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The nine books and one manuscript in this catalogue highlight the complex and unique interaction between text and reader (or readers).

Giovanni Ceva struggles valiantly with Newton's *Principia*, a book made “designedly” difficult to read, Samuel Taylor Coleridge disagrees with Southey over Henry More, William Bromley is consoled by Boswell's book on heraldry – “so ffrendlie a companyon in my sicknes” - and extensively personalizes the book for the young Hugh Cholmondeley, Anthony Scattergood consults Crescenzi's book on husbandry 200 years after its publication, John Upton meticulously analyses Spenser’s poetry while Edward Holder furiously annotates his rival's book with the evidence of his own guilt for forging paintings of Shakespeare.
"OF WHOM YOU BE DESCENDED"

1   BOSSEWELL (John), annotated and illuminated by BROMLEY (William). Workes of Armorie, devyded into three bookes, entituled, the Concordes of Armorie, the Armorie of Honor, and of Coates and Creastes, collected and gathered by John Bossewell Gentleman.

[London]: In aedibus Richardi Totelli, 1572 £18,000

First Edition. Small 4to. (188 x 150mm). [4], 136, 30 ff., with numerous woodcut heraldic shields throughout the text; hand-coloured, annotated and underlined throughout by William Bromley, with a long manuscript letter to Hugh Cholmondley bound at the beginning, over 60 additional painted heraldic shields and two small bust-length portraits added in the margins [see below]. Extensive repair work to the blank margins of the title-page, title-page a little grubby, some staining and minor repair work to the upper fore-corner of the following two leaves, a number of leaves from the first quire appear to have been reinserted on stubs, occasional discolouration and show-through caused by the heavy colouring and oxidisation of the woodcuts, some occasional light damp staining along the lower edge in places, extensive staining caused by the colouring and annotations to C3-C8, small paper repair in the lower inner margin of C8 (not touching the text), heavy brown staining to L1-L5, M3-N2 and Aa1-Bb2, green paint just beginning to crack on a single shield on L4v, inner margin of Z3 repaired, partial repair to the blank fore-margin of Bb4 and Cc1 (not touching the text), very small worm hole in the lower blank margin of Ff4 and Gg4, neat closed tear to Gg4 and an old repair in the inner margin, final couple of leaves a little browned.

Mid-19th-century polished calf, covers panelled in gilt, spine tooled in gilt with a brown morocco label in the second panel, marbled endleaves (joints and edges rubbed and a little worn).

STC 3393.

William Bromley annotates John Bossewell's Workes of Armorie for the young Hugh Cholmondeley.
The extensive additional manuscript materials by William Bromley of Nantwich in the margins of this book were designed to place the young Hugh Cholmondeley (1552-1601), the eldest son of Sir Hugh Cholmondeley (d. 1571), firmly within the context of his own family and their lengthy and powerful dynasty. The Cholmondeley family could trace their Cheshire roots back to the Norman conquest but Hugh Cholmondeley would have only been in his early twenties when this book was borrowed from him by his kinsman William Bromley and returned in May 1574. As a teenager in 1569 Cholmondeley had accompanied 130 soldiers under the command of his father to suppress a Northern rebellion. In 1574 – when the book was given back by Bromley – his mother had died and his father had just, or was on the brink of, marrying his second wife, Mary (d. 1588), daughter of Sir William Griffiths of Penrhyn, Chamberlain of North Wales, and widow of Sir Randall Brereton of Malpas, Cheshire (though all his children were by his first marriage). Now in his majority, as William Bromley expressly states in his manuscript letter at the beginning of this volume it was important that the young Hugh Cholmondeley learn, “of whom you be discended”.

In 1544 the elder Sir Hugh Cholmondeley of Cholmondeley (b. before 1513 - 6 Jan. 1596/7) – the second of three sons of Richard Cholmondeley (d. 1573/68) - was knighted for his services during an attack on Edinburgh and Leith in Henry VIII’s renewed war with Scotland. Basil Morgan, in the ODNB, states that Cholmondeley spent most of the remainder of his life in “diligent local service to the crown … as commissioner in Cheshire for musters, chantries, relief, church goods, piracy, and ecclesiastical causes; a JP for Cheshire and Shropshire; five times sheriff of Cheshire [lastly in 1888], once of Flintshire; and a deputy lieutenant for Cheshire in 1569, 1585, and 1587”. He was also Vice-President of the Queen’s Council in the Marches of Wales.

Hugh Cholmondeley the younger would be M.P. for Cheshire in 1585 and was knighted in 1588, and was High Sheriff of Cheshire in 1589. He married Mary (1563-1625), daughter and heiress of Christopher Holford of Holford and they had five sons and three daughters. Hugh died at Cholmondeley on 23 July 1601 and was buried in Malpas Church. His widow acquired the estate of Vale Royal and was named “The Bold Lady of Cheshire” by King James on his visit there in 1616. She died at Vale Royal on 15 August 1625 and was buried at Malpas. From their son Hugh descend the Marquesses of Cholmondeley and from Thomas the Barons Delamere of Vale Royal.

William Bromley (the annotator of this volume) appears to be the son of William Bromley of Nantwich (born c.1535- after 1554), M.P. for Liverpool (1553-54). He was the 6th son & heir of Sir John Bromley and his 1st wife Martha, one of six daughters of Sir Richard Woodville, 1st Earl Rivers (d. 1469) and Jacquetta de Luxembourg, Duchess of Bedford (c. 1416-72). Martha’s eldest sister Elizabeth Woodville married King Edward IV secretly in 1464. After the defeat of Edward IV at the Battle of Edgcote Earl Rivers and one of his sons, Sir John Woodville, were executed by order of the Earl of Warwick at Kenilworth on 12 August 1469 (the arms of “Woodyle, Earle Rivers” have been added in the margin of f. 39r). According to the History of Parliament, the elder Bromley was “related to the well-known legal family [of Shropshire, for whom see ODNB], and is described in the visitations of Shropshire and Cheshire as comptroller to the Earl of Derby. Since the Earl exercised considerable influence in Liverpool, usually nominating one Member, it must have been this William Bromley who sat four times for Liverpool and not any of his namesakes”, The History of Parliament goes on to state that Bromley was probably already deceased when his eldest son, William, married the daughter of Edward Underhill who was called Eleanor or Ellin (born c. 1549). In The Underhills of Warwickshire, J. H. Morrison stated that William Bromley (junior), “of Darnford nere Namptwich” died on June 9th 1592 leaving a son and heir, Thomas, who was aged 16 years, 6 months and 23 days (p. 51). The Bromley arms, as painted on the inserted leaf after the title (see below), include the griffin rampant of Earl Rivers on an escutcheon [fig.1] and, as one of many great-grandchildren of Rivers and Jacquetta de Luxembourg, William Bromley was related to many of the grandest noble families in England and Europe.
To the right honorable and his singular good lorde, Sir William Cecil, Baron of Burghleigh, Knight of the most noble order of the Garter, Lord the Treasurer of England, master of the courts of Wards and Liveries, Chancellor of the University of Cambridge, and one of the Twelve Masticaries, &c. unto you with the best entreaties of honor, I am your humble servant, and as to your most excellent request, that I could little have said some while written in our nation tongue of the science and skill of Armoiries, truly in my opinion, to be very fruitful and necessary, and honorable argument, but might I desire, or were it of sufficient, as Tullius in his Tusculanes, in the comparison between the Romans and the Greeks, which might exceed other, or be more amenable in knowledge, faith, and all of the lay-neglects, Honor altars arising, intend not against the assertion. Surely we neglect, but as in all other things, so in science, what may be so service, whereby the signification is neglected, what activity is where men lie down to sleep, with fiddly, what love, what friend, whom no man builds on faith, or credit, to take honor from law, rewards of Philosophers, admiration from mathematicians, and yet from heavenly science, and let for his fame to schools for them who doubt fully said with us, wisely, a hope, rewards, and learning, above. Yet fame there are, that feeds not altogether of this honor, and they rage together the few sparks of knowledge, and almost dead in the silence of solitudes, and rather than false build a fire.
William Bromley signed the manuscript letter at the beginning of this volume (see below) from “Namptwiche” (Nantwich, a market town in Cheshire). In a rare first person note in this volume, Bromley also states that “I have seen this other coate in the glasses wyndows at the Earle of Derbys Manor Howse of Colham”, which he may have visited with his father when he was the earl’s comptroller. Although something is known about Bromley’s father, it becomes fairly difficult to trace William the younger.

At the heart of this volume is Bossewell’s printed book on the science of heraldry, but this has become a platform for William Bromley to direct the young Hugh Cholmondeley through the science of heraldry, the history of the Cholmondeley family, and the position of that family in the context of the armorial families of the north-western counties of Cheshire and Shropshire.

The volume opens with a full-page painted coat-of-arms with six quarterings of the elder Sir Hugh Cholmondeley (c.1513-1587) as a frontispiece. Bromley states that he wishes the young man to know “what sondrie coates be therein marshalled, but also by what names & tytles, you beare them” – the quarterings of the Cholmondeley arms are explained on the 4th page of the two-leaf insertion between the title and the dedication is expanded upon in the margins throughout the book. Bromley includes several references in his notes to Gerard Legh’s The accedens of armory (1568, and later edns) but he gives no other source for his heraldic knowledge and admits his amateur status more than once in his notes, e.g. “But I referre myne oppynyon herin the Heralds with condigne reverence to their Authorityes” (Book III, f. 20v).

Bound between the title-page and the dedication are 2 leaves of manuscript that have never been studied despite the volume’s regular appearance at auction in the last 150 years. The first page contains two poems describing the Cholmondeley arms, “Blason by Colours” (10 lines, beginning “This Worthie Knight doith beare at home, likewise abroade in fielde for his Ensigne in Armorie, Dan Mars his Gulye Shielde.”) and “Blason by Stones” (6 lines, beginning “And on a Torce of Topace pure, & the riche Rubye redde, / a demye Griffon sergeant, doith stand upon his headle”). Beneath the poem is a painting of the arms of William Bromley suspended from a tree with a skull at the foot and the motto “Vivet post funera Virtus. W. Bromley, Ao D[ni] 1574”.

This is followed by a 2pp (64-line) manuscript letter (dated 29th May 1574) signed by “W. Bromley” addressed to “the right wurshipfull Mr Hugh Cholmondeley. Esquire”.

Bromley’s letter, filled with alliterative flourishes, begins with a reference to him returning the book to Cholmondeley which he had borrowed during a period of sickness since Christmas and is an extended apologia for having annotated and illustrated his book “in the margent & other voyde places”:
“I have found your book so friendly a companion in my sickness since the last Christmas, that I thought I might not (without reproach) send him away in his old suit of Silver & Sable [i.e. black & white]. But pulling that Winter Liveraye from his back, I have revested him against this Summer in somewhat more gallant Garments of sondrie fresshe & fflorishing colours. In fframyng & fyttting whereof you may well perceive some part of good will, then any piece of cunninge. I have (in the margent & other voyde places) added .60. Coate Armoiries or above, the wch although they have some resemblance to some of the printed coats that be on the same pages where they be poutrayed, either in partycon of the shields, or Tokens therein charged: yet doe they greatly differ both in order of bearing & blason and may serve somewhat for your instruction in what sondrie partes things me be borne for the avoyding of challenge, and therefore I trust you will not thinke them altogether incongruently placed. And first I have sett firstleye your fatheres Achievement [the frontispiece], wherein I wolde wishe you to be skillfull (however you do with the rest) that you shalte not onlie knowe what sondrie coats be therin marshalled, but also what names & tytles you beare them: wth their several colours & tokens, & teames of blason therto appartaynyng. The wch I thynk to be very convenient for thereby you shall not onlie Learne sondrie necessarie pointes belonging to this excellent Seyens of Heraultrye, but also knowe whoe & what they were of whom you be descended. Whoe, although devouringe Death hath distanced their deadde bodies, [and] consuminge tyme brought their humane shape into oblyvion: yet doe their worthiest virtues still flouryshe in the House of flame. Where their Ensignes remaine [-] of Royall Rewarded: for their valiaunt & doughtie desartes. ffor, whoe is he [whoe] having any skill in this worthie Science that shall beholde your Gulie Shielde charged wth such noble & Auncynte tokens Armoriall but he will straightways Judge, that yor Auncester (to whom it was ffirst given) did noe lesse desarve it, for his Manlye & martiall prowess: then the Heraules made, that ffirst devised the same? And by a certayn secret instynt of Nature, every perfyte Gentleman is drawn to Love & reverence his old unknowne Auncestors, whose badge he bearith: soe is he greatlie bounden to honor this Noble Science, wch resarvith to memorye the Monumentes of those antique tymes wherein they lyved. Representing to posteritye those their atchieved Ensignes, as perfyte patternes of their heroicall vertues. Imprynting wth all in ryche & gentle Spirite, an earnest zeale rather to Imytate the same whereby their Names maye be eternyzed: then gredelie to gape after their possessions & patrymonyes & being but thinges of a transytorie substaunce. And as I knowe your gentle Spirite to be capable of that Impression, whereby you are stirred up to love & lyking of this & other gentlemanlie Qualyties soe was I drawen to bestowe this small labour, wch hoping it will be some furtheraunce to yor desyred purpose. The ffaultes I trust you will ffrendlie favour, waighing that yt was neither prentyce wth Pygmalion, nor Apelles, nor fostred in the house of flame: but brought up in a brutish barrayne Soyle scante worthie to sarve as the poorest page in the statelie [?] of prudent Pallas, chiefe Patronesse of thies Martiall devises. But if skill & goodwill were equall, you maye be assured it shulde appeare in matters of greater consequence. Thus not doubting, but you will practise this pleasant exercice with hartie desier of your advauncement I take my leave. At the Namptwiche the :29: of Maye 1574. & your poore Kynnesman to Commande. W. Bromley.”

The fourth page (facing the dedication leaf) explains the heraldic structure of the six quarterings of the Cholmondeley arms in a point-by-point format [fig.2]. Below this, and separated by an intricate floral band heightened with silver and gold, is a biographical note describing the armorial:

“The atchievement thus blased doith appartaigne to the right Wurshipfull Sir Hugh Cholmondeley of Cholmondeley, in the Countie of Chester Knight, High Stewarde of the Towne & Baronye of the Wiche Malbancke in the countye aforesaid & one of the pryncypall Barons of the Cheafist & most part of the said Baronye, also Vice presydent of the Queenes Majesties honorable Counsell establysshed in the Marches of Wales. Anno Dni. 1574”. Bromley also notes that he has added at either side of the shield two “satyres” which are holding “salt barowes” (conical wicker
The armorial bearings are described, including:

1. Bearbeit Armorial, of three pieces Or and Sable, on a quarter Ermine, one mullet Argent. I took the device of this coat as I found it in a glass window, but within the parochial church of Lisleburn in the county of Hereford, by what name it then bore, there could not be known.

