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The last thirty years has seen a great outpouring of scholarship on seventeenth-century British antiquaries. Antiquaries' collaborative epistolary networks and the clubs and societies which shaped their work have been traced.[[1]](#footnote-1) Their attempts to understand Britain's ancient monuments have been studied.[[2]](#footnote-2) Their political commitments and their contributions to crucial debates about the status of the common law have been revealed.[[3]](#footnote-3) The ways antiquaries shaped sense of local and national identity have been explored.[[4]](#footnote-4) In that context, too, Anglo-centric accounts of British antiquarianism have recently been powerfully challenged.[[5]](#footnote-5) Scholars have studied antiquaries' methodologies, including the philological work embodied in their creation of dictionaries of medieval Latin or Anglo-Saxon grammars.[[6]](#footnote-6) Their passion for etymology has been uncovered, together with their desire to grasp the interrelationship between languages.[[7]](#footnote-7) Attention has been paid to the interconnections between antiquarianism and natural history.[[8]](#footnote-8) Antiquaries have also been studied as collectors of everything -- from medieval manuscripts to art, statues and coins.[[9]](#footnote-9) We have seen accounts of antiquaries' books and reading habits.[[10]](#footnote-10) The printing of antiquarian books has been examined.[[11]](#footnote-11) Biographies of individual antiquaries have been written, as have synoptic treatments of the whole antiquarian tradition.[[12]](#footnote-12)

 In all this, however, with some notable exceptions, there has been relatively little attention paid to the ways in which antiquaries wrote -- to antiquarian prose itself. This is understandable, for several reasons. For one thing, antiquarianism was a practice -- a thing done -- and that doing did not necessarily entail writing. Britain's antiquaries were usually (but not always) men who paid particular attention to the documents of the past.[[13]](#footnote-13) Those 'documents' were usually written -- medieval historians, Tower records, deeds of noble families. Such 'documents', however, did also encompass coins, inscriptions, urns, mosaics, prehistoric artefacts, bones, fossils, and much more. Perhaps a less anachronistic term than 'documents' would be 'monuments', which, especially in its Latin form, *monumenta*, encompassed everything from manuscripts to standing stones.[[14]](#footnote-14)When antiquaries wrote about their discoveries, they did so in a huge variety of forms. 'Antiquarian prose' might most immediately call to mind the great county histories of the seventeenth century, which, in our period, encompassed classics of the genre such as William Dugdale's *Antiquities of Warwickshire* (1656) and Robert Plot's *The Natural History of Oxford-Shire* (1677), but even these works, as we shall see, are structurally very different to one another. Seventeenth-century examples of this heterogeneous genre were ultimately attempts to deepen the chorographic accounts of each county offered by William Camden in his *Britannia* (1586-1607), a work which was revised and republished in the late-seventeenth century as a *summa* of the progress made in this kind of county historiography during the seventeenth century.

 But 'antiquarian prose' was by no means limited to this kind of county history. Almost at the same time as Dugdale published his *Antiquities of Warwickshire*, he was also responsible for publishing one of the great compilations of medieval documents in his *Monasticon Anglicanum* (1655), the collection of monastic charters which he and the Yorkshire antiquary Roger Dodsworth (1585-1654) had amassed. Antiquaries produced other kinds of edition in this period, too, especially editions of medieval monastic historians, like those edited by William Fulman and Thomas Gale and published by Oxford University Press.[[15]](#footnote-15) As well as directly producing editions of medieval documents, antiquaries also made catalogues of medieval manuscripts in this period, and increasingly brought them into print. Seventeenth-century catalogues of the celebrated library amassed by Robert Cotton (1570/1-1631) were written only in manuscript, but at the end of the century the non-juror, Thomas Smith (1638-1710), who acted as librarian to the Cotton Library in the 1690s, brought an expanded version of those earlier catalogues into print.[[16]](#footnote-16) But while many antiquaries were working toward publishing their findings, many others never intended to create systematic works for publication. Letters were not only a means for the major, publishing antiquaries to communicate with one another -- for many seventeenth-century people with an interest in doing antiquarianism, letters were the primary form in which they wrote about what they did. Many such antiquaries never intended to produce finished, publishable works about their findings, and thus their work found ideal expression in the brief and disposable form of the letter.

