SOME CLASSIFIED CATALOGUES OF THE COTTONIAN LIBRARY

E. C. TEVIOTDALE

Colin Tite has recently drawn our attention to the many manuscript catalogues of the Cotton collection copied in the seventeenth century and has initiated a reconsideration of their role in our understanding of the formation and early history of the Cottonian Library. It is my intention here to consider a group of catalogues copied when the library was in the hands of Sir John Cotton (1621–1702), the eldest grandson of the library’s founder. This group consists of eight classified lists of the collection, one of which survives only as a fragment. There is a complicated network of similarities among them, which could only be analysed in full if a complete comparative edition were made. This would be an enormous task, and I do not claim to have undertaken it. In the absence of an exhaustive study, however, some observations on the origin, the contents, and the owners of these manuscripts might be of interest.

Before turning to the manuscripts that will principally occupy us here, a few remarks about the Cottonian manuscripts themselves are in order. The majority of codices in the Cotton collection are volumes comprised of several discrete items (sometimes hundreds of discrete items) bound together only after they came into the Cottonian Library. In compiling a classified catalogue of the collection, each item in a given manuscript would have to be considered and listed separately, particularly as its character might be quite different from that of surrounding items. It should also be remembered that the chief collecting interest of the library’s founder, Sir Robert Cotton (1571–1631), was English history, and any classification scheme for the library would be rather more detailed for English history than for other subjects.

The surviving classified lists of the collection include six paper codices whose seventeenth-century owners can be traced, a fragment of a similar paper codex, and a large parchment document. The latter two present rather different problems from the first group, so I shall proceed to them from a discussion of the six paper codices, which are:

- Cambridge, Magdalene College, Pepys MS. 2427, ff. 33–186
- Cambridge, Trinity College, MS. O.4.12 (James 1243)
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These catalogues are arranged according to subject. Each entry includes a description of an individual item (occasionally a group of items within a single codex) followed by the pressmark of the manuscript (occasionally the pressmarks of more than one manuscript). Only very rarely is any indication given of that item’s position within the manuscript. It is not uncommon for a series of entries from one manuscript to appear together, in which case the pressmark generally will not be repeated but the word ‘ibidem’ will take the place of the pressmark in the later entries. There tend to be patches of entries from a single shelf together, but there is no systematic progression through the presses within each category. These catalogues would serve a user of the library well. Having perused the entries under the subject that interested him in the catalogue, he would be directed to a particular volume. Once he had the manuscript in hand, he could consult a table of contents at the front of the volume, if one was present, in order more precisely to locate the item that he sought.

Tite has already intimated that the six classified lists in codex format rely on the same or closely related exemplars, and this is indeed the case. All six are prefaced by an identical table of contents. In four of the manuscripts, this table is supplied with page references, identical in all four, not to the attached catalogue but to another earlier version of the catalogue. In the remaining two codices, the table was copied without page references, and then page references to the catalogue at hand were added later. Here follows a transcription of the table of contents as it appears in Petyt 538/40, one of the four manuscripts in which the page references to an earlier version of the catalogue have been faithfully copied and one of the most carefully copied and corrected manuscripts of the group:

History of England and other Countries p. 1
Theologicall booke and Ecclesiasticall history p. 37
Lives of Saints p. 91
Revenues, Priviledges, Foundations, Charters of Monasteries Churches and hospitalls p. 105
Prophecyes p. 117
Lawe
    Civill and Canon p. 126
    Co[m]non p. 123
Affaires of State between England &
    Italy p. 133
    Spaine p. 134
    France p. 139
    Low Countrys p. 145
    Scotland p. 151
    Ireland p. 152
    Denmarke p. 157
Germany 146
Poland, Muscovy, Hungary Maroccos &c. p. 157
Instruct[i]ons Treaties and other papers concerning State affaires p. 158 & 163
Of Princes their
Coronations p. 193
Marriages p. 194
Entertainments & feates p. 195
Journeys p. 196
The Kings house p. 203
Of Queenes p. 205
Great Officers of State
Constables p. 201
Admiralls p. 202
Stewards p. 201
Marshalls p. 201
Treasurers p. 201
Chancellors p. 202
Cheife Justices p. 202
Presidents of y^ North p. 202
Masters of the Ordinance and of the Navy p. 202
Rights of Kings to severall Crownes p. 204
of Parliaments p. 172
Acta Concilij p. 173
Of the King of Englands Dominions in France p. 214
Of Heraldry
heraulds at Armes p. 181
Genealogies p. 182
Funeralls p. 185
Precedency of Princes & Noble Familys p. 185
Creations of Noble Men p. 206
Of Knights
Garter p. 186
Bath p. 186
Golden Fleece p. 187
of Turneaments and Duells p. 219
of p[er]ticular Cittyes and Townes in England p. 211
Of the Cinque Ports p. 212
Of Merchandize and Moneys p. 174
Abstracts out of Ancient Records p. 165
Of Universities and Colleges p. 213
of the holy Land p. 213
of Warre p. 206
It will be apparent at a glance that the vast majority of the classifications relate to the history of England. It should also be remarked that the page references are not always consecutive and that one subject, ‘Of Particular Persons of England’, bears no page reference. This suggests that there was another version of the catalogue that presented the subjects in the order of their appearance in the table. Support for this hypothesis is to be found in the title of three of the surviving manuscripts: ‘Catalogus Bibliothecae Cottonianae Anno 1674 continet folia 86’. None of the six surviving manuscripts contains eighty-six folios, and the manuscript implied by the page references in the table of contents would be about 270 pages long (135 folios if both sides were used and 270 folios if only the rectos were written on). We have evidence, therefore, for two lost versions of the classified list, a ‘paginated catalogue’ and an ‘86 folio catalogue’. The former would have been copied from the latter, taking over the title (with its reference to the size of the earlier catalogue) and the table of contents, but differing from its model in the arrangement of the body of the catalogue (hence non-consecutive page references in the table). The four surviving manuscripts with the faithfully copied irrelevant page references must, of course, rely on the paginated catalogue rather than the ‘86 folio catalogue’, and it can be shown by the arrangement of the subjects within the body of the surviving codices that they all rely on the paginated catalogue.

An assessment of the arrangement of the surviving catalogues is complicated by three factors: (1) the classifications are not always explicitly labelled; (2) the heading in the body of the catalogue does not always agree with the wording in the table of contents; and (3) one section has been mislabelled. Nevertheless, an analysis of the entries themselves reveals that most of the subject divisions given in the table of contents are reflected in the six extant catalogues, but they appear neither in the order in which they are presented in the table nor in the order implied by the page references. Indeed, no two surviving versions of the catalogue present the classifications in exactly the same order. They share, however, certain patterns in their arrangement, and these all derive from the order of the paginated catalogue. Also, two of the copies include numbers in the left margin of the body of the catalogue that accord with pages of the paginated catalogue. Furthermore, none of the extant catalogues includes a section on particular persons of England, the very section that we surmised was missing from the paginated catalogue.

All of the surviving lists, as originally copied, are also missing the following categories: ‘Of Princes’, ‘The King’s House’, ‘Of Queens’, ‘Great Officers of State’, ‘Rights of Kings to several Crowns’, ‘Of Heraldry’, ‘Of Knights’, and ‘Of War’ (that is pp. 181–206 of the paginated catalogue). These subjects were ultimately transcribed into
Petyt 538/40 but are clearly a later addition. This provides an important clue for understanding the transmission of the text of the paginated catalogue to the manuscripts we have today. The exemplar for these six codices, most probably the paginated catalogue itself, was not a bound codex but was either a series of unbound gatherings or loose sheets bundled into sections. The portion that comprised pp. 181–206, it would seem, was not routinely available. This explains both the variety of arrangements and the haphazard labelling among the six copies, for a copyist could well be confused or misled by an exemplar in pieces, particularly in transcribing a text as monotonous as a catalogue and in the absence of a running head or careful labelling in the exemplar.