2. Bearbeit lozengy, Argent, and a quarter Sable.

3. Bearbeit Ermine, two bars Sable, a quarter Gules, and a quarter Argent.

4. Bearbeit, two pales Or, on a quarter Sable, one on each side Argent, a quarter of a Pale argent, and a quarter of a Pale sable.

5. Bearbeit Ermine, of three pieces Or and Sable, a quarter of a Pale argent, and a quarter of a Pale sable.

6. Bearbeit Ermine, of three pieces Or and Sable, a quarter of a Pale argent, and a quarter of a Pale sable.

7. Bearbeit Ermine, of three pieces Or and Sable, a quarter of a Pale argent, and a quarter of a Pale sable.

8. Bearbeit Ermine, of three pieces Or and Sable, a quarter of a Pale argent, and a quarter of a Pale sable.

9. Bearbeit Ermine, of three pieces Or and Sable, a quarter of a Pale argent, and a quarter of a Pale sable.

10. Bearbeit Ermine, of three pieces Or and Sable, a quarter of a Pale argent, and a quarter of a Pale sable.

11. Bearbeit Ermine, of three pieces Or and Sable, a quarter of a Pale argent, and a quarter of a Pale sable.

12. Bearbeit Ermine, of three pieces Or and Sable, a quarter of a Pale argent, and a quarter of a Pale sable.
baskets which allowed the salt brine to drain). These are intended as “fytt furniture” to represent the “jurisdiction […] that Sir Hugh hath in the Towne & Baronye of Wychemalbancke”. Nantwich and the surrounding area was famous for its salt production from the Roman period. The last 5 lines of this note have been cut-off and pasted to the back of the armorial frontispiece.

Within the text itself, among the first coat-of-arms that Bromley draws the young Cholmondeley’s attention to, apart from those of Bromley itself, (f. 27r) is that of the “The Towne of Wiche Malbancke” in “the Countye of Chester” (f. 27v). Bromley explains that the name of the town changed to Namptwyche “after the con-quest of this Realme by Duke William of Normandye; surnamed Conqueror” (f.28). Bromley is able to put Namptwyche (Nantwich today) into context within Chester whilst also highlighting its link to William the Conqueror. Nantwich was also of particular interest to Bromley as this is where he had been born and near where he lived.

At the end of the volume Bromley has also included two striking portrait miniatures [fig.4] of a man and woman dated 1574 on facing pages (Book III, f. 22v & 23r; the latter is slightly cropped at the foot and the blue backgrounds have partly degraded to red); both are dated 1574 in gold. It is not entirely clear who these two people are but it seems most likely that they represent the elder Sir Hugh Cholmondeley and his late wife Ann or Amy (d. 1571), daughter to Sir George Dorman, of Malpas, Cheshire (mother of the recipient of the volume). The woman’s portrait is surmounted by a winged bleeding heart motif and a celestial crown suspended from a cloud (so she is clearly deceased) and on a ribbon is the motto “Fac ut Mereas” beneath which Bromley has written “Aut Venus Aut Gorgon. / Yf Beautie cause men to disdaigne Medusa’s head though mayest obtaine” (there is a woodcut of Medusa’s head on a shield on the page opposite). No doubt they were copied from original panel paintings in the family house. There are a number of images online of the tomb-chest of Sir Hugh Cholmondeley and his second wife at St Oswald’s Church, Malpas which show two similar figures in alabaster. Bizarrely, it was suggested by Swann auctioneers in 1948 that the female portrait was of Elizabeth I and the man the Prince d’Anjou. Clearly the two portraits require further research.

Sir Hugh Cholmondeley the younger followed William Bromley’s advice and maintained an interest in his family history and heraldry. In 1597 the antiquary Sampson Ereswick (c. 1538-1603), who had estates in Cheshire and Staffordshire, was working on a pedigree of the Cholmondeley family for Sir Hugh. On 17 November 1597 he wrote to Sir Hugh from London: “Sir at the length I have founde a time to trace forth ye dissent according to ye noats I have receved of yor evidence such recorded as myself have ... and whereof noe appearance sheweth (as yet) to contradict the same.” This letter, bound with a watercolour of the Cholmondeley arms, a draft pedigree of the Cholmondeley descent, and other genealogical manuscripts was sold at Forum Auctions (25/1/2017, lot 138).

Geoffrey Whitney’s Choice of Emblemes, and other devises (Leiden, 1586). Both Sir Hugh Cholmondeley and his son Hugh the younger were the dedicatees of emblems and poems devised by Geoffrey Whitney (1548?-1600/01) who was born and educated in Cheshire, near Nantwich. Sir Hugh the elder’s emblem on p. 130 is the “Dicta septem sapientem”, the sayings of the Seven Sages of Greece and depicts a Sage mounted on a donkey with their names inscribed on banners and their attributes above. Hugh the younger’s emblem is “Ex bello, pax” and depicts a swarm of bees inside a knight’s helmet, their sweet honey being “the blessed fruiteres of peace.”

Early Provenance: 1. Sir Hugh Cholmondeley, Kt. (1552-1601), of Cholmondeley, Cheshire. Borrowed from him at Christmas 1573 and returned on 29 May 1574 by his “Kynnesman to Commaunde”, William Bromley, with numerous additions, annotations, hand-colouring and a 2-page manuscript letter by Bromley bound-in.

2. Signatures of “R W Ratcliffe” at the head of the first manuscript page,[fig.2] “Sum E Libris R. W. Ratcliffe 1687” (on A1r) and “Rob W. Ratcliffe me jure tenet 1687” at the head of the dedication with “Ex dono Jos: Stoner Higgs Lond.” below [fig.2], and (in Ratcliffe’s hand) “Ex Dono Jos: Stoner Higgs Call[ends]: Januar: 1687/8.” (C1v).

3. George Baker of Cringleford [Norfolk], late 18th-century flourished, [fig.4]
signature on the verso of the title-page.

4. George Wilkinson, early 19th-century signature to the upper blank margin of the title-page [fig. 5].

Later Provenance: 1. William Strong, Bookseller of 26 Clare Street, Bristol, offered in his, A Catalogue of British History and Topography (1840), no. 419 "a very curious and interesting volume, containing many additional arms, and numerous MS. additions by W. Bromley, 1574", then newly bound, £2/12/6d. 2. Rev. Dr Henry Wellesley (1794-1866), Principal of New Inn Hall, Oxford, curator of the Bodleian Library, curator of the Ashmolean Museum and Taylor Institute; collector of old master drawings, and topographical and historical prints, manuscripts and coins. Lot 1100 in the sale of his library, Sotheby, 8/11/1866 (and on the following fourteen days), sold for £2/2/- to Quaritch. 3. Quaritch Catalogue of June 1868, no. 11556 (£3/3/-) "fine edition, black letter, 400 coats of Arms, the arms emblazoned, and with numerous additions and alterations by W. Bromley, 1574, for Sir Hugh Cholmondeley, whose arms face the title-page, panelled calf £3 3s."

A LOUVAIN INCUNABLE CAREFULLY ANNOTATED BY A 17TH-CENTURY ENGLISH READER

CRESCENTIIIS [or CRESCENZI] (Petrus de), annotated by SCATTERGOOD (Anthony).

Liber ruralium commodorum.

Louvain: Johannes de Westfalia, c.1483

£28,000

Third Edition. Chancery Folio in 8s. [Text: 270 x 200 mm]. 195 leaves (of 196, lacking at blank). Collates: a–n8, o6, aa–kk8, ll6. Text printed in 2 columns, 41 lines; type 1B**: 89/90G, blank spaces for capitals. Three stocks of paper with watermarks of an eight-pointed star, gothic "p", and a Habsburg crowned double-headed eagle displayed. Rubricated throughout in the printer's workshop (the Liege, Heidelberg and former Evelyn family copy all rubricated in the same style if not the same hand) with 2- to 6-line initials and paragraph-marks, all in red. Large copy with all the pin-holes intact in the fore-margins; first and last leaves a little dusty and the first slightly frayed at the bottom edge; occasional minor stains, marks, and a little damp in the inner margins, otherwise a good, fresh copy. Early 17th-century English plain calf over pasteboards sewn on five alum-tawed leather bands, covers panelled in blind and with a small flower-head in the corners, lettered in ink on the top edge "PETRUS de CRESCENTIA" (rebacked, parts of the original spine preserved, rather worn and rubbed).

ISTC ic00966500. C 1839. BMC IX 145. Bod-inc C-479. GW 7822. IGI 3262. Klebs 310.4. First printed at Augsburg by Johann Schussler (about 16 Feb. 1471). This is the second of three editions printed in Louvain in the Low Countries by Johannes de Westfalia. The first is dated 9 December 1474 and the third "about 1486-97". ISTC records 26 holding institutions (including the present copy, formerly at Harpenden Rothamsted Experimental Station); Belgium 3 copies (including 1 imperfect, 1 destroyed [Leuven]), UK: 9 copies (inc. 1 fragment, 1 imperfect). France: 1 copy; Germany: 7 copies. Italy: 3 copies. The Netherlands: 1 copy; Poland: 1 copy (imperfect). USA: 1 copy (Harvard). Vatican: 1 copy. Of the first edition of 1471 ISTC records 70 holding institutions; of the first Louvain edition 48, and of the third 27.

An important resource nearly 200 years after it was printed: Anthony Scattergood's (1611-1687) annotated copy comparing Crescenzi with contemporary writers.
Pietro de Crescenzi (c.1230/35-c.1320)’s work is divided into twelve books covering planting locations, provision of water, plants in general, cultivation of fields and crops and construction of granaries, vines, fruit trees, herbs and herb gardens, meadows and woods, gardens, and animals and their breeding and care (including apiculture), hunting and hawking and an agenda for works to be done in each month of the year. The most cited author is Palladius (103 citations), followed by Avicenna’s Canon and Varro’s De re rustica, but many others are mentioned, in many cases the knowledge being gained secondhand.

The work, as the number of manuscripts and printed editions attests, was hugely popular and widely used. There are roughly a hundred surviving manuscripts of the text. It was a book owned by kings: Edward IV had a splendid manuscript written for him in about 1480 in the Low Countries (Royal 14 E VI in the BL) which was later owned by Henry VIII, who also owned a copy of this illustrated edition (now at Windsor in the Royal Library for which it was acquired in Queen Victoria’s reign). In New York the Morgan Library has a manuscript written in England 1400-1430 (MS B 17) as well as a famous illuminated manuscript made in the Low Countries (MS 232). There is also another such manuscript in the Arsenal Library in Paris (MS 5064). In the Belt Library at the University of California (MS 67) is a manuscript of the work dated 20 December 1466, and thus written not long before the first printed edition, written by his son Giovanni for Benalio di Benali (see Mirella Ferrari, Medieval & Renaissance Manuscripts at the University of California, Los Angeles, 1991, p. 5).

It is noteworthy that Scattergood is using a book which had been printed almost two hundred years earlier as a source for information on horticulture in the 17th century. Crescenzi’s own work is based on much older sources and so we have here evidence of a long legacy of use. Scattergood is also clearly using his copy of Crescenzi alongside contemporary printed works by writers such as John Evelyn and Samuel Hartlib providing important evidence for the way in which a wide range of printed texts - printed over a long period of time - could be contrasted and compared. Scattergood’s annotations also sit alongside much older annotations in the book (some of which appear to be in English [see below]) and these are clear evidence of the repeated use of the text as a source for information on horticulture.

Early Provenance: Book numbers added in ink at the head of each page in a contemporary hand. Early ink cypher which could comprise ‘EHKLORSTX’ with associated proverb “Ars durat ars manet / fortuna recedere curat” at the head of a1r. Occasional annotations in Latin [fig.2] with a few words in English in three or four 16th-century hands, probably all English; these are more frequent in Book 5 (on trees and their uses) and Book 6 (on herbs and their uses) where attention is often
FIG. 3
drawn to their medicinal benefits, e.g. “contra tristicia et multa alia” (l8r), “nota bene hoc capitulum” (n5v), “modycwort dicto mogwort” (of Artemisia; m2v). On n4v is an ink sketch of an elder tree [fig.4]. On the blank verso of the final leaf is a mid-16th-century ink inscription: “Hoc magnum studium quod nunc floret ad vada Bourn, Ante finem feculi florebit ad vada Saxi.”, an old proverb, claimed to be a prophecy of Merlin, concerning the foundation of Cambridge University (“Science that now o’er Oxford holds her sway / Shall bless fair Stamford at some future day”) and would suggest a writer with a Cambridge connection.

Later Provenance: Rev. Anthony Scattergood, D.D. (1611-87), with his signature “Anton. Scattergood” at the head of a1r with a heavily-inked-out inscription beneath [fig.5]. Anthony Scattergood was educated at Trinity College, Cambridge (B.A. 1633, M.A. 1636, D.D. 1662) where he was a chaplain in 1637-40 and tutor in 1640. He was rector of Winwick, Northants. (1641-87), and rector of Yelvertoft, Northants. (1670-97). As a student he was something of a poet and his Commonplace Book is in the British Library (MS Add. 44963). In 1653 he published an anonymous Latin commentary on the Old Testament and St Paul’s Letter to the Ephesians he found in the library of John Williams, then Bishop of Lincoln. In 1662 he was appointed to work on the proofs of the 1662 Book of Common Prayer and he was praised in his D.D. award for his work on the companion volume of Critici sacri to Walton’s Polyglot Bible, he was an expert etymologist, and published two sermons. His library passed to his son the Rev. Samuel Scattergood, D.D. (1646-96), graduate and fellow of Trinity College, Vicar of St Mary’s, Lichfield (1678-81), Vicar of Blockley, Worcs. (1681-96). Two of his sermons were published in his lifetime and there are two posthumous collections: Twelve Sermons (1700) and Fifty two Sermons (1723). The combined library was sold at auction by John Hartley on 26/7/1697 in almost 2000 lots. Largely theology, classics and etymology it also included Mercator’s and Speed’s atlases (the latter on large Paper), and a final section of “Libri Italici”. More surprisingly at the end is an unnumbered lot of “Divers other English and Italian Tracts both in Verse and Prose, together with betwixt Fourscore and an Hundred Italian Plays”. There are five incunables in his library: Valerius Maximus (Venice, 1495), Martial (Venice 1493), Virgil (Venice 1494), Aristotle (Venice 1498) and Gallus (Paris (1497).

In a tiny neat mid-17th-century hand are a series of lengthy ink marginal notes in English, all transcribed from contemporary printed books.