 The category of 'antiquarian prose' is, therefore, a bewilderingly broad one. Indeed, bewildering breadth is itself one of the most important characteristics of antiquarian prose. As Angus Vine has recently argued in a brilliant account of the subject, antiquarian works reflect a struggle to become at once both 'systematic and miscellaneous': 'systematic in the elaborate organizational principles that compilers often chose for them, but miscellaneous in their contents and methods of textual production'. Vine persuasively locates this tension between the 'accretive and accumulative' and the desire to be 'systematic', in the material culture within which antiquaries worked: mountains of miscellaneous notes had to be stitched together into some kind of coherent, organized shape.[[17]](#footnote-17) Vine's focus is largely on the late sixteenth century, but many of the same tensions he identifies are present within the antiquarianism of the seventeenth- and early-eighteenth centuries, too. Editions and catalogues of the mass of medieval documents were ways of bringing some kind of systematic order to those materials. Yet, as we shall see, medieval documents had a way of disrupting attempts to domesticate them to seventeenth-century prose. These tensions are given precise expression in the autobiographical account of the antiquary, Thomas Madox (1666-1727), of the process of researching and writing his massive history of the institution of the Exchequer in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. 'The first part of my business was', Madox writes, 'to make as full a collection from Records as I could, of Materials relating to the Subject'. This was not easy work: 'the labour of this cannot easily be estimated by any man who has not had some experience of it'. It is easy to see why many antiquaries never moved beyond this collecting phase. Madox, however, did. 'Those materials being ranged in a certain order in several books of *Collectanea*', he explains, 'I reviewed them, and weighing what they imported, and how they might be applied, drew from thence a general scheme of the projected Design'. 'When I pitched upon Chapters or heads of Discourse,' he goes on, 'I took materials out of the stock provided, and digested them in proper places'. He would 'write down, in the draught of this Book', relevant 'Records or testimonies', before 'connecting and applying them afterwards, as the case would admit'. [[18]](#footnote-18) Making collections, 'weighing what they imported', 'drawing from thence', 'digest[ing] them in proper places', 'connecting and applying': these are all the processes that the antiquary needed to go through in gathering and synthesizing the monuments of the past. It is easy to see how many antiquarian works ended up coming apart at the seams. The tensions within antiquarian prose are therefore the subject of the rest of this chapter.

**~~~**

That these tensions were felt to shape antiquarian prose writing is evident from some of the work which went into the revision of William Camden's *Britannia*, which was published in 1695.[[19]](#footnote-19) The overall editor of the book was a young Oxford scholar of Anglo-Saxon, Edmund Gibson (1669-1748), and he was tasked with bringing together the scattered work of antiquaries from across Britain and Ireland into a coherent and publishable form. His letters to Arthur Charlett (1655-1722), the Master of University College, Oxford, vividly illuminate many of the challenges he faced in preparing this enormous antiquarian publication. One of these was getting the *style* of the book right. William Camden had written his original *Britannia* in Latin, and the book had been translated into English by the translator of classical texts, Philemon Holland, in an edition published in 1610.[[20]](#footnote-20) By the end of the seventeenth century, however, Holland's translation seemed crude -- when the booksellers issued proposals for a new edition of the *Britannia*, they described the translation as 'very ill'.[[21]](#footnote-21) In producing a new edition of the *Britannia*, specialists in the antiquities of each region were tasked with preparing translations of Camden's account of that region -- the young Thomas Tanner (1674-1735) of Wiltshire, Edward Lhwyd of Wales, and so on. Each of these specialists then added a set of 'Additions' to their region, designed to bring the antiquarian scholarship on that area up to date. For some regions, multiple antiquaries contributed fragmentary sets of material: an inscription here, a hoard of coins there, and sometimes bits of modern economic history, too. When they did so, they wrote about it in different ways. This troubled Gibson. 'Now it was my design from the beginning', he explained to Charlett, 'to put all papers into form in their several Counties'. Unless he took a firm editorial hand, he risked 'an inequalitie of stile and composition, which would be the new consequence of several different pens' which 'must needs prove a great deformitie in the whole'.[[22]](#footnote-22) This was a problem that Gibson would be far from entirely able to resolve.