The problem of organizing a copy of the catalogue would have been exacerbated if the portions of the exemplar were not all available at once to a copyist, and this situation may well have obtained. The six catalogues we know today show no sign of having been produced centrally. Some were copied by a single hand, others by more than one. They are on a variety of papers, and no single paper is present in more than one copy. It is entirely possible, therefore, that someone who wanted a copy of the catalogue would receive portions of the exemplar as they were needed. Indeed, the exemplar may have been divided into portions in order to facilitate its speedy reproduction. Four of the surviving copies of the classified list bear the date 1674, and it is reasonable to assume that they would not have been copied much after that date. This assumption is confirmed for Petyt 538/40, into which another brief catalogue dated 30 March 1675 has been entered after the bulk of the Cotton catalogue was copied. The others probably date from around the same time, but we cannot be absolutely certain.

The six copies of the catalogue were owned by scholars and clergymen, most of whom were of Sir John Cotton’s generation, and there is no compelling reason to doubt that they were made for those men. The manuscript in Magdalene College, Cambridge, was owned by Samuel Pepys (1633–1703), the famous diarist. Sir John and he were certainly acquaintances by 1675, when they together advocated a large allocation for the building of new ships for the Royal Navy in a House of Commons debate. In later years, Pepys would borrow many manuscripts from the collection, and he was quoted as saying he considered the Cottonian Library one of the jewels of the crown of England.

Trinity College O.4.12 belonged to Thomas Gale (1635/6–1702), who was High Master of St Paul’s School at the time this manuscript would have been copied. He was the greatest scholar among those who possessed copies of this catalogue, and he used the library extensively. In the preface to the third volume of his Historiae Anglicaee Scriptores (1691), Gale praised the quality of the Cotton collection and the generosity of its owners in allowing access. Thomas Smith (1638–1710), who prepared the first printed catalogue of the Cotton collection (1696), mentioned therein Gale’s having used the library.

The copy of the classified list included in Harley 694 was owned by Edward Stillingfleet (1635–99), who was appointed Bishop of Worcester in 1689. His study of English church history, Origines Britannicae, was published in 1685. Of his
acquaintance with Cotton, we know only that Sir John was selected by the House of Commons to invite Stillingfleet to preach to the House in 1666.  

William Petyt (c. 1641-1707), most of whose writings dealt with the history of Parliament, owned the copy in the Inner Temple Library. Although little of his correspondence survives, we have a copy of a letter he wrote to Sir John Cotton in 1676 concerning the origins of Parliament. Petyt used many Cotton manuscripts, and he, like Gale, was mentioned by Smith in his history of the collection. Petyt had an emperor order catalogue of the Cottonian Library in addition to the classified list, and this emperor order catalogue was most probably one of the authorities consulted in the emendation of his classified list. Petyt's classified list was originally of the same extent as the others but was subsequently expanded by the addition of the subjects on pp. 181-206 of the paginated catalogue.

A list of 'Books given to Sir John Cottons Library by John Marsham, Esq.' has been written at the end of Kent County Archives Doc. U1121 Z19. This John Marsham would almost certainly have been the younger Sir John Marsham, who was particularly interested in English history. The elder Sir John (1602-85), the Egyptologist, was knighted in 1660 and created baronet in 1663, and it is unlikely he would have been referred to as ‘John Marsham, Esq.’ in the 1670s. Sir John Marsham the younger, on the other hand, would not have taken the title ‘Sir’ until he inherited the baronetcy on the death of his father in 1685. Many entries in this catalogue have been marked in the margin, including some for items that Sir John Marsham the younger had transcribed. One is tempted to hypothesize that the gift of manuscripts to the Cotton collection was in exchange for the classified list itself, which would indicate that the list was made for the son, but we cannot be certain for which Marsham the catalogue was copied.