1: d8r-v [Book II, Chapter 22 “De sematione in communi”). “A Direction to the sowing of Corne [fig.1 & 3]. First, ye soyl being supposed to be such as with the usuall husbandries of Dunging, Marling, Lyming, Folding, &c., will returne in some good measure a multiplied Crop of the Grain therein sowed. ... 6. Besides all generall good; it will better all Tiths [Tithes]. In Deo interim spes omnis collocanda est.” This is extracted from an anonymous 22-page pamphlet addressed to Benedict Webbe (a clothier from Kingwood, near Bristol), A Direction to the Husbandman in a new, cheape, and easie way of Fertilising, and Inriching areable grounds, &c. (London: Augustine Mathewes, 1634; STC 6920) and comprises the bulk of the main text from B2r-C2v (the Bodley copy reproduced on EEBO lacks the title-page). A manuscript transcript of the whole tract is in the Samuel Hartlib Papers at the University of Sheffield (MS Hartlib 59/24/6, reproduced online).

2: e3r-v [Book II, Chapter 24 “De insitutionibus per quas plantae mutantur ad domesticarum dispositiones“]. “Grafting is the artificial placing of the Cyan, or Graft, of one kinde upon the stock of an other, so as the sap of the stock may with out impediment come to nourish the Graft, which is performed 4 severall ways. The first and most known is grafting in the Cleft, Plums and Cherries about the new moon in Febr. ... The best time to Inoculate is in the evening of a fair day, in a dry season, for rain falling on the Buds, before they have taken, will at times destroy ym; after three weeks you may cut away the binding, and in March following the head of the stock, three fingers above the Bud, which being well grow, cut close, that the stock may cover.”
This passage is from John Rea’s *Flora, seu, de Florum Cultura. Or, a Complete Florilege, furnished with all requisites belonging to a Florist* (London, 1665, repr. 1676, 1702), Book III (Pomona), pp. 105-07.

3: n1v [Book V, Chapter 49 “De rosaria”]. “To have Roses late. Cut your Rose-Trees when they are ready to bud about the Change of the Moon & they will begin to bud when other Rose-trees have done bearing. This is an excellent secret, if Frosts happen in Budding-time: for you may have store of Roses when others shall have few or none.” [*fig.6*]

This short extract is closely derived from Sir Hugh Plat, *Floraes Paradise, beautified and adorned with sundry sorts of delicate fruites and flowers* (London, 1608, pp. 90-1; repr. as *The Garden of Eden, Or, an accurate of all flowers and fruits now growing in England* (London, 1653, pp. 95-6; and later eds)) which begins: “Cut your Roses when they are ready to bud in an apt time of the Moon, and they will begin to bud, when other Roses are done bearing: this is an excellent secret, if frosts happen in budding time: for so may have store of roses, when others have few or none.” [*fig.6*]

This secret was also published in *Appiroscopie: Or, a Compliat and Faithful History of Experiments and Observations: ... By T. Snow* [i.e. Richard Neve] (London, 1702, p. 1153; reissued as *Arts Improvement: ... By T.S.* (London, 1703)).

4: ll2v [Book XII “de his que singulis mensibus possunt in rure agi” (a monthly calendar of things to be done)]. “In Januarie/Trench ye Ground and make it ready for the Spring: prepare Soil, and use it where you have occasion: Dig borders, &c. uncover as yet Roots of trees, where Ablaqueation is requisite. ... In over wet, or hard weather, cleanse, mend, sharpen and prepare Garden-tools. Turn up your Bee-hives, and sprinkle them with a little warm and sweet wort. Fruits in Prime, or yet lasting. Apples. Kentish-pepin, Russet-pepin, ... Winter-pearmain. Pears. Winter-musk (bakes well), Winter-Norwich (excellent baked), Winter-Bergamot, Winter Bon-chrestien, both Mural: the great Surrerin.”

ll2v-3v: “In Februarie. ... Prune Fruit-trees and Vines, as yet. Remove Graffs of former years grafting. Cut and lay Quick-sets. ... Lastly, half open your passages for the Bees, or a little before (if the weather invites) but continue to feed weake stocks &c. ... Fruits in Prime or yet lasting. Apples. Kentish-pepin, ... Pearmain, John-apple. Pears. Winter Bon-chrestien, Winter-Peppering. Little Dagobert.”

ll3v-4: “In March. ...” “In April. ...” “In May. ...” “In June. ...” “In September. ...” “In October. ...” “In November. ...” “In December. Prune and Nail Wall Fruits, and standard Trees. You may now plant Vines, & also Stocks for Grafting. ... Turn and refresh your Autumnall Fruit, lest it taint, and open the windows where it lies, in a clear and serene Day. Fruits in Prime, or yet lasting, Apples, Russetting; Leather-Coat. ... Pears. The Squib-pear, Virgin, Gascoigne-Bergamot, Scarlet-pear, Stopple-pear, white, red and French Wardens, &c.”

These passages are all taken verbatim from the first (unrevised) edition of John Evelyn’s *Kalendarium Hortense: or the Gard’ners Almanac; Directing what he is to do Monethly, throughout the Year*. It was published as an appendix to the first edition of *Sylva, or a Discourse of Forest-Trees* (London, 1664; lifetime reprints 1670, 1679 and 1706). Each month is divided into two parts: “To be done in the Orchard, and Olitory-Garden [Kitchen Garden]” and “To be done in the Parterre, and Flower-Garden.” For each month the first part only has been transcribed in full. The text was revised for a separate edition, *Kalendarium Hortense* (1664; much reprinted) and the second (1666) and later editions of *Sylva*.

Modern Provenance: The Lawes Agricultural Library, Rothamsted Experimental Research Station, Harpenden, Hertfordshire (an old typed description loosely inserted has an ink number “4709/1922” which suggests 1922 as the purchase date). The Research Station was founded on farmland owned by Sir John Bennet Lawes, 1st Baronet (1834-1900), an agricultural chemist, and the library of early agricultural books (one of the best in the world) was formed by Sir (Edward) John Russell, Kt (1872-1965), director from 1912-43; the library was sold at Forum Auctions, 10/7/2018, where this was Lot 9.
"THIS NEVER, NEVER CAN BE THE NATURAL STATE OF A HUMAN BEING"

3 LAW (William), annotated by COLERIDGE (Samuel Taylor).

A Serious Call to a Devout and Holy Life. Adapted to the State and Condition of all Orders of Christians.

London: G. Robinson, 1772

£28,000

Tenth Edition. Small 8vo (172 x 100mm). vi, 353, [1] pp. Small ink blot to the title-page some marking in places throughout, four circular stains to leaves F5-6. 19th-century blind panelled calf by Nutt of Cambridge, red and green morocco labels to the spine, later gilt edges (rebacked preserving the old spine).

"Shut not thy heart, nor thy library against S.T.C.": Wordsworth's copy annotated by Coleridge.

A copy of Law's most popular work from the library of William Wordsworth which has been read and annotated by his friend and fellow poet, Samuel Taylor Coleridge (possibly when Coleridge was staying with Wordsworth and his sister Dorothy between June 1809 and March 1810 at Grasmere). Coleridge's long and passionate annotation (approximately 90 words) covers the entire lower blank margins of p.166-7:

"The thought that haunts me whenever I read this excellent book is the spirit of religious selfishness or rather selfness that prevades it. Generosity in act is everywhere enforced, and even in principle; but still the habit of the imagination is purely about my soul, my heart, the Spirit of God for me, etc etc. This never, never can be the natural state of a human being; it makes every movement of the mind too much an act of full consciousness. Even in common life we instinctively dislike self-conscious folks -- no odds, whether humility or pride".

The long annotation by Coleridge was published in George Whalley's Coleridge Marginalia (Princeton University Press, 1980) from a 19th-century transcription (itself based on transcriptions) in the Transactions of the Royal Society of Literature (2nd series IX (1870) p.433). This book has been unavailable to scholars since the 19th century. The modern editor ascribes Coleridge's annotation to a passage by Law on early rising, but it is clear looking at the book itself that Coleridge is commenting...
on the text as a whole but also on the wider concerns of the passage which included the measuring of self enjoyment, gluttony and “notorious acts of intemperance”. If this book was annotated by Coleridge when he was staying with William and Dorothy Wordsworth in Grasmere it was a period of Coleridge’s life when he was attempting to throw off his opium addiction, leaving him “unfitted by temperament for any course of action demanding application” (ODNB). With this in mind, Coleridge’s annotation and his reading of Law in general appears strikingly pertinent.

Pamela Edwards in her essay “Coleridge on Politics and Religion” notes that Coleridge “drew heavily” on Law’s work when writing Aids to Reflection as he attempted to establish “the foundations of true theology in distinction to false religion” (The Oxford Handbook of Samuel Taylor Coleridge, edited by Frederick Burwick, p.243).

Coleridge read voraciously from an early age - he claimed, according to the ODNB, “to have read a book of the Bible by the time he was three, and the Arabian Nights when he was five”. His father was so disturbed by his addiction to romances and tales of magic that he set fire to a number of his books. Coleridge described himself as a “library-cormorant” and annotated an enormous number of books, enough to fill numerous large volumes of marginalia in his collected works and consolidate his reputation “as a brilliant writer in the minor and somewhat suspect genre of marginal commentary” (H.R. Jackson, “Coleridge as Reader”, in The Oxford Handbook of Samuel Taylor Coleridge ed. Frederick Burwick (2009) p. 273). Jackson goes on to argue that “the once scattered marginalia deserve to be taken into account in studies of Coleridge’s life and writings, especially since they have now been conveniently and reliably brought together” (p.273).

“The annotated books provide a vivid image of the working of his mind, the occasion of writing and the relative order in which the notes were written, sometimes layer on layer” (Whalley BG)

This book is listed as No. 67 (of 141) in George Whalley’s “Coleridge Marginalia Lost” in The Book Collector, Winter 1968 as “In the possession of Alexander Macmillan in 1870”. It is again reported as “not located” in George Whalley’s exhaustive collected edition of Coleridge Marginalia (Princeton University Press, 1980) with the long annotation, “published from an appendix to C.M. Ingleby ‘On Some Points Connected with the Philosophy of Coleridge’ Transactions of the Royal Society of Literature. 2nd series ix (1870)”. A copy of Law’s A Serious Call is listed in the sale catalogue of Wordsworth’s library (no.223, with no date of publication given) and also in the manuscript catalogue of Wordsworth’s library at the Houghton Library (listed as “Law’s Call”). See Wordsworth’s Library ed. Chester Linn Shaver (1979).

Provenance: Alexander MacMillan (1818-1896), publisher and co-founder of Macmillan Publishers. Noted as being in the possession of Macmillan in 1870 by George Whalley in The Book Collector [see above]. This volume does not have Macmillan’s bookplate (which is present in another book from Coleridge’s library - Henry More’s Philosophicall Poems [see following item], which we purchased with this book.
"Strange and sometimes uncouth as he is, there are lines and passages of the highest poetry and most exquisite beauty". A great influence on Coleridge, extensively annotated by the poet and almost certainly the copy used by Coleridge for his heated discussion (with Southey) of More in *Omniana* (1812).

The first collected edition of More's poems, the celebrated leader of the Cambridge Platonists. The important poem “Psychozoia, or the Life of the Soul” had been first printed in Cambridge in 1642 but appears here in a much longer, revised and annotated form. It was “Psychozoia” which fascinated Coleridge but led to a heated exchange with Southey in *Omniana* - the annotations in this volume reflect that
conflict. Southey wrote of the poem: “There is perhaps no other poem in existence which has so little that is good in it, if it has anything good” (Omniana p.157). Coleridge countered that: “Southey must have wearied himself out with the poem, till the mists from its swamps and stagnants had spread over its flowery pots and and bowers” (Table Talk p.339).

In George Whalley’s “Coleridge Marginalia Lost”, a list of books known to have been owned by Coleridge but which have remained untraced, this volume appears as no. 79 (recording ten annotations) and stating that it was last traced in the sale catalogue of Robert Southey’s library. A copy of More’s Philosophiall Poems appears as lot 199 in the Catalogue of the Valuable Library of the Late Robert Southey (1844, bought by “Petheran”, presumably John Petheran, London bookseller) where it is marked with an asterix to denote (“at the particular request of some of the Friends of the late Poet Laureate”) that the volume contains “his [Southey’s] Autograph”. This copy certainly belonged to Coleridge but does not have Southey’s signature. Some of the short marginal notes may be by Southey and they certainly echo many of his feelings towards More. It appears that Whalley may have been wrong about Coleridge’s copy of this book being sold in the sale of Southey’s library as we have traced another copy offered for sale in 1818 which has an identical manuscript note in it [see below]. The annotations by Coleridge are typically performative though and provide important evidence for Coleridge’s reading of More and his feelings on poetry in general.

Coleridge begins by providing a long passionate summary note of his feelings on More on the front flyleaf of this volume:

“Ah! what strength might I gather, what comfort might we derive, from the Proclo-plotinian Platonists’ doctrine of the soul, if only they or their Spinosistic imitators, the nature-philosophers of present Germany, had told or could tell us what they meant by I and we, by pain and remorse! Poor we are nothing in act, but everything in suffering”.

A number of notes [fig.2] on the following leaf (taken from 18th and early 19th-century assessments of More) describe how Spenser was “a favourite author with him [More] from childhood” and remarks on the use of “the same octave stanza, which Spenser borrowed from the Italian poets”.

Coleridge responds to this correcting the previous note: “...not an octave, but an ennead...which Spenser did not borrow from the Italians, but, after many and various experiments, invented for himself, as a perfect whole, as it is indeed, and it only”. Coleridge then signs this note boldly “S.T. Coleridge” a clear indication that his annotations were intended to be read by others and echoing Jackson’s assertion that Coleridge was “a brilliant writer in the minor and somewhat suspect genre of marginal commentary” (H.R. Jackson, “Coleridge as Reader”, in The Oxford Handbook of Samuel Taylor Coleridge ed. Frederick Burwick (2009) p. 273).

Alongside the two long notes by Coleridge on the front leaves (approximately 120 words - signed near the end of the second note “S.T. Coleridge”), there is also a long note on the recto of the rear flyleaf (approx 250 words, also signed “S.T. Coleridge”) [fig.4] and a shorter three line note (referring to a section of the printed text) on the
FIG. 3

The Immortality of the Soul. Book 3.

Upon her self she strangely operates, 
And from her self and by her self returns 
Into her self; thus the soul circulates.

Do bodies die? Her axle-tree it burns,
With heat of motion. Thus he world the spurns,
Exhile her self to catch infinity.

Unspeakeable great numbers how the turns
Within her mind, like evening, mull the eye.
Dullness, whole muddy stems fare the wind doth fly.

Screches out time at both ends without end,
Makes place till higher swell, often creates.

What God near made, nor doth at all intend
To make, for phantasias, laugh in house fairest.

Forces her own condition, the relates
That all comprehension of eternity,
Complain she’s thristy full in all alls, that
That all the seas or has no se saucy.

His hungry self, nor fill her vast capacity.

But I’ll break off; My Muse her self forgot,
Her own great through and her foes foulblaze,
That is her name by her own pain may bies;
While she so many froward hopefuls in exult;

That fond profane plasie quite for to suppress;
Of the souls corporale see. For men may think
Her adventures through doth that her prile
To multitude of reason, makes her twinkle
With weary soily, and wear out such must forced ink:

Or that she loves with trampling inflations
To dominion in fade victory.