 Gibson's concern for the dangers of 'inequalitie of stile and composition' is a telling moment in the history of antiquarian prose. For one thing, despite antiquaries' reputation for sticking to the facts at the expense of eloquence, it demonstrates Gibson's concern for stylistic matters. As Joseph Levine has argued, even those who had a tendency to mock or condemn antiquarian learning in the seventeenth century were able to appreciate the need for antiquarian illumination of national history. Presenting the work with a polite and coherent smoothness was thus essential to making it palatable to readers for whom erudition was not automatically acceptable.[[23]](#footnote-23) But, at a deeper level, Gibson's desire to avoid stylistic plurality reflects the nature of antiquarianism at the end of the seventeenth century. For all that William Camden drew on the work of many fellow antiquarian collaborators, his work was ultimately that of a single author.[[24]](#footnote-24) Written in Latin, it had a fairly clear ambition to be received among the international world of European scholarship that had inspired the book in the first place. For all the perceived weaknesses (in the eyes of the late seventeenth-century antiquaries) of Philemon Holland's translation, it similarly had a singularity and unity to it as the work of an individual translator. The 1695 *Britannia* was, by contrast, many-headed: it represented diverse notions of what antiquarianism was and how it should be practised in the late seventeenth century, and diverse ways of writing about it. For some, antiquarianism was primarily focussed on Roman antiquities and remains; for others, it focussed on the middle ages; for others still, it could encompass modern economic history too. Some antiquaries prepared for Gibson coherently written and argued sustained treatments of particular counties, submitted to Gibson as little booklets, which are made to seem monumental beside the contributions of other antiquaries, who sent letters, notes, drawings, off-cuts of printed broadsides, or even brass-rubbings.[[25]](#footnote-25) By 1695, British antiquarianism had an almost uncontainable capaciousness to it, embodied materially in the profusion of documents which lie behind the 1695 *Britannia*. Gibson's task, therefore, was to try to contain these heterogeneous written and material forms, turning them into something capable of being printed.

 For Gibson, 'inequalitie of stile and composition' was problematic. That was not so, however, for all antiquaries in the late seventeenth century, as Kate Bennett has argued in what is probably the most searching treatment of seventeenth-century British antiquarian prose writing.[[26]](#footnote-26) Her article's central concept emerges from Gibson's dismissal of the three-volume *Monumenta Britannica* manuscript by John Aubrey (1626-1697) as a 'mere rhapsody'. Aubrey's *Monumenta* contained his celebrated discussion of Stonehenge, but also ranged far more widely over British antiquities and architecture.[[27]](#footnote-27) Gibson's dismissal of the work as a 'rhapsody' suggested, as Bennett explains, that he saw it as a loosely articulated series of miscellaneous materials, just the sort of thing that Gibson was attempting to avoid by trying to bring some stylistic unity to the *Britannia*. Turning Gibson's term of criticism on its head, Bennett argues that Aubrey deliberately embraced what she calls the 'rhapsodic book', one 'based in a new empirical evidence, impatient with rhetorical tradition, and incompatible with print culture; one which looked beyond the present to the needs of the future, and which infuriated traditionalists in its approach to authority'.[[28]](#footnote-28) In its embrace of provisionality and its orientation toward the readers of the future, Aubrey's antiquarian writing, Bennett argues, stood as an implicit rebuke to the ideals of more conventionally-minded antiquarian scholars. Aubrey's inability to bring his antiquarian materials together into a form that editors (then or now) find readily publishable is not a failure, but intrinsic to his approach to prose writing.

 Aubrey's embrace of the rhapsodic book (in Bennett's terms) clearly went to extremes that dismayed his contemporaries, but we might suggest that tensions between the rhapsodic (provisional, fragmentary, future-oriented, reader-centric) and its opposite, the unified, coherent, finished, and author-centric whole, were present within much antiquarian writing in late-seventeenth century Britain. As we have already seen, Gibson's approach to the *Britannia's* heterogeneity shows a desire to quell rhapsody. In other ways, though, even if he did not quite enthusiastically embrace rhapsody, he came closer towards it. For his whole conception of antiquarianism demonstrated the need to balance claims of provisionality and completeness. For him, Camden's *Britannia* -- the masterpiece of British antiquarian prose -- did not have an entirely monumental status. He articulates his vision of Camden, and with it his wider conception of antiquarian prose, in the 1695 *Britannia*'s 'Preface to the Reader'.[[29]](#footnote-29) Here, he explains that Camden had won 'applause and commendation' from those who read his work, and had been 'stil'd the *Varro*, the *Strabo*, and the *Pausanias* of Britain'. He was, in other words, Britain's contribution to an antiquarian tradition which stretched back to the classical past. Even so, Camden was in need of '*Additions* and *Corrections*', which, 'in an Author of such an establish'd reputation', might risk looking 'too assuming, or be constru'd a piece of envy and detraction'. However, supplementing and correcting Camden was not a mere exercise in chopping off the heads of tall poppies. It was inevitable that new antiquarian knowledge would continue to emerge since Camden's time, and therefore supplementation and correction were no sign of weakness in the original author. But Gibson goes further. 'If Mr. *Camden* had liv'd to this day', he argues, 'he had been still adding and altering'. Camden, in other words, was an author who had taken his place in a canonical, classical tradition, but who, on the other hand, simultaneously embodied the provisionality of antiquarian writing. To Gibson, British antiquarianism's greatest monument was a monument to provisionality -- to a never-ending process of 'adding and altering'.