William Sancroft (1617-93) owned Tanner 273. His name is inscribed at the head of the manuscript: ‘W: Cant.’ Sancroft did not become Archbishop of Canterbury until 1678, but he may have owned the manuscript earlier. He marked several entries on church history in the margin of his copy. If we are to believe Thomas Smith, Sancroft did not think very highly of his catalogue:

To help me to realise the purpose to which I clung [i.e., the preparation of a new catalogue of the Cotton collection] I consulted the most reverend father and lord in Christ, William Sancroft, the late archbishop of Canterbury, while he was still living at Lambeth, and he approved of the idea and poured charming encouragement into my ready ears to revise or rather reconstruct the old catalogues which were mutilated and imperfect, teeming, as he said, with a thousand errors.

A fragment of a manuscript like the six discussed thus far forms a part of MS. Rawlinson D.901 in the Bodleian Library. It bears no marks of previous ownership, not even an earlier pagination or foliation, and its provenance cannot be traced further back than 1893, when it was bound into Rawlinson D.901 from Rawlinson fragments. It is a genuine fragment, and not a selective listing. There are far too few entries to a page for it to be a fragment of the ‘86 folio catalogue’, and the absence of any pagination makes it unlikely that it is a fragment of the paginated catalogue. It is most probably,
therefore, all that remains of another copy of the classified list that circulated in the 1670s.

It is likely that Henry Powle (1630–92) owned, or at least used, a copy of the classified list. ‘A Catalogue of the Manuscripts in Sir Robert Cotton's Library reduced under severall heads’ occupies a page of MS. Additional C.40 in the Bodleian Library, which once belonged to him. It consists of a version of the table of contents familiar from the six paper codices. It is, however, different in intriguing respects. The page references are mostly those of the faithful copies of the table of the paginated catalogue, but the order of presentation of classifications is not quite the same, the wording is not quite the same, and three categories are missing. The changes seem to reflect an attempt to make better order of the more familiar table. This table certainly does not, however, present the categories in the order implied by the page references, so it does not directly reflect the shape of the paginated catalogue. On the verso of the page on which the table is written is ‘A note of some choyse MS. remaining in the sayd Library’. This gives brief descriptions and emperor pressmarks of about thirty items, with page references to the classified list. The entries are not identified according to classification, however, and they appear neither in the order of their appearance in any surviving copy of the classified list nor in emperor order. These entries in Additional C.40 provide, therefore, somewhat puzzling evidence for the further dissemination of the classified list.

The last manuscript of our group, Additional MS. 8926 in the British Library (fig. 1), is a large parchment document of twenty folios stabbed at the bottom edge and tied with string and coloured silks, to which are attached three seals, all melted. It is written in a single elegant formal hand. This manuscript attracted the attention of Joseph Planta when he was preparing the now standard catalogue of the Cotton collection. It was not incorporated as an Additional Manuscript by the British Museum until c. 1832, and it seems to have been among the Cotton Manuscripts when Planta knew it. It differs from the paper codices in the complete absence of the table of contents and of pressmarks. The subjects are familiar from the paper manuscripts, and they are presented in the order of the paginated catalogue. The subject ‘Of Particular Persons of England’, apparently missing from the paginated catalogue and certainly missing from the paper codices, is missing here as well. The parchment manuscript would have been copied, therefore, from the same exemplar as the others. It was copied later than the others, however, for it includes an extra section, headed ‘Roberti Grosthed Episcopi Lincoln opera’, which contains entries for dozens of items in manuscripts returned to the Cottonian Library from Westminster Abbey. These manuscripts left the library in Sir Robert's time and were definitely at Westminster at the time the classified list was originally drawn up. Thomas Smith alluded to their return in his catalogue of 1696, claiming that they had been estranged from the library for sixty years, but we do not know precisely when these manuscripts came back to the Cotton collection.

The parchment document could be the schedule mentioned in an act of Parliament of 1701 concerning the transfer of the collection into public hands. Its pretentious format suggests that it may have been made in connection with the gift of the collection to the
nated. Whereas the paper codices constituted a sort of publication of the library’s contents to scholars, the parchment copy would have been made for another purpose. It would prove impractical for locating material in the library because of the absence of pressmarks, and it must have been copied more for ostentation than for utility, most likely, I think, when the Cottonian Library was bequeathed to the nation at the turn of the century.

