent long hours, exchanging lampoons and satirical verses with fellow writers. Among these, one was likely to find a young Alexander Pope. Like many others, he was there to engage in conversation, read the papers and to hear Dryden’s words of wisdom.⁵

² In 1669 Dr John Fell, the dean of Christ Church, arranged for Wood’s collections relating to the history of the university to be published by the university press.


Draught of a London coffee house, c. 1690–1700
British Museum (shelfmark 1931.0613.2).
The goal, in these newly opened establishments, appears to have been to create a context conducive to dialogue among like minds. This dialogue (together with the passion for connoisseurship and a consummate engagement in collecting on a grand scale) has directly and spectacularly changed the paradigm for 18th-century libraries.

The present brief article aims at outlining how this might have happened and why.

Soon after this, in 1654, *The Queen's Lane Coffee House*, still in existence today, was established by one Cirques Jobson. He was a ‘Jacobite’ Jew \(^6\) “borne neare Mount Libanus. <who> sold coffey in Oxon in an house between Edmund Hall and Quenn Coll, corner.”\(^7\)

Another popular coffee house was opened in 1655 “by Arthur Tillyard, an apothecary and great royalist. He sold coffey publickly in his house against All-soules Coll. He was encouraged so to do by som royalists, now living in Oxon, and by others who esteem’d themselves either *virtuosi* or *wits*; of which the chiefest number were of Alls. Coll – as Peter Pett, Thomas Millington, Timothy Baldwin, Christopher Wren, Georg Castle, William Bull, etc. There were others also, as John Lampliere, a physician [...]”\(^10\). Robert Boyle, Robert Hooke and members of the ‘Chemistry Club’ were among the regulars as well. The latter group included a number of *virtuosi* from the original Tillyard’s clique. They were joined by Dr. John Wallis, Nathaniel Crew, Thomas Branker, Dr. Ralph Bathurst, Dr. Henry Yerbury, Dr. Thomas Janes, Richard Lower and Richard Griffith. John Locke was among the participants in an earlier ‘Chemistry Club’. Wallis, Wren, Bathurst, Lower, and Locke would later become important Fellows of the Royal Society.\(^11\)

Tellingly, the first coffee houses established in Oxford were known as ‘Penny Universities’. They charged a penny for admission, so were affordable, and offered an alternative form of learning. They attracted a wide variety of people to engage in heated debates, but essentially, they were places where scholars could congregate, read and learn from each other.

Overall, little is known about the coffee houses of Oxford in the 1650s other than what Anthony Wood and John Evelyn recorded in their memoirs. However, it is there that we are told repeatedly that, aside from coffee, chocolate and wine, coffee houses were also sought after for their regular supplies of newspapers and books.

In this context, Anthony Wood’s brief note written at the end of December 1668 tells an interesting story:

“A little before Xmas, the Xt Ch. Men, young men, set a library in Short’s coffee hous in the study ther, viz. Rablais, poems, plaies, etc. One scholar gave a booke of Is and chaine 10d.”\(^12\) Indeed, Short's had opened a coffee house on the site where the Sheldonian Theatre began to be built four years later (in 1669 it was moved to the corner of what is now known as St Helen's Passage). This establishment is significant for our discussion as it was a group from Christ Church who founded and kept a library there from 1668.\(^13\)

---

\(^6\) The very earliest record found of this site in Oxford was penned in 1391 when an Inn called “Tabord” was leased by St. John’s Hospital [where Magdalen College stands today]. Then, in 1510 it was extended and expanded and renamed “The Angel”, becoming Oxford’s most important coaching Inn. A number of distinguished guests stayed at “The Angel” including King Christian II of Denmark who stayed in 1768 and Queen Adelaide, consort to King William IV stayed here in 1835.


\(^8\) ‘Jacobite’ was the name given to the Monophysite Christians of Syria.

\(^9\) *The Life and Times of Anthony Wood*, antiquary, I (1891), p. 188.

\(^10\) Ibid., p. 201.


\(^12\) *The Life and Times of Anthony Wood*, antiquary, II (1892), p. 147.

At this point we do not know much about this library; how it came into being, what it contained and what happened to it. But Christ Church’s connection to the ‘coffee business’ looks surprisingly strong through Nathaniel Canopius. Canopius was a Cretan scholar who appears to have studied at Balliol, but was made canon of Christ Church by bishop Laud.14 During his time in Oxford from 1637 to 1648, he is reputed to have brewed the first cup of coffee in England. “There came in my time to the College one Nathaniel Canopius, out of Greece... he was the first I ever saw drink coffee,”15 wrote John Evelyn in his Memoirs in 1637.

Further delving in old college documents and a good deal of luck is needed in order to, hopefully, unveil something approaching more detailed information about the coffee house library opened by Christ Church. For now, all we have is Anthony Wood’s fleeting remark. However, this is an important statement by a contemporary witness.