 In seeing Camden in this way, Gibson was at odds with some of his contemporaries, who viewed his *Britannia* as a more stable classic. In the late seventeenth century, at the same time as canonical classics of the English literary tradition from the late-sixteenth century and the early-seventeenth century (like Shakespeare and Ben Jonson) were being established, so too were canonical classics of scholarship from exactly the same period.[[30]](#footnote-30) Camden (and his *Britannia*, especially) was one of the foremost examples from early-modern England of a scholar who deserved a place among the well-known names of the canon of continental scholarship. This meant that, for some, Gibson's whole project of adding to the *Britannia* and, perhaps even worse, translating it again into English, served to undermine the classic status of the work. For scholars engaged in antiquarian pursuits, such as the nonjuror Thomas Smith, Camden ought to be reprinted only in his original Latin. Moreover, for Smith, the most proper supplements to Camden were those compiled either (ideally) by Camden himself or (if necessary) those directly connected to him. In one of his letters to the young Thomas Hearne, who would become a leading antiquarian non-juror of the early eighteenth-century, Smith wrote that 'I have by mee' Camden's own copy of the 1607 *Britannia*, 'the last edition published in his lifetime' (deliberately discounting the English translation of the *Britannia* published in 1610 as not an *edition* of the book), in which various inscriptions have been 'added and inserted by himselfe in MS in their proper places, and more found out since his death'.[[31]](#footnote-31) Supplementing Camden, therefore, was a privilege for Camden himself and those sufficiently intimately connected to Camden's legacy as to be able literally to have pasted manuscript additions into Camden's own copy of his book. It was not a matter to be opened to the plurality of Britain's antiquaries. Gibson's approach to the materiality of Camden's text was very different. Together with the booksellers who published the 1695 *Britannia*, he arranged for those responsible for each county to receive unbound leaves of the 1637 edition of the English translation of that county. Antiquaries could then write their own additions as marginalia in these unbound leaves.For Smith, authority lay in Camden's own personal copy of the book; for Gibson, Camden's book was literally and metaphorically unbound, ready for the supplements of antiquaries across Britain.[[32]](#footnote-32) In this context, Gibson's approach to the writing of antiquarianism seems comparatively anti-authoritarian, polyvocal, and even, to some extent, rhapsodic.

**~~~**

The tendency towards stylistic heterogeneity in seventeenth-century antiquarian prose was exacerbated by antiquaries' central subject: the medieval. It is true that, of course, since Britain had been a Roman province, there were some British antiquaries in this period who saw it as their specific remit to write almost exclusively about Roman Britain. One such was the schoolmaster, William Burton (1609-657), whose commentary on the Antonine Itinerary -- one of the most important sources for understanding the geography of Roman Britain -- was published in 1658, shortly after his death. This work is a word-by-word commentary on the Antonine Itinerary, picking apart errors of copyists, analysing and emending grammatical solecisms, and locating Roman places in modern Britain with reference to archaeological finds. Burton was a classical antiquarian, proud of his ability to engage directly with the titanic figures of European scholarship despite being 'a poor Country Schoolmaster'.[[33]](#footnote-33) Burton, however, was an extremely unusual figure in British antiquarianism. Most British antiquaries were medievalists, grappling with the languages and manuscripts of post-Roman Britain. Antiquaries were necessarily faced with the difficult question of how the archaic, unclassical, and often (in their terms) stylistically crude medieval tradition could be absorbed into contemporary prose.