But let no man dare call such accusations
Against the blameless. For no matter,
Nor fruitfulle pom, nor any wayes.

Of that opinion that the best destroys
Made her so large. No, wis her selfe.

Garish witching fallhood that weak souls annoyes
And off doth chace chace chering hopes of failing joyes.
verso of the flyleaf, a five line note in the preface (Hrv) to Psychathansia responding to the printed text, a long annotation [fig.3] filling almost all of the blank space between the printed text on p.128 (The Immortality of the Soul), and a short marginal annotation a few leaves later at p.135 and a 10 line annotation in the blank space between the printed text on p.353 (Notes upon Psychozoia).

There are various additional notes throughout which may be by Robert Southey of which some are single words but others short notes. Southey in Omniana is predominantly concerned with More’s borrowings from other poets and the annotations in this volume largely tend to note similarities with poets such as Milton, Spenser and Chaucer. A note on p.7 likens More’s text to “Milton in Lycidas” with a note below observing a similarity to Spenser. There are other references to Spenser on p.86, 99 and 297 and Milton on p.32 (Comus), 69, 96, 143 (Comus), 149 (Paradise Lost) and 244 (Comus).

The annotations by Coleridge were published in George Whalley’s Coleridge Marginalia (Princeton University Press, 1980) from a 19th-century transcription (itself based on transcriptions) in the Transactions of the Royal Society of Literature (2nd series IX (1870) p.433). This book has been unavailable to scholars since the 19th century, despite the continued interest in the influence of More and the Cambridge Platonists on Coleridge’s work. The annotations in the book which are not by Coleridge also require further research as they clearly provide evidence of a detailed reader of More who had a good knowledge of Milton and Spenser.

Provenance: 1. Henry Bradshawe (d.1698), nephew of the regicide John Bradshaw, Lord President of the Commonwealth Council (1602-1659), signature on the title-page [fig.1]. 2. Samuel Taylor Coleridge (1772-1834), poet, with numerous annotations both before and in the text (a number signed S.T.C or S.T.Coleridge). 3. This copy appears to have been offered as no. 1524 in A Catalogue of Old Books in various Languages (1822) by Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme & Brown which lists a copy of More’s Philosophical Poems with a manuscript note reading: “more uses many words that are obsolete many that are provincial, and many that are entirely his own coinage”, matching the note on the flyleaf of this copy. £15s. This would make it impossible to have been the copy offered in Southey’s sale in 1844. 4. Alexander Macmillan (1818-1896), publisher and co founder of Macmillan Publishers, his bookplate on the front pastedown.
BOMBARDING THE READER: HOW GIOVANNI CEVA READ HIS PRINCIPIA. ONE OF THE MOST IMPORTANT SURVIVING TESTIMONIES TO NEWTON’S RECEPTION IN EUROPE

5

NEWTON (Isaac), annotated by CEVA (Giovanni).

Philosophiae naturalis principia mathematica … editio ultima auctior et emendatior.

Amsterdam: Sumptibus Societatis, 1714. SOLD

First Amsterdam Edition. 4to (245 x 187mm). [28], 484, [8]p., engraved title vignette and folding engraved plate at p.465. Evenly browned throughout, some later blue chalk marking to the final few leaves. Contemporary Dutch calf, spine tooled in gilt, red morocco label in the second panel (joints, corners and edges carefully refurbished). Preserved in a morocco-backed cloth box, lettered in gilt.

“To avoid being baited by little Smatterers in Mathematicks…he designedly made his Principia abstruse; but yet so as to be understood by able Mathematicians” (William Derham to John Conduitt, 8 July 1733).

A unique copy of Newton’s most important work and one of the most famous books in the history of thought: copiously annotated by the Italian mathematician Giovanni Ceva (1647-1734) providing important new evidence for the reception of Newton on the Continent and within scientific circles in Newton’s own lifetime.

Works of science do not stand still. Theories and hypotheses may be rejected or improved, and this is never more true than with Newton’s Principia which, within ten years of its first appearance in 1687, Newton was radically revising, his corrections circulating around Europe in manuscript.

The interaction of text as published by the author, and the reader, whoever that may be, is the point of a book, and where we are fortunate enough to have documentary evidence of that interaction recorded by the reader – particularly in annotations in a specific copy of the book – we have a concrete example of the effect of a book, of how it was read, and judged. If the reader is a contemporary, so much the better. If the reader is a great savant, that is better still.

Reading (and understanding) Newton, for any reader, in any time period, encounters one major problem: as Elizabethanne Boran notes in the first paragraph.
EDITORIS

Jam illud concessi aequum est, quod Mathematicis rationibus colliguitur & certamine demonstratur; Corpora semper omnino, quæ moventur in linea aliqua curva in plano descripta, quaque radii animadversione ad punctum vel quicque vel utquecumque motum describuntur, areas circa punctum illud temporalis proportionales, umeri a Vitisque ad idem punctum tendunt. Cum igitur in conflagro sit, quod Astronomos, Planetas primarios circum tellurem, secundarios vero circumpus primarios, areas describentes temporalis proportionales; consequentia est ut Vitis, quae perpetuo detractur, a Tangeribus recte, & in Orbitis curvilineis revolvit coguntur, verus corpora dirigatur quæ situnt in Orbitarum centris. Hac itaque Vitis non inepti vocari potest, respectu quidem corporis revolventis, Centripeta; respectu autem corporis centralis, Attractiva; a quaquecumque demum caule oriri fingitur.

Quia & haec quoque concedenda sunt & Mathematice demonstratur: Si corpus plura motu acquisti revolvatur in Circulo concentricis, & quadam temporis periculum sit ut cuius dilataturum est centro commune; Vires centripetas revolvuntur in quadam reciprocus ut quadrata dilataturum. Vels, si corpora revolvantur in Orbitis qui sunt Circuli concentrici, & quiqueque Orbius Apides: Vires centripetas revolvuntur fore reciprocus ut quadrata dilataturum. Obtinetur eum alterum in Planetis universis concentrium Astronomo. Itaque Vites cirpticæ Plantarum omnium sunt reciprocus ut quadrata dilataturum ad Orbitam centrum. Si quis obiecta Planetarum & Luna praeterea, Apides non penitus quiescere; sed motu quodam loco ferri in consequentia: responderi potest, etiam concedamus hanc motum tardum esse, inde profutrum esse quod Vites cirpticæ proprie abscert altissimam a duplicata, aberrationem illum per computum Mathematicum inventire potest & plane infimissime est. Ipsi enim ratio Vites cirpticæ Lunaris, quæ omnium maxime turbati debet, pullorum quidem duplicata superest; ad hanc vero sexangula ferre posse, ut Vitis cirpticæ proprie abscert altissimam a duplicata, aberrationem illum per computum Mathematicum inventire potest, non ex aberratione a duplicata proportione, sed ex altae profusio diversa caute oriri, quammodum egregie communium in hae Philosopha.

Relac ergo ut Vites cirpticæ, quibus Planetarum proprii tandem verus Solem & secundarii verus primarios supers, sint accurate ut quadrata dilataturum reciprocus.

PRÆFATIO

Ex ipsis quæ habemus dicta sunt, confit Planetas in Orbitis suis retinueri per Vitis aliam cum ipso perpetuo agmen; confit Vitis illam dirigere tempus verus Orbitarum centra; confit hujus efficace augeri in accedunt ad centrum, diminuunt in recedunt ab eodem; & augeri quidem in eadem proportione quæ diminuunt quadratum dulantur, diminuunt in eadem proportione quæ dilatant quadratum augeretur. Videamus iam, comparatione intuitu inter Planeturum Vites cirpticæ & Vitis Gravitates, eam ejusdem forte finem gerenti. Ejusdem vero generis erunt, e deprehendatur hinc & inde leges eadem caduceae aequitiones. Primo itaque Luna, quas proxima est, e circumpetam etexasim.

Sparta recte, quæ a corporibus et quie diemis datis temporibus ipsis motus initio descenduntur, ubi a virtus quibuscumque urgeantur; proportionalis tunc eis viribus, a hoc quique conqueque ratione Mathematicis. Erit igitur Vitis Luna in Orbita sua revolvatur, ad Vitis Gravitates in superficie Terra, ut fiatam quod tempore quam minimum describere luna descenderet per Vites cirpticæ versus Terram, si circulari omni motu privati genteretur, ad spatium quod eadem tempore quam minimum describire gravem corpus in visudia Terrae, per Vitis gravitates finem tunc habeatur. Horum spatium prorsus aeguale est arcus ad Terram per idem tempus descripitu luni vero, quippe quæ Luna transferatur in aequatim de Aequatore, fratrum a Vitis cirpticæ, metueat; quae adeo comparati potest ex data sum Luna tempore periodicum tam dilatatur ejus a centro Terra. Spatium poletii inventur per Experimenta Pendulorum, quammodum docuit Huygens. Inte itaque calculo, frigium prorsus ad spatium poletii, seu Vitis cirpticæ Luna in Orbita sua revolvatur ad Vitis Gravitates in superficie Terra, erat quadrantum semidiverticulae Terra ad Orbita semidiverticula quadraturum. Eandem habet rationem, per ea quae superficies offensiva; ad spatium Luna in Orbita sua revolvatur etiam Terra circumcita proprie Terra superficiem. Vitis cirpticæ proprie Terra superficiem aequales est Vitis Gravitates. Non ergo diversa sint vire, sed una aequaliter eadem: etiam diversa effect, corpora viribus congrui integrar numeri in Terram cadere quam eia fola Gravitates. Constat igitur Vitis illam cirpticam, qua Luna perpetuo de Tantange et vel traditur et vel impellitur & in Orbita retinuerit, ipsum eum Vitis Gravitates terreflris ad Lunam aequaliter pertingit. Et ratione quidem de sequentibus ut ad ingentis dilatatione illae solis Vitis circumpetam.
of her introduction to *Reading Newton in Early Modern Europe*: “the *Principia*… was not a reader-friendly book; nor was it designed to be. Many early readers (able mathematicians included) complained that it was too difficult even for them” (p.3).

The difficulty of reading, let alone understanding the *Principia*, has ensured that the pool of possible annotators of the text is very small therefore of those copies which were annotated only a very small number have survived and of those in turn only a few of the annotators can be identified.

**“IT TRANSFORMED HIS LIFE, AND IT TRANSFORMED SCIENCE”:**

**PRINTING THE PRINCIPIA**

The *Principia* was first published in London in 1687 and was the culmination of two and a half years of intensive and solitary research by Newton which “kept expanding in every direction and revealing new facets” (ODNB). Edmund Halley supervised the printing of the first edition which was completed on 5th July 1687. Westfall notes: “Never in the history of civilization has a major theory been so fully, so clearly, or so influentially proved”. The book immediately caught the attention of the intellectual elite and garnered as much praise as it did criticism.

The second edition of the text was extensively revised by Newton and seen through the Cambridge University press by the classical scholar Richard Bentley (1662-1742). Bentley wrote to Newton in 1708 stating that the revised edition, “is expected here with great impatience, & the prospect of it has already lowered ye price of ye former edition above half of what it once was”. The Cambridge edition was published in an edition of 700 copies with a number being sent to Europe for circulation amongst the intellectual elite. Newton himself drew up a list of seventy possible recipients, including Peter the Great and Abbé Bignon who were to receive 6 and 8 copies respectively. This edition quickly became rare and difficult to find, and in the summer of 1713 the *Journal Littéraire* announced an Amsterdam reprint, presumably made from one of the copies sent to Holland: “two presses are constantly in action to advance this work”. This is the present edition of 1714.

**THE IDENTITY OF THE ANNOTATOR**

Our volume has no marks of direct provenance but careful reading of the annotations reveals that the annotator frequently writes in the first person and refers to two books of which he was almost certainly the author. He refers firstly to his book called “*statica nostra*” (see p.29 “si methodum hanc quam nemo concipi, sequi velimus... Cum *statica nostra* et motus geometriam edidimus.”) and in another note on p. 29 he writes “si methodum hanc quam nemo concipi, sequi velimus... *Cum statica nostra et motus geometriam edidimus*.”

Giovanni Ceva had published his first and most significant work in Milan in 1678, *De lineis rectis se invicem secantibus statica constructio*, where he used the properties of the centre of gravity of a system of points to obtain the relation of the segments which are produced by straight lines drawn through their intersections” (*DSB* iii, 182). *It is in this work that he gives and proves what is called Ceva’s theorem* in Euclidian plane geometry (“given a triangle ABC let the lines AO, BO and CO be drawn from the vertices to a common point O (not on one of the sides of ABC) to meet opposite sides at D, E and F respectively. (The segments AD, BE, and CF are known as *cevians*.”)

Later, on p. 36, is another reference by the annotator to “*nostra motus geometria*”: (“Hec multo generalius et tutius deducuntur ex *nostra motus geometria*; etenim, ut diximus...”), and this would point to Giovanni Ceva whose *Geometria motus opusculum geometricum* had been published in Bologna in 1692. This is in two books, the first on simple motion and the second on composite motion. *There is also a reference on *verso* to another work by Ceva published in Mantua in 1710: *Tria problemata geometrica proposita* (“Hoc nos putamus planissime ostendisse ab suo corporis interno principio, ut iam edidimus, cum tria illa problemata geometrice proposuimus”; cf. Riccardi *op. cit.* i, 342 no. 8)). This was also published in 1728 (*see below*). *This short work discussed gravity and refers to the “centrum universi”, a topic frequently touched upon in the annotations in this book.*
PHILOSOPIAE NATURALIS

De Motu de datur punctum B per quod Hyperbola, Asymptotis CH, CD, corporum descripti describatur; ut & ipsius & tempus quorum eam deurius est, tempus quo punctum AD in medie similari resistentia describatur.".

PROPOSITIO VI. THEOREMA VI.

Corpora Sphaerica homogeneae & aequales, resistentiæ in duplicata ratione velocitatis impedita, & solis viribus resistitur, temporibus que sunt reciproce ut velocitates sub initio, describunt simper aequalia spatio, & mittunt partes velocitatis proportionales totis.

Asymptotis rectangulis CD, CH descripta Hyperbola qua-

vis B & E locatam perpendicularum AB, a, b, D, d, in B, b, E, e, exponantur velocitatis initia-

les per perpendiculara AB, DE, & tempora per lineas AA, DD.

Ergo ut D o ad D o data (per

Hyperbolam) CD ad AB, &

ita (ex natura Hyperbolae)

CD ad CD, & componendo,

ita CD ad CD. Ergo area ABC

b, D, e, hoc esset, spatia descripsit aquantur inter fe, & ve-

locitates prima AB, DE sunt ultimum AB, DE, & proporciones dividendo) partibus eis suis amillis AB – ab, DE – de proportionales. Q. E. D.

PROPOSITIO VII. THEOREMA V.