It remains to consider when, how, and by whom the classified list was originally drawn up. Although the exemplar for the manuscripts we have today was undoubtedly dated 1674, it need not have been made in that year. There is some evidence that the list was compiled over several years. As already mentioned, there is no systematic progression through the presses within each category. One has the impression that parts of the list were begun in a fairly systematic fashion (the large classifications start with a series of entries from Julius) but that this was abandoned and the work then proceeded more casually. The section of documents relating to monasteries, churches, and hospitals must already have been partially compiled when the entries were made for three manuscripts (Claudius A. XIII, Nero E. VII, and Otho B. XIV) given to the Cottonian Library in 1670 by Samuel Roper (1633–78). The entries for these manuscripts appear together in a sequence near the end of the section and would have been added when the manuscripts were assigned pressmarks shortly after their arrival. Titus C. XVI and Titus C. XVII, given by Sir Edward Walker (1612–77), were clearly also a late addition to the list. These factors point to work on the classified list having spanned some years beginning in the 1660s.

The classified list was partially, and probably mostly, prepared from an emperor order catalogue of the collection. Items from manuscripts that had been out on loan for decades or had been missing since the mid 1650s are to be found among the entries in the classified list. The list was not, however, exclusively compiled from an old catalogue, as attested by the inclusion of acquisitions as recent as the Roper gifts. The classified list, therefore, reflects the state of the collection as it would have been in the 1670s, had manuscripts not become estranged from the collection. The list would seem to have been updated even after the paper codices were copied. The parchment copy includes an entry for Vespasian E. XXVI, absent from the paper copies, as the last item in the section of documents relating to monasteries, churches, and hospitals. This manuscript, a gift from Anchitell Grey (d. 1702), was a late addition to the collection.

Finally we come to the question of the authorship of the classified list. Sir John Cotton did not attend to the maintenance of the collection himself. He spent most of his maturity at his villa at Stratton, Bedfordshire. He would have had neither the inclination nor the opportunity to prepare the classified list, although he probably would have authorized its reproduction in 1674. If one person was largely responsible for the compilation of the classified list, that person most probably would have been Sir William Dugdale (1605–86). It was he who claimed in his autobiography to have been given free access to the library by Sir Thomas Cotton (1594–1662) in the early 1650s, to have sorted much material, and to have arranged for the binding of some eighty volumes around that
It was also Dugdale who wrote the *ex dono* inscriptions in the codices whose entries appear to represent late additions to the classified list, both before and after the publication in 1674. Between the death of John Selden (1584–1654) and the advent of Thomas Smith, no scholar was more closely associated with the Cottonian Library than Dugdale. He might have made some partial lists in connection with the sorting and binding of state papers in the early 1650s, or he might have begun by drawing up lists in connection with his work for the *Monasticon Anglicanum* (1655–73) or his *Antiquities of Warwickshire* (1656), and only later conceived of a classified list of the whole of the collection. We have no compelling evidence that Dugdale compiled the classified list, but he certainly had the opportunity to do so.

I would like to offer the following provisional conclusions, which await refinement, refutation, or confirmation once a comparative edition of the manuscripts has been made. The classified list was compiled, perhaps by Dugdale, during the 1660s and 1670s from an emperor order catalogue and also from the manuscripts themselves. A version of that list, the ‘paginated catalogue’, served as the exemplar for the eight surviving manuscripts. The paper codices, copied in the 1670s for scholars and clergymen, constituted a limited publication of the contents of the library. The parchment document was copied later, perhaps in connection with the donation of the collection to the nation around the turn of the century.