 Those who satirised antiquaries liked to suggest that their overfondness for antiquated things was not limited to the past's material remains, but extended to its language, too. The *New Dictionary of the Canting Crew* (1699), for instance, defined 'The Antiquary' as a 'curious Critick in old Coins, Stones and Inscriptions, in Worm-eaten records and ancient Manuscripts', who 'affects and blindly doats' on 'Relicks, Ruins, old Customs, Phrases and Fashions'.[[34]](#footnote-34)Antiquated 'phrases' were part of the antiquary's misplaced enthusiasms, alongside coins, inscriptions and manuscripts. Archaism was an acknowledged danger of antiquarian prose writing. This danger is perhaps voiced most clearly by the lawyer, James Harrington (1664-1693), in the preface he wrote to the first volume of Anthony Wood's *Athenae Oxonienses* (1691), that enormous compilation of biographies of scholars who graduated from Oxford University from the time of Henry VII to the present day. Harrington, in his preface to the work, is careful to defend the book's language, in particular. 'As to the Language,' he explains, 'the Reader may expect such Words as are suitable to the character of the Work, and of the Person'. Antiquaries, he explains, 'who always converse with old Authors', inevitably 'learn the dialect of their Acquaintance'. Indeed, for the antiquary, few words are 'recevi'd as English, but such as have been naturaliz'd by Spencer', suggesting (with gentle humour) that the famously archaic poet offered the accepted model for antiquaries' prose writing. But, Harrington goes on to say, antiquaries like Wood are right not to sugar-coat the writings of the past by updating their language. 'Originals are best express'd as found', he argues, 'without Alteration; and it is not only a misspent, but ridiculous labour, to change the old Expressions of a Deed; and to put a new Stamp upon a Medal'.[[35]](#footnote-35) The difficult, archaic language of antiquated legal documents needs to be quoted without false embellishment. This process of absorbing old documents into antiquarian writing through quotation may roughen the smooth, elegant, polite verbal surface which Harrington's era admired, but it is inevitable in order to give a historically honest account of the past.

 Some antiquaries did attempt to defend the gothic splendour of the Northern European writing of the early middle ages. Most notable here was the greatest Anglo-Saxon scholar of the age, the nonjuror George Hickes (1642-1715), who attempted to make a case for the rugged majesty of Icelandic sagas and other Northern European poetry.[[36]](#footnote-36) But even those most sympathetic to Hickes and to the study of 'septentrional languages' were unpersuaded. Another Anglo-Saxon scholar, whom Hickes had mentored, the Bishop of Carlisle, William Nicolson (1655-1727), in his account of the Icelandic sagas, commented ironically that those who defended such poets assured us that 'the happiest flights we can meet with in the *Greek* and *Roman* poets, are dull Trash, if compar'd with the Seraphick Lines of a true *Cimbrian* *Scalder*'.[[37]](#footnote-37) Perhaps more common, however, was a cautious acceptance that early medieval prose -- especially Anglo-Saxon prose -- had a certain roughness that was intrinsic to its nature. This raised fascinating questions about how Anglo-Saxon prose ought to be translated into Latin (and it was more common for almost this volume's entire period to see translations of Anglo-Saxon into Latin than into modern English). As translators of Anglo-Saxon, seventeenth-century scholars consciously sought to depart from perhaps their most prominent and significant sixteenth-century precedent. In 1568, the pioneering Anglo-Saxonist and historian of Kent, William Lambarde (1536-1601), had published a collection of Anglo-Saxon laws and treaties.[[38]](#footnote-38) This book remained well-known to seventeenth-century Anglo-Saxonists, and was republished in Cambridge in 1644. To the leading scholars in that era, however, Lambarde's practice as a translator seemed to betray the true nature of Anglo-Saxon prose. Another pioneering Kentish Anglo-Saxon scholar, William Somner (bap.1598, d.1669), who in many ways consciously sought to model his career on that of Lambarde, voiced criticisms of his influential forebear in the preface to his great Anglo-Saxon dictionary, published in Oxford in 1659. Here, Somner explained, he had kept his translations literal, 'deliberately departing from that polite and elaborate style so greatly affected by William Lambarde in his own translation of the Anglo-Saxon laws'.[[39]](#footnote-39) Not only, as he explained, were such paraphrastic translations unhelpful to the beginner in the language, the implication that Lambarde 'affected' such a 'polite and elaborate style' is that his Latin prose was not true to the rough-hewn nature of the original Anglo-Saxon.