Corpora Sphaerica quibus resistentia in duplicata ratione velocitatum, temporibus que sunt ut motus primi directe & resistente prime inversæ, amittent partes motuum proportionales totis, & spatia describent temporibus finis in velocitatis primis ducti proportionales.

Namque motum partes amillis sunt ut resistente & tempora com-
GIOVANNI BENDETTO CEVA (1647-1734)

Ceva was the son of Carlo Francesco Ceva (1610-90), a businessman and collector of revenues for the Duke of Milan. Educated by the Jesuits at the Brera college in Milan, Ceva for a time followed in his father's commercial and administrative footsteps, but in 1670 he enrolled at the university of Pisa under Donato Rossetti (1633-1686), logician and supporter of atomic theories, and remained there for about four years. Resident in Mantua for many years Ceva was appointed as Auditor and Commissioner to Ferdinando Carlo Gonzaga, the Duke of Mantua and Montferrat, and in 1686 was appointed to the chair of mathematics at the University. Shortly after, he wrote to Lorenzo Magliabecchi in Florence about his interest and work on hydraulic engineering, stating that it would all be treated geometrically, with infallible proofs "fatte alla presenza di persone intelligente, e religiosa" (letter 28. X. 1685 quoted in Mercanti (2004) p. 43). It is clear that in 1685 he was already working on the Geometria motus, which was published in 1692, and of which he sent copies to Viviani and Magliabecchi.

Pietro Riccardi (Biblioteca matematica italiana, I, 342-343) lists ten works by Ceva published between 1678 and 1728. The last work, Opus hydrostaticum, 1728, contained reprints of a number of his tracts.

Ceva's works were certainly known in England; there were two in the Macclesfield library (see Sotheby's, Library of the Earls of Macclesfield part 2 (10 June,2004) lot 51 (De linesis rectis, 1678) and ibid. part 5, lot 1415, no. 4 (De re numaria quoad fieri possit geometriae tractate, 1711), and Newton himself owned Ceva's Italian work on hydraulic engineering, published in Mantua in 1717 Replic... in difesa delle sue dimostrazioni, e ragioni, per il quali non debbasi intradurre Reno in Po, contro la risposta datasi dal sign. Dottor Eustachio Manfredi (now at Trinity; Harrison, Library of Isaac Newton, (1778) no. 364).

A further work by Ceva of which no copy has ever been found and for which there seems to be no material evidence, was advertised in Giornale de' letterati (1715), p. 459 as being in the press: De mundi fabrica unico gravitatis principi invenia, deque flaminibus, quatenus eorum effectus a motu pendentes exhibentur, ac eorum decursus metiri licet. It may be that it was a work intended for publication, but not actually printed, possibly because of fears of trouble with the Church. Mercanti (2004, p. 102-104) tells us that this "ghost" seems to have been conjured up in about 1800, and also that in the title the word "flaminibus" has been changed to "fluminibus". It may be that it was a work intended for publication, but not actually printed, possibly because of fears of trouble with the Church. Mercanti (p. 104 n. 200) refers to a letter from Grandi to Galiani (30.vi.1714) mentioning new decrees emanating from the Congregation of the Index, and stating that he preferred to keep to the Galileo line and affirm that the gravity is a constant force. Might it be that this annotated copy of Newton may have served as something of a 'work in progress' towards De mundi fabrica, of which we have no trace?

THE ANNOTATIONS

There are approximately 160 annotations throughout the volume on 92 text leaves. The majority of the annotations are lengthy (rather than a single word or gloss) and amount to over 3000 words of manuscript text. A number of pages have the blank margins almost entirely filled with annotations. The text has been annotated throughout but with significant gaps, allowing us to see the particular sections that Ceva was interested in.

Six sections of the book have been particularly heavily annotated: the preface (fig.1), p.1-36 (the "Definitions" in which Newton explains the key technical terms used in the book (figs.2 & 4), p.47-52 (in which Newton discusses properties of motion in paths of eccentric conic-section form), p.222-225 (implications of resistance in proportion to the square of velocity (fig.3), p.260-266 ( hydrostatics and the properties of compressible fluids) and p.299-321 (on the motion of fluids, and the resistance made to projected bodies (fig.5)).

Ceva's extensive annotations show how he drew on Newton's writing for his own shared scientific interests, but also clearly demonstrate that he vehemently disagreed with Newton on some points. He also draws comparisons between Newton and other scientists, such as Toricelli and Galileo. Ceva begins by carefully working...
FIG. 5

**Philosophia Naturalis**

De Mercem velocitatem acquisitum in utroque caelo, ut Galileus demonstravit.

**Cæs.** Eadem est aquæ velocitatis effluens per foramen in intere vasa. Nam si foramen parum fit, ut intervallum inter superficies $ABC$ et $KL$ quoad sensum evanescat, & vena aquæ horizontaliter exsiliens figuram Parabolica efformat: ex lateri recto haugio Parabolae collocatur, $QU$ velocitas aquæ effluens est quæ contingat corpus ab aquæ in vasa efluentes ad altitude $HG$ vel $IC$ cadendo acquirere potuit. Facto utique experimento inveni quod, si altitude aquæ flagrantis super foramen effexy suspicitur $CH$ alium et alio foraminis super planum horizontale $AB$ effluat, aquæ proprietas incidenter in planum illud ad distansiam digitorum $37$. circiter a perpendiculo quod in planum illud a foraminis demittebat captam. Nam sine rectifiatione vel suspicatur debuit in planum illud ad distansiam digitorum $40$, existente paraabolice lateri recto digitorum $8o$.

**Cæs.** Quin sint aquæ effluent, sicut ferarum, adeo egredietur cum velocitate. Afectant enim aquæ effluentia vasa paratim perpendiculariter ad aquæ in vasa flagrantis ad altitude $G$ vel $I$, nisi quattuor ascensus ejus ab ascensu sita, adiunctio ad quantum impeditur; ac proinde ea effluat cum velocitate quam ab altitude illa cedendo acquirere potuit. Aquæ effluens partiuit inqueque usque ad suspicitur $CH$, ad foramen in fundo vasa, nisi horizontaliter effluxerit per foramen in ejus latera, sitve egrediatur in canalem & inde acquirere per foramen parum in superiores canales parte factum. Et velocitatem quam aquæ effluent, cum eflit quam in hæa Propositio ineginit, unde suspicitur, sed etiam per experimenta nilam jam dictatam manifestum est.

**Cæs.** Eadem est aquæ effluens velocitatis figurae foraminis fit circulisque quadrato vel triangulares aut alia quacunque circulari aquæ. Non velocitati aquæ effluens non pendet a figura foraminis sed ab eis altitudine infra planum $K$.

**Cæs.** Si vasa $ABCD$ pars inferior in aquæ flagrantis immersatur,
through Roger Cotes's important Preface to the *Principia*, noting in the margin:

*(In translation)* “Analysis is a progression of calculus from both unknown and known facts leading to known quantities. Synthesis is in truth a regression from the known, or from given quantities to unknown ones, which then become known. From both of these processes arises the technique of algebra…. *This is a truth which applies everywhere and further cannot be doubted.*”

Of particular interest to us today is Ceva's criticism of Newton. In a long annotation concerning Newton's ideas about gravity he writes:

“That which the writer [Newton] falsely calls attractions, should be called mutual resistance of bodies which gravitate to each other, since all things on earth gravitate towards the centre of the universe. It should be known that a body insofar as it is further distant from the centre becomes thereby heavier, and from this come the equal weight of the smaller part with the larger, since otherwise according to the opinion of the writer [Newton] an equilibrium would not be made. *This is what Toricelli and Galileo both supposed in the motion of projectiles.* But this is something false which you evince from the very nature of gravity; for allowing that a body horizontal, it does not move uniformly, but gets weaker in the process, as the weight gets heavier” (B3recto).

Ceva continues, again contradicting Newton:

“We do not agree in the system of the world, and therefore we give up annotation. We have acted on no other different firm principle than gravity by virtue of which other things follow. The firmament, which is a fluid body drives the stars and planets and is itself born along by the most violent circulation of the primum mobile. Meanwhile the earth growing peaceful the regressions of the stars as they are more distant from the primum mobile, stand forth for a shorter time, because as there the firmament is thinner, it does not have that force within it of seizing those things which it has in the paragraph above as more solid or dense” (B3verso).

In certain passages, though, we see detailed and clear interaction between Newton's text and Ceva which powerfully illustrate the deep understanding between both scientists:

“The writer distinguishes force from gravity… and given that principle he follows Toricelli in the concept of the perseverance of motion, since motion generated by an external force, I do not stand against the proportions which force brings; but from that fallacious principle, as we have said above, reason dies. For motion caused by force continually wastes away so that in the end it dies. Nor do I see why the earth's atmosphere should reach as far as the moon, since the moon is carried round in the firmament, which does not pertain to the actual atmosphere of earth. *We do not disagree however that the concourses of the atmospheres of moon and earth are found in the revolutions of the moon round the earth, for it is in those that strong perturbations at sea take place, and then it is necessary, as we shall state elsewhere that with the globes striving against each other that the moon and earth should by reason of a mechanical law approach each other, unless they had received more from their proper abysses.*” (B4verso).

In the most densely annotated section of the book (on the motion of fluids, and the resistance made to projected bodies) we see Ceva working closely through Newton's text and comparing it with his own work:

“We have discussed all of this more generally and more clearly and with every rigour in our book Geometria motus [Ceva's own work published in 1692, see above], we have produced these plane figures and this is the genesis of movement from which images of time come and from these forms we get images of velocity” (p.222).

But later in this section, Ceva's annotations note frustration at Newton and directly prove Elizabethanne Boran's thesis that the *Principia* was not designed to be “reader friendly”:

“…nor is our method content to discuss the simple movements of the sun but discusses also acceleration in a universal manner… but the author [Newton] bom-bards the reader with unusual definitions so that in the end the reader puts the book down tired” (p. 223).

Giovanni Ceva's copy of Newton's *Principia* is an important new discovery that provides detailed and extensive evidence of how difficult, controversial and fluid Newton's ground-breaking ideas were in his own time. The annotations are extensive and would warrant much further study and add greatly to a small pool of annotated copies of Newton's texts.

Later Provenance: Lot 395 at Il Ponte, Milan, 22nd May 2017. The catalogue description mentioned the annotations but without identifying the name of the annotator or the significance. The book was granted an Italian export license in September 2017.
"FROM THE SLACK AND DULL TO THE PRECISE AND LIVELY": A WORKING MANUSCRIPT OF POPE'S FIRST PUBLISHED POEM

6 POPE (Alexander), annotated by WALSH (William).

Alterations to the Pastorals: (The Solutions of the Queries are written by Mr. Walsh).

c.1706 £30,000

Small 4to (184 x 150mm). 4pp. Neatly folded across the centre (some pin holes along the fold), recto of first leaf a little dusty, original stab-stitching holes in the inner margins. Preserved in a custom-made folder and slip case, lettered in gilt on the slipcase.

A famous and important manuscript: Pope's own corrections to his Pastorals with additional alterations by his most trusted literary mentor - "the Muse's Judge and Friend" - William Walsh (1662-1708). A fascinating insight into the birth and evolution of Pope as a poet and the shaping of his talent by Walsh. With a highly distinguished provenance, having belonged to Pope's friend Jonathan Richardson the Younger and later passing through five famous collections of English literature: Chew-Bemis-Houghton-Garden-Davids.

Pastorals, written by Alexander Pope c. 1704-6 when he was still a teenager, would eventually herald his arrival as a poet and make him an instant celebrity. The journey to print was long and frustrating for Pope and began with the wide circulation of the manuscript amongst many of the new literary figures he had met on his arrival in London. Pope wrote a note on the completed manuscript of the poem that it had, "past thro' ye hands of Mr Walsh, Mr Congreve, Mr Mainwaring, Dr. Garth, Mr Granville, Mr Southern, Sr H. Sheers, Sr W. Trumbull, Ld Halifax, Ld Wharton, Marq. of Dorchester, D. of Bucks. &c...the Alterations from this Copy were upon ye Objections of some of these, or my own". It was on the advice - "especially of Walsh" (ODNB) - that Pope made significant changes to many lines of verse. Pastorals was eventually first printed in the sixth volume of Tonson's Poetical Miscellanies in 1709.

The manuscript comprises of approximately 120 lines of poetry in Pope's hand alongside 25 additional annotations by both Pope and Walsh which correct,
Part 1. Law 3. If Byron smile, she brightens all the shore,
   The town multitudes, and Nature charmed no more.

   Whether to say the sun is authorised, or not by the Sanctuary, the south
   Forth the sea.

   If 500 gold be equal with 30, Do you approve, and God be willing?

   If Tiber smile, she brightens all the shore,
   All Nature cent years, and shines no more.

   Oh! or, Light, sound, without, and Nature charmed no more.

   Wilt thou? Or, Kindness to her alike to shine no more.

   Oh! end of hope, 800.

Part 1. Law 88. May tell me first what Region came there from?
   In which by Thistles gather are eddied?

   Oh! or, May tell me first in what more happy fields;
   The Thistle springs to which the Lily yields.

   Quere. Which of these Companions are better reproved and better named?
   Whether it better here to use Thistle or Thistles, Lily or Lilies, Singers
   or Flowers? Alluding to ye Companions of Snow in.

   The Search (chap. 12) is given in, which on a Science, as in a

Part 2. Law 41. Some praising God permit me to imagine
   The Good that no man knoweth, nor can till they have seen or

   They must my Voice by getting, and err employ,
   Be 100 100, he be received, worthy

   Or, or, more I made by some transforming Point
   The Captain, that songs within the heart. Then might, — No.

   The Psalm 222 round number to explain the Thought, on account of all
   high, or 200, or, ye, is to better than the other, — The Search are fair,
   for 100 thou and 200, he made you.

Part 2. Law 67. On design to grace our happy moral State,
   Our happy Fountains, and our green Retreats;

   When you, 100 Presence is the great thing.
   Our friends are kind, and our beak and dry,

   The searching Lamp say ping on the plains.

   By return, they shall be seen again.

   Oh! the design to grace our happy moral State,

   Our pretty Fountain, our green Retreats;

   Where we walk, all gently from the Glee,

Even when you 120 shall come into a shade.
   Nor

   Where you tread, in painted shoes tall life,

   And all things flourish where you turn your eye, proud flourish life.

   Quere. Which of these is better?

   The Search shall the explanation on 

   14
improve and amplify the text and show the working relationship between both men. The sections are divided by ruled ink lines and include five excerpts from the first pastoral, five from the second, one from the third and three from the fourth. Pope provides his first “draft” of a particular section of the poem, then lists his “objection”, provides a “quere” for Walsh and then Walsh suggests his own ideas and criticism beneath this. The first page of the manuscript [fig.1] gives a good sense of the rest and illustrates how Pope’s pastorals were very much a work-in-progress at this point.