2 This group was defined by Tite, *Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Cottonian Library* (1696) reprinted from Sir Robert Harley’s Copy, annotated by Humfrey Wanley, together with documents relating to the fire of 1731 (Cambridge, 1984), p. 14.
4 Montague Rhodes James, *The Western Manuscripts in the Library of Trinity College, Cambridge, Volume III containing an account of the manuscripts standing in class O* (Cambridge, 1902), p. 262; *Catalogi librorum manuscriptorum*, vol. ii, pt. i, p. 190 (no. 6051). I am grateful to D. J. McKitterick, Librarian at Trinity College, for permission to examine this manuscript.
7 There is no published catalogue of the collection of the Kent County Archives. The ‘unofficial catalogues’ can be consulted at the archives. The Marsham material was catalogued by F. Hull, Mar.–Apr. 1966.
10 Pepys 2427, Trinity College O.4.12, Petty 538/40, and Kent County Archives Doc. U1121 Z19. Some of the page references have been
effaced in Kent County Archives Doc. U1121 Z19, and page references for the volume at hand have been entered in their place.

11 Harley 694 and Tanner 273.

12 It probably once occupied pp. 207–10 of that catalogue, but was removed before the page references were entered into the table. ‘Of War’ only contains a handful of entries and could not have occupied all of the space between pp. 206 and 211 (see Petyt 538/40, f. 189r).

13 Pepys 2427, Harley 694, Petyt 538/40. In Kent County Archives Doc. U1121 Z19, the title has been written as in the other three, but without the number of folios; then the number of folios of the volume at hand (129) has been added.

14 For example, ‘Acta Concilii’ and ‘Of Merchandise and Moneys’ are present in all six codices, but are not labelled as such.

15 For example, the section ‘Abstracts out of ancient records’ is headed ‘Rotula Records Registra Chartuaria &c’ in Harley 694 (f. 261r).

16 The section labelled ‘Miscellanea’ beginning on f. 27or of Harley 694 is actually a part of the section ‘Theological Books and Ecclesiastical History’.

17 Trinity College O.4.12, ff. 23r–31r, 45r–50r, 78r–90v; Harley 694, ff. 27or–273r. Some of these numbers do not appear in consecutive order, and it is apparent that the pages within the section ‘Theological Books and Ecclesiastical History’ were scrambled in the exemplar. This has led to inaccurate implications of pressmarks in the catalogues we have today. If the first entry at the top of a page in the exemplar had ‘ibidem’ rather than a pressmark and that page was copied out of order, the wrong pressmark would then be implied, because the nearest preceding pressmark would not be the correct one. The numbers do not occur in consecutive pairs, which suggests that only one side of each leaf was written on in the paginated catalogue.

18 The bulk of the Cottonian catalogue in Petyt 538/40 (ff. 1–172) was copied by a single scribe. Another hand has carefully corrected and emended the work of the first and has written the portion containing the missing categories (ff. 181–189).

19 I have not made a comparative palaeographic study of these manuscripts.

20 F. 179.

21 They surely would have been copied before 1687, when Sir John Cotton wrote to Thomas Smith (30 June): ‘Truly (Sir) we are fallen into so dangerous times, that it may be more for the advantage of my private concerns, & the publick too, that the library should not be too much known. There are many things in it, which are very crosse to the Romish interest, & you know what kind of persons the Jesuits are’. (Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS. Smith 48 [SC 15655], p. 253).


23 For the loans, see the correspondence between Pepys and Thomas Smith contained in Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS. Smith 53 (SC 15660) and MS. Smith 65 (SC 15671).


26 Thomas Smith quoted this passage in his catalogue of the Cottonian manuscripts (Catalogus librorum manuscriptorum bibliothecae Cottonianae [Oxford, 1696], p. L).

27 Smith, Catalogus, p. XLII.

28 The entry for Stillingfleet in Fontes Harleiani is somewhat misleading. The table of contents at the beginning of this volume originally listed only the first nineteen items in the manuscript (a series of catalogues of libraries in a single hand and on the same paper). The Cottonian catalogue is in several hands and on different papers and is a later addition to the table of contents. Nevertheless, it is almost certain that this Cottonian catalogue belonged to Stillingfleet and came into the Harleian collection together with the other Stillingfleet manuscripts, not only because it is now bound into a volume with other Stillingfleet material, but because two catalogues of Stillingfleet’s manuscripts include entries for a catalogue of the Cotton collection (London, BL, Harl. MS. 7644, f. [1v] and Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS. Rawlinson D.878, f. 78r). Cf. Cyril


32 A list of Cottonian manuscripts consulted by Petyt is included as an appendix to Conway Davies’s catalogue of the manuscripts in the library of the Inner Temple (*Catalogue*, pp. 1347–8).