 This criticism was repeated and extended by the German scholar of Northern European languages and collector of Anglo-Saxon manuscripts, Franciscus Junius (1591-1677), who argued that Lambarde's translations are inferior to those of the middle ages (which he attributes to John Brompton), because we ought 'rather to embrace translation of a rough and uncultivated age, than rashly adhere to those new translations which are more seemingly cultivated'.[[40]](#footnote-40) These arguments were echoed by Edmund Gibson in the preface to his own edition of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle and summarized by the antiquarian and cleric White Kennett (1660-1728) in his biography of Somner, who concluded that 'such an elegant and paraphrastic way of rendring old Records, was too much like paint on the face of a wrinkled matron, or a cap and feather upon gray hairs'.[[41]](#footnote-41) There was a consensus among seventeenth-century antiquaries with a particular interest in Anglo-Saxon that the prose of that era ought to be rendered in a way which embraced its strange antiquity, rather than rendering it palatable to polite modern tastes.

 Almost at the end of our period, Elizabeth Elstob (1683-1756) brought these debates about the proper translation of Anglo-Saxon texts into the vernacular. Elstob was by no means the first woman in England to take an interest in antiquarian texts, but she was the first to make substantive publications in the field.[[42]](#footnote-42) Through her brother, William Elstob, she was introduced to the circle of the Oxford Saxonists, and her work was encouraged by George Hickes himself. She celebrated his mentorship in the preface to her 1709 edition of Aelfric's homily on the birthday of Pope Gregory the Great, who had been responsible for sending Augustine on a mission to Kent to convert the Anglo-Saxons.[[43]](#footnote-43) In that preface, too, she not only defended women's learning (and Anglo-Saxon learning in particular), but also theorised about how Anglo-Saxon prose ought to be translated into English. The translation, she explains, 'I have not done with any great Elegance, according to the Genius of our present Idiom'. This methodological statement is far more than a conventional modesty topos. She goes on to explain that she kept her translation literal not only to help the reader decipher the unfamiliar language, but also in order that the 'Saxon and the English might be discerned to be of the same Kindred and Affinity'. These aims, she concludes, 'would not be so well answer'd, by a Translation more polite and elaborate' (ix). Here she echoes in English the precise wording of Somner's criticisms of Lambarde's original translations of the Anglo-Saxon laws -- that he had 'affected a polite and elaborate style'. In echoing Somner, she affirms her place as a modern successor to this tradition of antiquarian scholarship. But she departs from it, too, not only in that her translation is from Anglo-Saxon into the English vernacular, but also in that her translations aim to show 'Kindred and Affinity' between the ancient and the modern language, rather than to underline Anglo-Saxon's distance from the present. In the rest of the preface, Elstob is at pains to show that the modern Protestant church has many continuities with that of Anglo-Saxon England. Likewise, at the linguistic level, her prose shows that 'Kindred and Affinity' between the languages and eras, while stopping short of fully subsuming Anglo-Saxon prose into 'our present Idiom'.

 British antiquaries of this period, then, had frequently to contend with a difficult question in their prose writing: how should they absorb or respond to the writing of the middle ages, when their own age valued very different kinds of prose style? We have found various kinds of responses to this problem, from humour, to defence of archaism, to subtle accommodation of the ancient to the modern (and vice versa). But perhaps one of the most wonderful examples of antiquarian integration of medieval into early-modern prose is done in the simplest way: through quotation. This is found in the writing of William Dugdale, the revered herald, historian of Warwickshire, and leading expert on the Tower Records in the seventeenth century.[[44]](#footnote-44) Perhaps no antiquary did more in this period to bring the prose writing of medieval legal documents and charters to a seventeenth-century readership. But his use of medieval texts goes beyond mere source citation or cautious apologetics for archaism. Take, for example, the opening preface of his *Baronage of England* (1675), one of his last final antiquarian works, which told the story of the lives, genealogies and military exploits of England's medieval barons. He opens the work with a defence of history, which he initially gives over entirely to Cicero's *De Oratore*: 'There having been so much, and so well, in general, already spoken in few words, by that great Orator Cicero, in commendation of History, That it is the Witness of times past, the Voice of Antiquity, the Light of Truth, and the Life of Memory; to offer more, were superfluous'. But Dugdale *does* decide it is necessary to supplement this piece of classical authority. He does so by quoting from the biography of Edward the Confessor written by the abbot, Aelred of Rievaulx (1110-1167). 'Ailred, an old Monk of Rievaulx (who lived in the time of King Stephen, and Henry the Second)', Dugdale explains, gave a defence of historical biography in the preface to his *Vita S. Eduardi regis et confessoris* (1162-3). Aelred wrote (in Dugdale's translation) that 'by Recording the Lives and Actions of the Good, those who come after, have encouragement to imitate their Vertues; and, that nothing more inciteth the mind of Man, to an emulation of others, than to hear the report of their noble Atchievements'.[[45]](#footnote-45) Dugdale here, without embarrassment or apology, places the medieval author alongside Cicero, effectively equating their authority and status. Aelred's quotation itself clearly emerges from classical defences of historiography, suggesting direct continuities between the classical era and the high middle ages. Commonplaces from both eras flow directly into one another in Dugdale's prose. Dugdale does not simply tolerate or defend medieval 'monkish' prose: he simply treats it seamlessly with that of the Roman Latin classics. Here the antiquarian amassing of material does not suggest the pressures toward miscellaneity, but continuity and coherence.