The manuscript begins with Pope copying out the opening lines:

“First in these Fields I sing the Sylvan Strains, / Nor blush to sport on Windsor’s peaceful Plains; / Fair Thames flow gently from thy sacred Spring, While on thy Banks Sicilian Muses sing”. Pope then begins a new line and provides his “objection” to the passage above highlighting how the young poet is still grappling with the finished text: “That the Letter is hunted too much - Sing the Sylvan - Peaceful Plains - and that the word Sing is used two lines after, Sicilian Muses sing”. Beneath this he then suggests his “alteration”: “First in these Fields I try the Sylvan Strains, Nor blush to sport on Windsor’s happy Plains, etc. Pope then writes his “quere” or question to Walsh concerning the lines above: “If ‘Try’ be not proper in relation to ‘First; as, we first attempt a thing; and more modest? and if ‘Happy’ be not more than ‘Peaceful?’ Beneath this, in Walsh’s own hand, he responds to Pope’s queries and offers his own suggestions: “Try is better than sing - Happy does not sound right, the first Syllable being short; perhaps you may find a better word than peaceful, as Flowy”. In the final version of the poem, Pope chose to use “blissful” rather than “peaceful”.

Walsh’s main literary importance is as Alexander Pope’s mentor. He saw manuscripts of some of Pope’s pastorals, forwarded by their common friend Wycherley, perhaps as early as 1705; certainly he wrote very encouragingly to Pope in the following year; and in August 1707, when Pope visited him at Abberley, he famously advised the young poet to make correctness his study and aim. Walsh commented upon and corrected Pope’s pastorals, and Pope appropriated some of his critical ideas for his “Discourse on pastoral poetry’. Walsh may also have seen an early draft of the Essay on Criticism, a poem that seems to have been conceived under his influence and concludes with high praise of Walsh as ‘the Muse’s Judge and Friend’ (ODNB).
Sotheby’s in 1989. Both lots were purchased by Quaritch – the complete manuscript was offered in Quaritch catalogue 1120 English Books & Manuscripts (no.88 $175,000) and the “alterations” sold to the English manuscript collector, Roy Davids.

**Provenance:**
1. Jonathan Richardson, the Younger (1694-1771), portrait painter and writer. Thought to have been given by Pope to Richardson and still in the Richardson family collection in 1871 (according to Elwin in the *Works*).  
2. Beverley Chew (1850-1924), green leather and gilt book label on the folding case, sold at the sale of the Chew Library at Anderson, New York, 8th December 1924, lot 309 $2000 (clipped description retained with the manuscript).  
3. Frank Brewer Bemis (1861-1935), large pictorial bookplate on the folding case, apparently sold by Bemis’s executors through A.S.W. Rosenbach to.  
5. The Collection of The Garden Ltd [Haven O’More], sold at Sotheby’s Nov 9th 1989, lot 138 £17,000 to Bernard Quaritch. Later in the collection of Roy Davids and sold on Bonhams, June 24th 2015 (lot 41).


An angry response to Sir Robert Peel’s attack on the American political system which uses Tocqueville’s words to advance Peel’s argument. Tocqueville’s own carefully read and annotated copy.

On the 13th January 1837 Sir Robert Peel made a speech at the Glasgow Peel Banquet in which he asked the audience, “whether the state of Society in America be preferable to our own?” (to which the audience responded with “cries of no”). The printed account of the speech then notes that Peel read, “some quotations from the work of M. de Tocqueville, illustrative of the working of the American system, and showing most conclusively that the effect of the domination of the tyrant majority in that country was to prevent the minority from exercising and enjoying perfect liberty of opinion” (p.18). Peel’s speech was published by John Murray as *A Correct Report of Sir Robert Peel’s Speeches at Glasgow* (1837), but even before publication it was already a controversial subject.

The present pamphlet is an anonymous response (thought to be by Obadiah Rich, who is named in the imprint) to Peel’s speech signed only from ‘A Citizen of the United States of North America’ and addressed from the North American
Coffee House, Throgmorton Street, London, February, 1837. The author primarily objects to the way in which Peel uses Tocqueville’s words to advance his own arguments in favour of the British political system over the American, writing: “...on the subject of the political principles of M. de Tocqueville, who is, however, as you are well aware, completely imbued with aristocratical prejudices, I would ask you, who claim to have read his work, whether the jumble of quotations you have given in support of your own assertions, is not a gross attempt at imposture and deception?”. He goes on, “I ask you whether M. de Tocqueville does not give substantive instances showing the exercise in America of the despotic domination of this your feared and hated ‘tyrant majority’? He does, and you know he does...” (p.10).

This copy was owned and annotated by Alexis de Tocqueville (1805-1859). The presentation inscription reads: “M. de Tocqueville No. 12 Rue de Bourgogne with H.R’s regards” [fig.1]. It was probably a gift from Henry Reeve, translator of Tocqueville’s Democracy in America, which first appeared in 1836, just a year before this publication. Tocqueville clearly read this pamphlet closely and made over 140 pencil annotations in the margins. Tocqueville denotes an English word in the text with a small “+” and provides the French translation for the word in the margin, in his own hand.

Tocqueville appears to acknowledge receipt of the pamphlet in a letter to Reeve, dated March 22, 1837, and is clearly pleased and - having been subject to attack by both parties - bemused to have it: “Before your letter came I received the speech of Sir Robert Peel and the pamphlet by an American citizen. I do not know if I am indebted to you for them. I should be much obliged if you would always let me see any publications of this description, if more should appear. Besides being seriously interested by the opinions which other people take the trouble of forming on me, I am amused at seeing the different characters that are ascribed to me according to the political views of the critic. I like to put them together as a series of portraits. Hitherto I have not found one that exactly represents the original.”

The interpretation and the uses and misuses of Tocqueville’s words was a much debated subject. In the Edinburgh Review in October 1840, John Stuart Mill noted that Tocqueville’s famous phrase “the tyranny of the majority” had been “adopted into the Conservative dialect, and trumpeted by Sir Robert Peel...when, as booksellers’
irritated; I should almost say that they felt a repugnance to the first grand step made towards the introduction of the democratic principle into the Government of Great Britain: I mean the emancipation of the Roman Catholic inhabitants of your country; the restoration of a third of the inhabitants of the British Islands to political liberty and privilege. But it was not the democratic tendency of the holy and just measure of Catholic Emancipation which caused that revulsion of honorable feeling in the minds of many of my countrymen—no, it was the conduct of the man by whom that measure was advocated, and carried through the British Commons House of Parliament, which irritated and provoked the “finer feelings” of my more refined and educated countrymen. They felt that by your conduct in that measure, all honorable confidence between man and man became chilled; that you had generated a suspicion of the treachery, a distrust of the integrity of public men, most hurtful to the well-being of good government. This was their sole ground of dissatisfaction with the glorious measure of “Catholic Emancipation,” or, as it may be called, the initiatory step towards democratic improvement in the government of your country.

Leaving, however, this portion of your speech, in which you have impressed American citizens as witnesses to the unimprovable excellencies of your boasted British Constitution, I come to that portion of your long oration where you cite a talented but prejudiced foreigner as an impartial witness to the rise of our American democracy.

Here, after descanting on what you are pleased to style “the domination of the tyrant majority” in America, you state that you do not desire any one to take your opinions on the subject of the tyranny exercised by the majority in America, on your assertion alone. But you refer them to the testimony of a distinguished French writer (M. de Tocqueville), who has made the condition of the North American Republic the subject of his study and his pen. Here I again quote from your own words, addressed to the aristocrats of Glasgow; they are as follow: “Read what he (M. de Tocqueville) says: he is an advocate of popular principles in a most extended sense; his feelings are altogether with the present dynasty of France, as compared with the former; his testimony, as well from actual personal experience as on account of freedom from prejudice, is above exception; and this is the account he gives of the results produced by Republican institutions in the United States. ‘I know no country (says M. de T.) ‘in which there is so little true independence of mind, and freedom of discussion, as in America. In America, the majority raises very formidable barriers to the liberty of opinion. Within these barriers, an author may write whatever he pleases; but he will repent it, if he ever steps beyond them.’ In democratic States, organised on the principle of the American Republic, the authority of the majority is so absolute, so irresistible, that a man must give up his rights as a citizen, and almost abjure his
advertisements have since frequently reminded us, he 'earnestly requested the perusal' of the book by all and each of his audience. And we believe it has since been the opinion of the country gentlemen that M. de Tocqueville is one of the pillars of Conservatism, and his book a definitive demolition of America and Democracy ("M. De Tocqueville on Democracy in America", published in John Stuart Mill Dissertations and Discussions, London, 1859, p.3). Booksellers did in fact use Peel's words to sell Tocqueville's books, with an advert for "Saunders and Otley, Conduit Street, Hanover-square" in The Morning Post for January 20th 1837 offering "M. de Tocqueville's New Work - Second Edition - in 2vols. 8vo" with a quotation from Peel's speech ending "Read what he says."

Provenance: Jacob Peter Mayer (1903-1992), academic, editor of the Gallimard edition of Tocqueville's works and founder of the De Tocqueville Institute at the University of Reading. His collection was dispersed at Bonhams in 2015 and included a presentation copy of John Stuart Mill's On Liberty to Tocqueville (£115,500 incl' premium). The present pamphlet was part of a lot with several other items, but only the present one had annotations by Tocqueville (11th November 2015 lot 265).
JOHN UPTON’S ANNOTATED COPY OF THE FAERIE QUEENE

8

SPENSER (Edmund), annotated by UPTON (John).

[The Faerie Queen: The Shepheardes Calendar: together with the other works of England’s arch-poët, Edm. Spenser: collected into one volume, and carefully corrected].

[London: printed by H[umphrey]. L[ownes]. For Matthew Lownes, 1611].

1611

£45,000

First Collected Edition. Small Folio (approx. 266 x 180mm). Without the general title-page, leaves Hh4-Ii3 (“Title-page and five text leaves of “Two Cantos of Mutabilitie”) and Ii4 (blank), F4 in Shepherds Calendar (blank) and final text leaf M2 (“The Visions of Petrarch”) although the end ornament from the verso of the leaf has been clipped and pasted to the blank verso of Mr.

Extensively annotated and marked-up throughout in ink by Spenser’s greatest 18th-century editor John Upton [see below]. This is clearly Upton’s “working copy” of this edition, and as such it is in delicate, yet eminently usable condition.

Initial dedication leaf extensively repaired at the edges with both old and new paper (not touching the printed text), some manuscript notes on the blank verso showing through onto the recto, second and third leaves (A2-3) also repaired at the lower edges (only just touching the printed text but not obscuring the meaning) and a little creased and grubby, some light damp staining in places throughout, numerous folded corners and some smaller repairs to a few closed tears, ink blotting in places, burn hole to the centre of Bb3-4 (obscuring a couple of letters on five lines of text), final leaf repaired and re-inserted on a crude stub (a small tear has obscured a couple of lines of text), woodcut tail-piece cut and pasted onto the blank recto of the final leaf (M1).

Contemporary sheep, covers ruled in blind, plain spine (binding extensively and crudely repaired, joints split, headcaps torn away, board-edges and corners heavily worn, upper panel of the spine renewed, some incision marks to the covers and some minor worming, old pastedowns with a pot watermark, no flyleaves).
STC 23083.3. Pforzheimer 972. “Having a number of unsold copies of the 1609 Faerie Queene still on his hands, he [Matthew Lownes] determined to use those copies by including them in the collected edition in lieu of a 1611 reprint of the same. In order to effect this end he printed the general-title and the dedicatory leaf on a single sheet, unsigned, and so was enabled thus to make-up copies of a collected edition by cancelling the title of the 1609 edition and substituting the new general-title and dedicatory leaf and adding a 1611 edition of the remaining parts.” (Pforzheimer).

An important copy of the first collected edition of Spenser’s poetry with almost 900 manuscript annotations by the celebrated 18th-century editor and critic John Upton. This “working copy” of the 1611 Folio was extensively used and cited by Upton in his 1758 edition of Spenser’s Faerie Queene. This is the only 17th-century edition of Spenser known to contain Upton’s annotations and complements his annotated copy of the 1733 printing of his edited text of The Faerie Queene, in the Beinecke Library, his own copy of his complete 1758 edition with added notes and corrections made after publication, perhaps for a second edition, in the British Library and his annotated copy of Milton’s Paradise Lost (1758) also now in the Beinecke Library.

This volume is the only source for Upton’s notes on Spenser’s minor poems including the Shepard’s Calendar and Colin Clouts.

In January 1759 J. and R. Tonson published in 2 volumes quarto an edition of Spenser’s “Faerie Queene” edited by the Rev. John Upton (1707-1760), Prebendary of Rochester and Rector of Great Rissington, Gloucestershire. Although the titles are dated 1758 it was advertised as “just printed” on 1 January 1759 (Gazeteer and London Daily Advertiser) and “this day printed” on 11 January (Whitehall Evening Post). The edited text of the poem had been set and printed as early as 1753, though the notes, which comprise the second half of Vol. 2 and the prefatory matter were only printed in 1758.

Although the text of the edition of Spenser’s Works edited by John Hughes (6 vols, 12mo, 1715; reprinted 1750 and, slightly re-edited 1758) is considered the “first attempt at a critical edition, one that makes use of the earlier printings as opposed to the later ones” (http://spenserians.cath.vt.edu/TextRecord.php?textsid=33896) his attempts at modernizing many of Spenser’s spellings were unfortunate and did not last. The text of the 1751 edition with its handsome engraved plates designed by William Kent and a life of Spenser by Thomas Birch was based, as the title claims, on “an exact Collation of the two Original Editions published by himself at London in Quarto” but contains no notes or variant readings. Upton’s text was also collated with the folio editions of 1609, 1611, and 1617 and was the first to include extensive notes, not only of variant readings but also on Spenser’s sources, allegories, and historical allusions, etc. Upton’s lauded edition of Spenser relied on his deep interest in classical and Biblical allusion and Elizabethan history (though his knowledge of early English romances was inadequate in Thomas Warton’s opinion).

By coincidence, a few days later on 22 January 1759, another critical edition of The Faerie Queene in 4 vols. by the Rev. Ralph Church (1707/8-87) of Christ Church, Oxford, was published by William Faden. Church used the same editorial methods, as established by Lewis Theobald for Shakespeare, as Upton and provided many variant readings from the earlier editions and some critical comments in his footnotes and, while he also reverted to Spenser’s original spellings, he substantially changed the punctuation which he considered compositors’ errors.

David Hill Radcliffe, in Edmund Spenser, a Reception History (1996), stated that: “Upton attempted to establish an accurate text along the lines of contemporary
The Authors Intention.