33 Smith, *Catalogus*, p. XLII.

34 London, Inner Temple Library, Petyt MS. 538/41. Some of the corrections reflect archaisms in his emperor order catalogue and thus would have been made from it rather than from the manuscripts themselves.

35 F. 181r–189.

36 F. 120r.

37 *D.N.B.* under Marsham.

38 Transcripts from Cottonian manuscripts made for Marsham are preserved in the Kent County Archives Office (Docs. U1121 Z53/3 & 6 and U1121 Z54/2–6).

39 There is an entry for this catalogue in a manuscript catalogue of Sancroft’s manuscripts, dated 1721 (Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS. Carte 263, f. 110r).


42 Macray, *Catalogi*, col. 101. The hand responsible for this fragment is quite like that of Pepys’s copy of the classified list. Their resemblance ought to be more closely examined, especially as some Pepys material found its way into the Rawlinson collection (Falconer Madan, *A Summary Catalogue of Western Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library at Oxford*, vol. iii (Oxford, 1895), p. 178).

43 Its arrangement is particularly chaotic, with fragments of the alphabetical section interspersed among the subject divisions.


45 The numbers of the references generally agree with those in the four faithful copies, but in the few instances in which they are qualified, they are said to be folio rather than page numbers. This contributes to the suspicion that only the rectos of leaves were written on in the paginated catalogue (see n. 17). The categories that are entirely missing are: ‘Of Particular Persons of England’, ‘Of Particular Cities and Towns in England’, and ‘Of Universities and Colleges’. These would not have been strictly contiguous in the paginated catalogue.

46 P. viii.

47 ‘Catalogue of Additional Manuscripts Nos. 6666–10018’, p. 56 (an unpublished catalogue available in the Students’ Room of the Department of Manuscripts).


49 Planta, *Catalogue*, p. xi. The date of its incorporation as an Additional Manuscript is suggested by its number. Additional MSS. 8928–8976 were received into the Department of Manuscripts in 1832 (‘Catalogue of Additional Manuscripts Nos. 6666–10018’, p. 56).

50 It does, however, include the categories on pp. 181–206 of the paginated catalogue.


52 The copies of the classified list owned by Gale and Sancroft include the following entry at the appropriate place in the alphabetical portion:
'Roberti Grostest opera fuere in hac bibliotheca nunc translatas sunt in Westmonasteriensem' (Trinity College O.4.12, f. 105v and Tanner 273, f. 134r).

53 Smith, Catalogus, ‘lector’ (not paginated).

54 The statute states that all the manuscripts ‘are particularly mentioned and named in a Schedule now remaining in the said Library’ (The Statutes of the Realm, vol. vii, p. 642). It goes on to specify one of the duties of the keeper once he is appointed: ‘... he shall cause another Schedule to be made in Parchment which shall contain not only the Names and Titles of all the said Manuscripts Parchments Written Papers Records and other Memorialls but also the Number of the Pages and Folio’s thereunto belonging...’ (Ibid., vol. vii, p. 643). The schedule ‘now remaining in the said Library’ was clearly considered inadequate, as well Add. MS. 8926 might be.

55 Two different cartularies were given the pressmark Otho B. XIV during the course of the seventeenth century. I refer here to the second manuscript to be given that pressmark, a Lenton cartulary. Although Otho B. XIV was destroyed in the fire of 1731, we know that it was once owned by Samuel Roper (G. R. C. Davis, Medieval Cartularies of Great Britain: A Short Catalogue (London, 1958), p. 62). Claudius A. XIII and Nero E. VII have dated ex dono inscriptions, and it seems reasonable to assume that all three manuscripts were given in 1670.