**~~~**

We have seen that the larger antiquarian problem -- the need to contain and discipline miscellaneous, contradictory, alien materials -- shaped the prose in which antiquaries wrote. That antiquaries were concerned to bring some measure of formal and stylistic organisation and even unity to the materials they studied does to some extent run counter to central concepts within the study of antiquarianism itself. Arnaldo Momigliano, in his founding article on the study of antiquarianism, made formal questions about the way in which antiquaries wrote central to the definition of antiquarianism. The question Momigliano asked in his celebrated article was 'what is the difference between an antiquarian and a historian?'. One crucial difference is in the form of their writing: 'historians write in a chronological order; antiquaries write in a systematic order'.[[46]](#footnote-46) Beyond that, however, antiquaries were not concerned to burnish what they wrote with rhetorical elevation. Before the late eighteenth century, history, in Momigliano's argument, is a branch of rhetoric: it is an attempt to tell well-known stories of the past elegantly. Antiquarian research is, therefore, by contrast, unrhetorical: indeed it is not only often written plainly, but also in a crabbed, even pedantic style, as though specifically to display the fact that stylistic matters were unimportant. Although Momigliano describes antiquaries as writing in a 'systematic order', there is for Momigliano, as Vine has pointed out, something intrinsically *un*systematic to antiquarians.[[47]](#footnote-47) This is the second point of Momigliano's distinction between historians and antiquaries: whereas the former produces 'facts which serve to illustrate or explain a certain situation', the latter 'collect all the items that are connected with a certain subject, whether they help to solve a problem or not. Historians seek to 'explain', antiquaries to 'collect'. Rhetorical and explanatory history is thus ranged against an unrhetorical and compilatory antiquarianism. By way of a conclusion to this essay, I would like to revisit some of these questions and what they might tell us about British antiquarian prose in the seventeenth century.

 There were certainly plenty of seventeenth-century antiquaries who argued that it was appropriate antiquarianism ought to be written in a plain style. One of these was the natural philosopher and first keeper of the Ashmolean Museum, Robert Plot (bap. 1640, d. 1696). His *Natural History of Oxfordshire* was first published by the Oxford University Press in 1677.[[48]](#footnote-48) Plot intended the work as a prolegomenon to a natural history of the whole of Britain, but in the end, only one more part, *The Natural History of Staffordshire* (1686), would be published. Plot's work emerges out of the tradition of county, chorographic antiquarianism, but he presents it, quite specifically, as a work of natural history. In the dedication of the work to Charles II, Plot states that the 'subject' of his work has 'alwaies deserved the notice, and the Enquirers into it, the favour of Princes'.[[49]](#footnote-49) His *exempla* of princely patronage for his chosen subject are classical. 'Thus', he writes, 'had *Aristotle* in writing his Treatise of Animals the assistance of *Alexander*; and *Pliny* the Patronage of *Titus Vespasian* to his Natural History'. Whereas we saw Camden praised as the '*Varro*, the *Strabo*, and the *Pausanias* of Britain', Plot positions himself in a natural historical tradition which can be traced back to Pliny and even Aristotle. Nevertheless, it was commonly expected for the boundaries between antiquarianism and natural history to be porous in the seventeenth century, with the botanist, John Ray (1627-1705), providing lists of each region's plants to the new 1695 *Britannia*. Plot's book on Oxfordshire is organised according to natural historical categories -- 'Of the Heavens and Air', 'Of the Waters', 'Of the Earths' and so on. However, it is hard to keep antiquities out of these chapters, with a description of Oxford's location 'between the two Rivers of *Isis* and *Cherwell*' in the chapter 'Of the Waters' leading seamlessly into lists of Parliaments and Synods held in the city, drawing from 'an imperfect List in a MSS. in *Corpus Christi College* Library *Oxon*.'Moreover, a whole tenth chapter was entirely devoted to 'Antiquities', including his famous account of the Rollright Stones (which he speculated might be a '*Danish* or *Norwegian monument*' to the 'election of their *Kings*'), and an original (and correct) argument that the ancient British had coins before the Roman invasion.[[50]](#footnote-50)