The other in his Gigfay, whose like invention was toedice in the pension of Sosmata after him Aristotle comprized both in his Iconography and lacyd Teufel discovered them again, and formed both in two persons, namely: the two which they in Philosophy call science, or verses of a poetical man: the other named Pistor in his Gedichte. By example of which excellent Poets, I have in my small part in the name of Aristotle, he being King, the image of a great Knight, perfected in the twelve principal moral verses, as Aristotle hath declared, which is the purpose of his first twelve books: which if I find to be so established, I may be perhaps encouraged, to frame the other part of poetics verses in his pension, after that he became King.

To come, I know this method will swell disproporionate, which had rather have good discipline delivered plainly in ways of precepts, or determined as large, as they oft, than thus closely enwrapped in allegorical declits. But such, wise, sincere, should be satisfied with the value of these days, seeing all things accounted by their flowers, and nothing esteemed, of that is not delightful and pleasing to common sense. For this cause is Alphonso preceded before Plato, for that one in the exquisite depth of his judgement, formed a Commonwealth such as should be, but the other, in the pension of Gyym and the Sympos, founded a government such as might be:

So much more probable and gracious of a kindred by example, than by rule. So much I laboured over in the pension of Aristotle: whom I conceive after his long education by Timon (to whom he was by Merida delivered to be brought up, so done as he was born, the lady Gyym) to have foreseen a realistic vision of the queen, which with the excellent beauty ravished, he being awaken to seek her out; and so being by Heron armed, and by Timon thoroughly instructed, he went to seek her forth in every land: in that every queen, I mean glory in my generall intention: but in my particular, I conceive the most excellent and glorious person of our foregoing the Queen, and her kingdom in every land. And yet some places where, I do otherwise shadow her. For considering five beautiful persons, the one of a most royal Queen or Empress, the other a most veracious and beautiful lady, this latter part in some places I do expresse in obscure, fashionning her name according to your own excellent concern of Cynthis, Phoebe and Cynthia being both names of Persians. So in the pension of Prince of Aristotle, I have expressed arrogance in particular, which verse, for that (according to Aristotle and the rest) it was the perfection of all the rest, and consummated in it all them, therefore in the whole course I mention the pedigrees of Aristotle applicable to that verse, which I write in the first Book. But of her other verses, I make all other Knights the Patrons, for the more variety of the stories: Of which these three books contain three. The first of the Knight of the Redehor, in which I express

Sir Trevor:

The second of Sir Gynem, in whom I express

Sir Trevor:

The third of the Queen's lady, to whom I express
work being done on Shakespeare. His edition is most remarkable for its copious notes, which differ from Wharton's Observations in emphasizing classical and biblical sources, and in their sustained attempt to trace the references in Spenser's poem to contemporary persons and events” (p.62).

Upton and Church's editions of Spenser remained the standard text for less than 50 years until Henry John Todd's 8-volume variorum edition of the Works published in 1805. In his preface Todd wrote: “Of the Faerie Queene two separate editions, by Mr. Upton and Mr. Church, appeared in 1758, in which the diligence and utility of collation, more especially by the latter of these gentlemen, are as obvious as they are important; in which the original orthography has been judiciously followed; in which, however, some few variations may be observed. It has therefore been a part of my business to compare and adjust the readings also of these editors. ... In late editions of the British poets, Spenser is unjustly presented in a piebald suit; for the Faerie Queene has been printed from the text of Upton, and the Miscellaneous Poems from the text of Hughes ... A copy of Mr. Upton's text of the Faerie Queene, with his own manuscript remarks in the margins, has been also kindly entrusted to me by the reverend Mr. Dunster. But these remarks are merely intended as references to the subject of the notes, which were printed after the text; a circumstance alluded to by Mr. Upton himself ...” [presumably this refers to the copy at Beinecke].

The importance of Upton's edition has outlived his work on the text alone. In the introduction to his PhD thesis (University of Edinburgh, 1983), John Upton's Notes on the Fairy Queen: in Four Volumes (www.eea.lib.ed.ac.uk/handle/1842/18553) and published by Garland Press (New York, 1987), John G. Radcliffe notes that although many of Upton's textual interventions and suggestions are of “obvious merit” not all have withstood the test of later Spenser scholarship: “Upton is not always persuasive of course, but some of his emendations are difficult to reject” (p. xliv).

However, it is Upton's explanatory notes to the text that are of greater importance. Radcliffe continues, “Upton's ‘Notes on the Fairy Queen’ constitute his greatest contribution to the study of Spenser and English literary scholarship. They are characterized by such a rare quality of perception and breadth of erudition that one is inclined to forego comment and allow the ‘Notes’ to speak for themselves. In his consideration of the poem, Upton incorporates materials from poets, dramatists, critics, scholars, grammarians, theologians, antiquaries, historians, and virtually every branch of knowledge from classical times until his own day. His ‘Notes’ reveal him to be a master of his material who, throughout his consideration of the poem, brings his learning to bear carefully and judiciously.” (Radcliffe, pp. xl-xl). “Despite the obvious merit of Upton's textual notes, it is his explanatory notes which have earned him the respect and admiration of all students of Spenser.” (p. xlvi) ... “Upton's ‘Notes’ are the first extended study of Spenser in the history of...
In the depth of Merlin's cave, the sage predicted the future.
The tale of Arthur's fate was revealed, the sword in the stone found.
A questfilled prophecy, ensnared with mystery and woe.

In a distant land, a figure rose, called the first king's heir.
A destiny awaited, where strength and virtue were needed.
And so, the narrative unfolds, a saga of courage and character.
a note, and many a comment, as my custom is on favourite authors; it came to my 
mind to send you a specimen of what you might expect, should I commence an ed-
tor in form..."

"Methinks every reader would require that the last editor should consult ev-
ey former edition, and that he should faithfully and fairly exhibit all the various 
readings of even the least authority; he would require, too, that an editor of Spenser 
should be master of Spenser's learning: for otherwise how would he know his allu-
sions and various beauties? When and in what manner to omit them, or to lay them 
before his reader? ...

Upton provides a further glimpse of his source texts (and his book collecting) 
in the preface to his 1758 edition:

"... There are three other editions in Folio, which I have frequently con-
sulted, and have mentioned in the notes; printed in the years, 1611, 1617 and 1679...
I have two copies of the first edition, printed in the year 1590 and yet these had 
several variations; which may be accounted for, by supposing the alterations made, 
while the copy was working off at the press. The first edition containing the three 
first books, I made the groundwork of mine; and sent it to the press, with such

In the present copy he has part-underlined "de gendered" and noted in the margin 
"9 d 167. 161." (noting that the "d" is omitted).

Likewise, for Book IV, Canto XII, stanza 13, lines 1-2 where the 1611 edition 
reads "Thus whilst his stony heart was toucht with tender ruth, / And mighty cour-
age something mollifide," he gives an alternative reading in the lower margin for 
the first two lines: "Thus whilst his stony heart wth t.r. / was toucht, & m. c. moll-
ifide. Quarto." In his edition Upton uses the 4to text (I, p. 668) and prints the folio 
version in his note with the comment: "Thus is this verse, beyond its due measure, 
printed in the folio, which I have reformed from the more authentick edition, the 

On the other hand many of his more extensive notes to the printed text attract 
no annotations in this copy or only a small reference or quote. For example, in his 
note on Book II, Canto 8, stanza 3 his printed note reads, "So the first quarto; the 
word below catching the printer's eye, but the 2d quarto and Folios read as I have 
given it in the context" (II, p. 360) but the present 1611 copy bears no annotation at all. 
Similarly, in his printed notes Upton provides a lengthy commentary on Book III, 
Canto 6, stanza 45 (II, p. 553-4) ending "Thus reader, you have here offered two expla-
nations of a dark and mysterious passage" but the present 1611 copy has no mark-
ing at all.

The most frequent manuscript annotations - in a form which is repeated throughout the volume - are Upton's contracted cross-references to authors who 
Spenser may be alluding to. There are hundreds of these pointing the reader towards 
the works of Chaucer, Milton, Ariosto, Virgil, Gower, Thomas Aquinas, Sir Philip 
Sidney, Homer, Boccaccio, Ovid, Tasso, Dante, Lucan and many other, less obvious 
sources such as Richard Carew's The Survey of Cornwall (first published in 1602).

For example, in our copy, Book I, Canto 1, stanza 23 of The Faerie Queene is sur-
rrounded by six brief cross-references by Upton, the first being to Ariosto. In the 
printed text (II, p. 346) these brief notes have become a long discursive note concern-

ing the Italian poet Marco Girolamo Vida (1487-1566) and the art of poetry, although 
Vida is referenced elsewhere in the volume. Occasionally Upton's notes are more discursive, such as his discussion in Book II, Canto 12, stanza 39 where he notes: "It seems to me very plain that Spenser took 
his description of this sacred cursed or enchanted soil from the island of Circe; as 
Homer & Vergil described it ^ & from the enchanted Island of Arminda. Homer 
says the beasts of the Island [four words crossed through] transformed from men 
by the witch Circe, were of gentle manners. Virgil supposes them savage & fierce. 
For the sake of the English reader I will transcribe the translations of Homer & 
Virgil". In his note to the printed text (II, p. 506) Upton notes "Spenser, I believe, 
had in his eye the coast of Circe, as described by Virgil, vii. 15" and quotes the Aeneid 
as translated by Dryden but suggests that, "the reader may compare at his leisure 
Hom[er]. Od. x. where Ulysses lands at the Circean promontory in Italy, and visits
THE SECOND BOOKE OF

CANT. X

The Faire Queene

As ever, pensive...
the palace of Circe. Never was a story better suited for poetry, as it is both wonderful, and entertaining, and the allegory instructive - I believe too our poet had Ovid in his eye, Met. xiv. 235."

In a similar fashion, in Book IV, Canto 11, stanza 36 Upton provides a long note about Hadrian's wall which appears in a different form in the printed edition of the Works. Upton notes that, “Hadrian built a wall 80 miles in length across the Island from Solway-firth, upon the Irish sea, to the mouth of Tyne by Newcastle. He laid the foundation with strong piles driven deep & fastened together ... This wall the Britons called Gait-sewer or Gat-sewer: the Scots Mur-sewer, i.e. Severus wall: for Severus repaired with bulwarks of stone & turrets Hadrians wall.” In the printed edition (II, p. 607) Upton's note omits Hadrian's name and the methods of construction and repair, refers the reader to the latest edition of Camden and Gordon's Itinerarium Septentrionale, and adds a definition of the word “brazen” as “firm and strong”.

A good example of the way this 1611 folio needs to be researched to see how it fits into the genesis of Upton's notes is Book I, Canto VII, stanza 16, concerning the Giant Gorgoglio, which begins: “From that day forth Duesa was his deare / And highly honour'd in his haughty eye.” Hazel Wilkinson (p. 146) quotes in full Upton's lengthy note on the “allegory & allusions” referring to the Books of Daniel & Revelations in his annotated copy of the 1596 edition at the British Library (interleaf from Solway-firth, upon the Irish sea, to the mouth of Tyne by Newcastle. He laid the foundation with strong piles driven deep & fastened together ... This wall the Britons called Gait-sewer or Gat-sewer: the Scots Mur-sewer, i.e. Severus wall: for Severus repaired with bulwarks of stone & turrets Hadrians wall.” In the printed edition (II, p. 306): 'Now the complete scarlet whore. She saith in her heart I sit a queen. Rev. xviii. 7.' The single reference to Revelation reveals none of Upton's delicate and complex thinking on the stanza, and as a result it is not very helpful. Once again, it seems that having explained Spenser's allegorical complexity to himself through a process of exegesis, Upton did not feel the need to share his working in print. He seems to have imagined his readers as a congregation for which his word had automatic authority." Here (p.30) in the lower margin which is otherwise filled with other quotes relevant to other stanzas on the page he just gives the same passage from Revelations (though at greater length and without a reference): "She glorified herself & liv'd deliciously: & said in her heart I sit a queen & shall see no sorrow."

Upton has also marked-up *The Shepheards Calender* ("collated with an Edit. printed 1597") and the additional poems (including Colin Clouts) at the end of this volume which he did not include in his edition of *The Faerie Queene* but which were intended for a third volume mentioned in his preface (p. ix) that was terminated by his early death in 1760.

There is no other source, other than the present volume, for Upton's notes on Spenser's Minor Poems.

These notes continue in much the same detailed fashion and while many are clearly cross-references used in his editing of the *Faerie Queene*, they also include discursive comments such as his opinion on “September” in the *Calendar*, that, “I never knew a pastoral less understood & so much abused as [this] IXth. Spenser's pastorals have all references to himself, his friends or [?]. Hobbinoll is his friend Harvey: Diggon, some clergyman promoted in Wales, where many of the papistical clergy had gotten possession of the conscience & families of the gentlemen of that country. - Hobbinoll seeing his Welsh friend greets him (with good humour) in his Welsh dialect. & Diggon answers in character.” (p. 38 of the *Shepheards Calender*). At the beginning of *Colin Clouts*, Upton also notes the names of the characters in the poem: “The names, though seemingly shepheards mean real persons throughout this Eclogue. Colin Clout is Spenser; Tityrus, Chaucer, Hobbinoll, Gabriel Harvey. The Shepheard of the Ocean, x 66. Sr W. Raleigh - some of them must be left to mere conjecture at this distance of time & want of proper lights” (p. 147 of *Colin Clouts*).

The entire volume is meticulously marked and scattered with annotations, references and cross-references written at different times, probably over many years. The book was clearly an important part of Upton's working library and is one of the standard editions of Spenser that he must have repeatedly referred to whilst compiling his own meticulous edition of the poet’s most famous work. Further research comparing the other books from Upton's library will, as Helen Wilkinson hopes, no doubt cast further light on his editing processes and the wider concerns of literary editors in the 18th century.

Listed on the online Catalogue of English Literary Manuscripts 1450-1700, nos. SpE 86-99 are annotated copies of early editions of Spenser’s Works, perhaps the best-known of which is Ben Jonson's copiously annotated copy now in the Wormsley Library (SpE 95). The present volume will be an important addition to this list.

Provenance: John Upton (1707-1760), clergyman and literary editor. His library was sold at auction by Leigh & Sotheby on 15+16/1784. Bibliotheca Upontiana: or catalogue of the valuable and elegant library of the late John Upton, ... [not examined]. There are two earlier ink pen-trial addresses (“Thorpe in Warwick upon Avon”, p. 107; “To Mrs Sarah Welby in Newark”, p. 134), alphabets (e.g. p. 287 & 298), and the volume could well have been defective when Upton purchased it. There are no marks of ownership after Upton.