56 Kent County Archives Doc. U1121 Z19 is missing the entry for Nero E. VII, presumably due to a scribal error.

57 These manuscripts were numbered Titus C. XVII and Titus C. XVIII when they first entered the collection (and carry those pressmarks in the classified list). These both have ex dono inscriptions. The classification ‘History of England and other Countries’ is arranged as follows: anonymous chronicles and histories, attributed chronicles and histories (in alphabetical order), histories arranged chronologically by reigning English monarch. The entries for Titus C. XVI (Mandeville, Travels) and Titus C. XVII (Geoffrey of Monmouth, Historia brttonum) appear together at the end of the alphabetical sequence.

58 For example, the Cotton Genesis (Otho B. VI) was lent to the Earl of Arundel in 1630 (BL, Harl. MS. 6018, f. 178v) and was bought back for the library not long before 1696 (Smith, Catalogus, ‘lector’ (not paginated)), but it is listed in the classified catalogue. Similarly, Tiberius B. VII (William Thorne, Chronicle), missing according to a checklist made in 1696 (BL, Add. MS. 36682, f. 1r, where it is mistakenly listed as an Augustus manuscript) and never recovered, is recorded in the classified catalogue.

59 Here follows an outline of changes in the shape of the collection as reflected in the first emperor catalogue (Add. MS. 36682) and as reflected in the classified list: when the classified list was made, Caligula B had 10 volumes, Caligula C had 9, Caligula D and E each had 12, Nero C had been extended to 12 volumes, Nero E had been extended to 7, Galba E had been extended to 12, Otho D had been extended to 11, Vespasian E had 25 volumes, Vespasian F had 11, Titus C had been extended to 18 volumes, Titus D had been extended to 17, Faustina C had 11 volumes, Faustina D had 14, Faustina E had 15 (?), Faustina F had 1 volume. No manuscripts are classed in the Augustus press in the classified list. It should be remembered that the first emperor catalogue, no less than the classified list itself, seems to have been compiled over a period of some years, and we do not know to what extent it is complete or accurately reflects the actual holdings at the time it was drawn up. On the dating of the first emperor catalogue, see Tite, ‘The Early Catalogues’, pp. 148–50.

60 It is included as a marginal addition in Petyt 538/40 (f. 127v).

61 The gift is recorded in an ex dono inscription in the manuscript (f. 2r). We do not know when the manuscript came into the Cotton collection.

62 D.N.B. under Cotton.


64 That is: Claudius A. XIII, Nero E. VII, Vespasian E. XXVI, Titus C. XVI, and Titus C. XVII. Colin Tite has kindly confirmed the identification of Dugdale’s hand. I am most grateful to him for his counsel and encouragement in the preparation of this article.

65 Smith first proposed preparing a new catalogue in a letter to Sir John Cotton dated 23 June 1687 (Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS. Smith 59 [SC 15666], p. 181), but he did not begin work on the new catalogue until 13 Apr. 1694 (see Smith 59,
p. 232). Smith and Cotton were on friendly terms, Smith having already visited Sir John's country home, by 1686 (see Smith 48, pp. 247–248). I am grateful to Martin Kauffmann for assistance on this point and on other matters pertaining to Bodleian manuscripts. The correspondence between Smith and both Sir John and his half brother Sir Robert deserves closer scrutiny.

66 D.N.B. under Cotton. He has written pressmarks and tables of contents in a number of Cotton manuscripts (I owe this point to Colin Tite).

Thomas Smith mentioned Dugdale several times in his history of the library (Catalogus, pp. XXXI–XLVI), and he acknowledged Dugdale as a predecessor in his address to the reader (Smith, Catalogus, 'lector' [not paginated]). If Dugdale supervised the copying of the classified list, he might have withheld the portion of the exemplar that was not routinely available (pp. 181–206 of the paginated catalogue) because it included the section of genealogies, which he needed as he prepared his Baronage of England (1675–6) for the press.