It has been often assumed that the reading matter consumed in the coffee house was confined to newspapers, but, the more closely one explores the situation, the clearer it becomes that libraries established there were much broader. They included political pamphlets, tracts on theology, science and philosophy, poetry, satire in verse, maps and printed music.16 Browsing through fragmentary lists and surviving copies traced to have once belonged to known coffee house libraries provides a priceless insight into 18th-century culture. As a rule, these type of collections were, more than anything else, largely focused on recent publications, able to fuel interest and provide good, juicy topics for debate. We must not forget that, first and foremost, coffee houses were set up to encourage convivial sociability and intellectual exchange. But the very fact that they were celebrated as one of the paradigmatic public spaces for the dissemination and consumption of news and print culture, puts their little-known libraries at the centre of attention.

Compared to other libraries dating from this period (libraries of prestigious institutions such as universities and learned societies, parochial libraries and private libraries), coffee house libraries were small and functioned as places of entertainment as much as repositories of knowledge. The public nature of this environment involved a great deal of reading aloud and debating. Incidentally, reading aloud was then a recognised social skill.17 But more importantly, reading in coffee house libraries was also associated with another activity: writing. Looking through fragmentary items that once belonged to coffee house libraries, one is bound to notice that many volumes are marked by splashes of ink or have manuscript marginalia (linked or not linked to the topic of the work itself). The interesting thing about this type of largely off-the-cuff writing is how often it can shed real light on the printed text. Many coffee house copies have been marked up with names identifying concealed subjects of censure, or comments on the quality of the writing.18

Another notable feature of these establishments was their close association with the book trade, in particular with the practice of holding book auctions. These auctions were advertised by printed catalogues aimed at a specific clientele. Books were not only read and commented upon there, but also sold and bought, and this in turn had a significant impact on the emerging knowledge economy.

Contemporary sources often refer to an increasing level of organisation in 18th-century libraries, with collections (both large and small) having a flexible book identification system, allowing users to easily locate the desired material: a simple but effective innovation, essentially a mark that specified the location of a book in the classification scheme and on the bookshelf.

We know that for scholars and antiquaries, the library was a room in which they spent a great deal of time. It was a de facto living room, and during the 18th century, perhaps more than ever, a living room with a twist, for it usually was more than a comfortable room full of books. Private libraries of the time also included collections of curiosities, coins, medals, gems and works of art. Such collections had their origin in the cabinet of curiosities assembled during the 16th and 17th centuries across the continent.

One of the most celebrated collections known to English scholars was the Musaeum Wormianum, created during 1620-54 by Ole Worm in Copenhagen, known through its influential printed catalogue.19 The appeal of the book and its author is obvious. The collector, in this instance, was a medical professor, and polymath, also known as the founder of Danish archaeology, due to his publication

18 Ibid., p. 34.
19 Ole Worm, Musaeum Wormianum. Seu, Historia rerum rariorum, tam naturalium, quam artificialium, tam domesticarum, quam exoticae, que Hafniæ Danorum in ædibus authoris servatur (Lund: Elsevier, 1655).
of Danish and Norwegian runic inscriptions. The Musaeum Wormianum was a real place, in Worm’s own house, filled to the rafters by a huge variety of items. The way the space of this particular cabinet of curiosities was organised is visible in the frontispiece engraving published in the catalogue. This is a claustrophobic room, crammed with everything from specimens of the natural world and scientific instruments to ethnographic objects. It was all aimed not just at showing off the owner’s range of interests (and perhaps his wealth), but also at being a source of study and understanding.

There is no apparent connection between such cabinet repositories (typical of the seventeenth century) and the spaces dedicated to institutional collections, be they grand academic libraries, or small coffee house reading rooms (typical of the 18th century). Yet, all, I think, stem from the same paradigm, contemplating the realisation of an institution embracing the combined roles of library, museum and laboratory. Stepping over their threshold, users were, in effect, invited to engage in much more than reading. They could contemplate works of art (both bequeathed and commissioned). They could make use of a great number of cutting-edge scientific instruments. They could examine coins, medals and gem casts, but also other rarities, like mandrakes, silver boxes, books on palm leaves, miniature writing and chess pieces. All the above are equally part and parcel of the furniture and the ethos of the awe-inspiring scholarly 18th-century libraries, of which a typical example is the ‘New Library’ at Christ Church.

Likewise, although they may have disappeared now, and their collections are irretrievable, the apparently insignificant, chaotic coffee house libraries might have played an important, if little discussed, role in what libraries had become. With their imposition of order, systematised, retrievable and historical, their varied resources acquired an archival quality, and with this, grand collections could emerge and develop unhindered.

Sadly nothing seems to be left of the Short’s coffee house library established by Christ Church in 1668. In contrast, there is a vast quantity of information about the 18th-century New Library. Founded in the same period, they seem to be eons apart. One was surely very small and barely worth a footnote. Its contents are now lost and its location fuzzy. The other is one of the grandest libraries in the world. Still, they were both the product of a period of enlightenment and passion in human history. Irrespective of their size and the value of their contents, their aim was to create a context conducive to dialogue among like minds. This (together with the passion for connoisseurship and a consummate engagement in collecting on a grand scale) had spectacularly changed the paradigm for what a library should be. Much more than repositories, 18th-century libraries, both large and small, were museums and laboratories in equal measure. They were places were knowledge was not only stored, but created... Such was the power of coffee during the 18th century.
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