Later Provenance: Krown & Spellman, booksellers, Culver City, California. Part of the Krown and Spellman stock that was sold at Heritage Auctions, Dallas, Texas, in 2015.
Ancient Funerall Monuments within the United Monarchie of Great Britaine, Ireland and the Islands adjacent, with the dissolved Monasteries therein contained: their Founders, and what eminent Persons have bee in the same interred. As also the Death and Buriall of Certaine of the Bloud Royall; the Nobilitie and Gentrie of these Kingdomes entombed in forraine Nations. A worke reviving the dead memory of the Royall Progenie, the Nobilitie, Gentrie, and Communalitie, of these his Majesties Dominions. Intermixed and illustrated with variety HistoriCALL observations annotations, and briefe notes, extracted out of approved Authors, infallible records, lieger bookes, charters, rolls, old manuscripts, and the collections of judicious Antiquaries. Whereunto is prefixed a discourse of Funerall Monuments. Of the foundation and fall of religious houses. Of religious orders. Of the Ecclesiasticall estate of England. And of other occurrences touched upon by the way, in the whole passage of these intended labours. Composed by the Studie and Travels of John Weever.

London: by Thomas Harper, 1631

£12,000

First Edition. Folio. Large Paper (303 x 205mm). [16], [348 of 871 only] pp., with the engraved portrait of Weever and the additional engraved architectural title-page by T. Cecill (very fine impressions); partially interleaved (mostly from pp. 259–95 in the section of the monuments in the Diocese of Canterbury, otherwise occasional). Small damp stain to the blank fore-edge of the first few gatherings, some minor spotting and a little browning in places, manuscript annotations to the text and blank interleaves throughout by Sir Edward Dering [see below]. Early 19th-century tree calf by Sharpe of Warwick [small oval binder’s ticket on the inside of the upper board], smooth spine tooled and ruled in gilt, black morocco label, spot-marbled endleaves, red sprinkled edges (a little rubbed in places, joints split but holding firm).
STC 25223. Large Paper, with a crowned coat-of-arms watermark with initials “RD” in the first quarter and a lion in the 4th quarter (also found on the interleaves) of the type also found in Large Paper copies of Ben Jonson’s Workes (1616); 65 mm higher and 25 mm wider than an average ordinary paper copy which has a pot watermark. ESTC distinguishes only one copy as being on Large Paper (Storer collection, Eton College Library) and another at Christ Church, Oxford must be due to its size (32cm). Several copies described as Large Paper have sold at auction in the last 100 years.

Sir Edward Dering’s extensively marked-up and annotated copy of an important work of antiquarianism derived from Weever’s research in the “inestimable Librarie” of Sir Robert Cotton.

Weever explains in his preface that he began the research for this book in order to record the inscriptions on funeral monuments for future generations after seeing so many “broken downe, and utterly almost all ruinated, their brasen inscriptions erazed, torne away, and all pilfered” (see Weever’s address to the reader). He notes that he has “travalled over the most parts of all England, and some part of Scotland” collecting inscriptions but has also relied on the help of his friend, the herald and fellow antiquary, Augustine Vincent (c.1584-1626) and “the inestimable Librarie [of] such Bookes and manuscripts” belonging to Sir Robert Cotton.

Underlined and extensively marked-up throughout in red and black ink and with fifty-nine textual annotations ranging from a single word gloss to lengthy supplementary comments, and twenty-eight lengthy manuscript notes (sometimes covering an entire folio page) on the blank leaves by the antiquary Sir Edward Dering, 1st Baronet (1598-1644).

There is no direct ownership inscription by Dering (other than the initials “E.D” after one annotation) but the underlining in red ink is common to many books from Dering’s library (see for example item 81 in Maggs catalogue 1495). In the present volume the surnames are systematically underlined throughout, presumably as part of an indexing process by Dering. One of the first annotations (on A2r) is signed with the initials “E.D” which have three distinct flourishes passing back over the letters in a style which is identical to Dering’s signature on a letter to Robert Cotton in the British Library (Cotton MS Julius C III, f.143, now digitized online).

One of the most extensively annotated passages of the books is the lengthy section devoted to the funeral monuments in Canterbury of the Dering family. In this section Dering has provided extensive additional manuscript material on the blank leaves and deleted and amended sections of the printed text (fig.1,2&3).

A copy of Weever’s book appears in Dering’s library catalogue (see Private Libraries in Renaissance England, Vol 1, p.181 (no.4.94), Dering paid 10s for it).

Weever’s book would clearly have been an important and useful resource for Dering in his antiquarian research focussing on his native county of Kent. As well as showing how Dering extracted material from printed accounts (as he also did from manuscript sources) we also get a picture of the antiquary “in action”: one of the first lengthy annotations in the book occurs in Weever’s preface where he notes how from time-to-time his own examinations of funeral monuments have been hampered by over-zealous church wardens who denied him the opportunity to “view of the monuments as I much desired for that I wanted a Commission” (A2r). Dering notes in the margin: “The sexton or clarke of Sibertswould [a village in Kent] would (in ye like humour) have locked me up, in that church, because I did climbe up into a window to descry an imperfect coat of arms. I have no commission from his majty [Majesty] but a gnll [general] warrant from ye LL of his counsell to search all offices and places of recorde”. Further on, in a section on the Wotton family of Boughton Malherbe (Kent) Dering indicated one particular passage noting in the margin “but none of them mentioned in ye greate pedegree of ye wottons which this last yeare I saw” (p.289).

We have, so far, been unable to trace what happened to the remaining portion of this book other than a reference in the third edition of John Leland’s Itinerary.
within the Diocese of Canterbury.

Next was built with sculptured stone Richard Dering in this form, so whole memory is inscribed, that his remains from his death to his 72nd year was 40% of length of person.
of which some few MS additions are written in the table, but at the end follow
some Heraldry writing, but he cannot tell of what hand. **He says the copy was the**
**famous Sr. Edward Dering's formerly, as by the arms appears** (Vol. I, p.134). In
part eleven of the sale of Thomas Rawlinson's library by Thomas Ballard beginning
on 22 January 1727/8, lot 2240 (highlighted with a manicule - reserved for lots which
Ballard thought particularly notable) was "Weever's ancient Funerall Monuments of
Great-Britain and Ireland with Table and M.S. Notes [Ch. M. Lib. rariss.] Lond.
1617" which, being Large Paper and most rare, is most surely the present volume. The
interleaving of Dering's copy may have meant that this copy was bound in more than
one volume and the first section would have been most pertinent to Dering as it
specifically covers the monuments in the Dioceses of Canterbury and Rochester in Kent.
A new section of books begins on p. 350 with the funeral monuments of London and
ends with Norwich, the rest of the country being omitted. The errata leaf before the
text shows that the errata were corrected by Dering throughout the entire book but
it could be the case that the sections on other parts of England became separated.
Hearne's note suggests that Rawlinson may have only had the end part of the book
(including the index) and that it still remained in Dering's armorial binding (which
our portion of the text does not).
The later sections of the book have many more (and many grander) engraved plates
and it is quite possible that these were simply harvested at some point when the
sections of the book became separated.

**Provenance:** 1. Sir Edward Dering, 1st Baronet (1598-1644), knighted 1619,
created baronet 1 February 1627 (the 5th in order of precedence), antiquary and religious
controversialist, of Surrenden Dering in Kent, M.P. for Hythe (1625) and Lieutenant
of Dover Castle (1629-33). Many of the Dering family books were sold in a series
of disposals from 1811 to the 1860's but if this volume was in Thomas Rawlinson's
library then it must have left much earlier. 2. John Peyto-Verney, Baron Willoughby
de Broke, with armorial bookplate [either the 14th Baron (1778-1816; succ. 1752) or
his son with the same name the 15th Baron (1762-1820)]; by descent to Robert John
Verney, formerly Barnard, 17th Baron Willoughby de Broke (1809-1862; succ. 1852),
with his armorial bookplate. The family lived at Compton Verney, Warwickshire, sold
by the 19th Baron in 1921; a selection from the library was sold by Sotheby's on 13
July 1908. 3. Charles J. Sawyer, London bookseller, their Catalogues 75 (1924), item
233 in £210/- & 89 (1927), item 620, £3. 4. Pencil purchase date "13.11.[19]36" on the
front flyleaf. 5. Anonymous sale, Forum Book Auctions, London, 6th December
2017 lot 142 "extensive annotations in an attractive 17th century hand", without
further identification.

(Oxford, 1770; first published 1710, but here reprinted from a copy with Hearne's
annotations) in which the editor Thomas Hearne praises Weever's book for preserv-
ing so many lost monumental inscriptions and then mentions in a footnote: "Since
the writing of this Mr [Thomas] Rawlinson tells me he hath a Weever at the end

(89)
An Inquiry into the History, Authenticity, & Characteristics of the Shakespeare Portraits, in which the Criticism of Malone, Steevens, Boaden, & Others, are examined, confirmed, or refuted. Embracing the Delton, the Chandos, the Duke of Somerset’s Pictures, the Droeshout Print, and the Monument of Shakespeare, at Stratford; together with an Exposé of the Spurious Pictures and Prints. By Abraham Wivell, Portrait Painter.

London: by the Author, 1827

First Edition. 8vo (227 x 145mm), [4], 254, [2]pp., with the engraved frontispiece portrait of the Stratford memorial and the seven engraved plates in the text (as listed in the instruction to the binder at the end of the work). A little browned and foxed in places, uncut edges a little chipped and torn in places, some creasing and folded corners. Original drab publisher’s boards, spine with an old manuscript label reading “Shakespeare” (binding carefully restored retaining almost the entirety of the original paper spine and the paper label).

An examination into the authenticity of portraits of Shakespeare so elaborately illustrated as to reduce the author from “affluence to comparative poverty”. Extensively - and angrily - annotated by an accused forger.

Abraham Wivell (1786-1849) rose to fame after the publication of his drawings of the Cato Street conspirators and later as a portrait painter to the Royal family and the aristocracy. He became interested in Shakespeare around 1825 when he made a drawing of the Stratford memorial bust which was engraved by J.S. Agar. He produced the present book two years later but the work did not sell well and the cost of the numerous plates in the publication reduced Wivell to poverty.

This copy has over 100 manuscript annotations by the fellow painter, picture restorer and accused forger, Edward Holder (1783-1865). The annotations are often very lengthy (occasionally filling all of the blank margins of a double page) and react angrily to the supposed inaccuracies of the printed text.
The picture is painted upon oak, about the three-quarter size; it has no name or date upon it. Having questioned Holder as to how he formerly came by it, he replied, "That about ten months ago he had it of Mr. Bryant, of Great Ormond Street." As soon as we parted I went to Mr. B.; this gentleman, after hearing all I had to say, assured me that he had never sold the picture as Shakespeare, and was much surprised that it should be said that he had, well knowing it to be no such thing. On my way home, at the corner of Charles Street and Oxford Street, I met Mr. Holder, who informed me that the shop where the picture was bought by Mr. Liddell, was but a few doors up Charles Street; I went there with him, we had been but a few minutes in the shop, when in came Mr. B., who could no more have expected to see us than we him. Mr. B. of course, accused Holder of having wrongly used his name; the arguments which Holder made in his defence, only showed that he was a man whose word could not be taken; in consequence I requested Mr. Bryant to meet me at the Hon. Thomas Liddell's, to satisfy that gentleman of the spuriousness of the picture; he readily complied; we met, and the result was, he found the picture so very different to what it was when he parted with it, that to make use of Holder's words to a friend of his,

* Mr. Bryant informs me that Holder had offered this picture to a friend for nine pounds, but who declined purchasing it; Mr. Holder had told him it was one of his own making out of a picture he had bought of Mr. B. prior to which Holder had two other old paintings of him, and both were converted into Shakespeare.

he would not know it again. There were some parts Mr. B. could not speak very positively as to having been altered; but he added to what I had discovered he remarked, that when the portrait was in his possession, the nose was very different, and that the hair had been taken off the forehead, and what was still there, re-painted, and the ear-rings added. The date, which had been upon the left corner, was obliterated, which would not have answered the purpose to remain, for he perfectly recollected it was of a later date than the poet's life-time. That was all. What else was there?" I asked. If there was anything to write which I could use, I knew not. The next day the Hon. Gentleman waited upon me with the intelligence that one of our most distinguished artists, whose judgment in these matters was not to be disputed, would take an oath that the picture was genuine. The following Monday was appointed for him, with Mr. Smith, Mr. Holder, and myself, to meet in Portland Place, for the purpose of re-examining the portrait; and, by the desire of the owner, I addressed a letter to Holder to that effect, and as he was a poor man, he was to be paid for his trouble. I arrived there at the time appointed, but was informed the Hon. Gentleman was in the country; no message was left for me, nor had either the Artist or Holder made their appearance; myself, it seems, was the only one to be disappointed,—"it is the cause, it is the cause."
On a smaller tipped-in sheet before the main body of the text, Wivell has inscribed this copy:

“Edw Holders - presented by A. Wival”.

The remainder of the presentation inscription has been crossed through and underneath, presumably Holder, has written:

“Wival is an author whom no one can mistake his object / to make himself popular as a painter and as a / Wonderful Wival”.

This punning and bitter inscription sets the tone for the annotations throughout the book.

Holder annotates the entire book, presumably with the intention that by denigrating Wivell’s opinion of all the known portraits of Shakespeare he could build up an even greater justification of his innocence concerning the portrait which he himself most certainly had a hand in. Wivell discusses, for example, the Felton portrait which he believes “There is the strongest reason, therefore, to presume a forgery”. Holder, beneath this, writes “Say a strong reason - you called upon me to attend you (just for the indulgence of your whim) - I was better employed - and what then - a proof - a proof! you exultingly cry out. Fudge! Mr W. Fudge!!” (p.46).

Later in the book Wivell describes the Martin Droeshout portrait of Shakespeare as “a performance, which claims the most indubitable right to originality”. Holder replies beneath this - adding two exclamation marks to the end of Wivell’s own sentence - “and after all, has it come to this? God Lord deliver us”. (p.56). The annotations continue in this manner throughout the book with Holder making sniping
comments about Wivell's assertions and the quality of his writing. This builds up towards the end of the volume before exploding when Wivell discusses a supposed portrait of Shakespeare belonging to Henry Liddell, 1st Earl of Ravensworth.

“In the nineteenth century, a number of rogues specialized in altering portraits of other people into likenesses of Shakespeare. The master of this art, Edward Holder and F.W. Zincke, are thought to have created at least sixty Shakespeares between them in careers that spanned two decades. Holder, a sometime art dealer, is said to have altered a portrait by scraping off existing details rather than by painting on top of it. Later feeling either sadistic or repentant, he would sometimes reveal his methods to trusting buyers, but they in turn often outright ignored his confession, so determined were they to believe they had a genuine portrait... Holder claimed that he gave his buyers plenty of hints 'I have never been inclined to dupe the world as many in my situation in life have done. I have a wife and nine children to support; and had I the advantages which others have made by my works, I should not be the poor man I am now. Holder and Zincke were quite proud of their skill in transmogrification, once demonstrating their method to Abraham Wivell, a student of iconography in the 1820s. Before Wivell's eyes, Holder neatly turned a portrait of a clergyman into a recognisable Oliver Cromwell. Zincke then took it to an art shop and sold it for £4" (Stephanie Nolen, *Shakespeare's Face: Unravelling the Legend and History of Shakespeare's Mysterious Portrait*, 2002).