 Plot opens his work with a defence of its plain style. His natural historical gleanings, Plot explains, 'I intend to deliver as succinctly as may be, in a plain, easie, unartificial Stile, studiously avoiding all ornaments of Language'. Plot had already presented his work in Baconian terms, arguing that its remit -- to cover both nature itself and nature 'as she is restrained, forced, fashioned, or determined, by Artificial Operations' -- 'may fall under the general notation of a *Natural History*' because 'things of Art (as the Lord *Bacon* well observeth) are only different from 'those of Nature' in their efficient cause. It would be easy to attribute Plot's advocacy of the plain style for his natural historical antiquarianism to the Baconian influence of the Royal Society, to which he was elected soon after this book's publication.[[51]](#footnote-51) There must be truth to this, but Plot was not new in advocating for a plain, unadorned style for antiquarian prose. In 1656, a few years before the founding of the Royal Society, William Dugdale had defended his own great work of county history, *The Antiquities of Warwickshire*, in not dissimilar terms. Although another classic of the same genre in which Plot wrote, this work also has many differences to his. Structurally, it is arranged not according to features of the natural world, but to the county's hundreds, its ancient administrative division which Dugdale dates to the Anglo-Saxon period. The hundreds themselves are ordered according to the county's rivers, a structuring device which echoes that of Camden's *Britannia*. Whereas Plot tends to focus on more ancient artefacts, Dugdale's work is stuffed with the evidences of medieval legal and administrative documents, which allow Dugdale to trace evolving place names, land ownership, and ecclesiastical administration. Despite this documentary focus, Dugdale does also provide a memorable description (and engraving) of a pre-historic axe, the kind of antiquity that would certainly have caught Plot's attention.[[52]](#footnote-52) For all their formal differences, too, Dugdale also defends his work's lack of rhetorical adornment. 'In all which,' he writes, near the end of his book's preface, 'and throughout the whole work, I have to my utmost, endeavoured the plainest style, as most meet (in my Judgment) for such a business'. Dugdale justifies this stylistic choice not in Baconian terms, but with an appeal to classical authority. When he 'endeavoured the plainest style' he was, he explains, 'well remembring that of Cicero, how an Historian should be qualified'. He quotes Cicero's *De Oratore*, in which Catulus argues that the historian ought 'not of necessitie to be an Orator, satis est non esse mendacem [it is sufficient that he is not a liar]'. 'The truth is it', he goes on, 'which is principally to be aimed at', and he continues to quote Cicero: 'For who does not know the first law of History, never dare to speak falsehood? And then never dare not to speak the truth?'.[[53]](#footnote-53) Dugdale defends his work using the most well-known ancient statement on proper historical method, suggesting not only that he understood his work's plain style to be justified by classical rhetorical theory (rather than by anything more modern), but also that the boundaries (for Dugdale) between antiquities and history were blurred.

 Dugdale was perfectly capable of *not* being plain when it was appropriate for him not to be. Indeed, the preface which we have just quoted begins with an almost bombastic quotation from Walter Raleigh's *History of the World*, which defends 'Historie' for having 'carried our knowledge over the vast and devouring space of many thousand years'.[[54]](#footnote-54) Before he printed the *Antiquities of Warwickshire*, Dugdale circulated this preface (and the book's dedicatory epistles) to his fellow antiquary, William Somner (who had criticised Lambarde's 'polite and elaborate' translations of the Saxon laws) for his commentary. The preface, Somner replied to Dugdale, is 'for the matter and contents, very pertinent, learned, and elaborate' and 'for the stile and language, such as the subject doth require, sober, serious and savoury, or (if you will rather) like the Author, grave'.[[55]](#footnote-55) When 'grave' and 'elaborate' was required, Dugdale could produce it and Somner would approve of it, even if 'elaborate' was specifically a term of criticism when applied to Lambarde's translations of Anglo-Saxon prose. The detail of antiquities, on the other hand, required an appropriate plainness. We have seen, therefore, that there is much truth in Momigliano's distinction between history and antiquarianism in rhetorical terms. However, we have also seen that, for Dugdale, 'history' and 'antiquarianism', could not be firmly separated. If we return for a moment to Momigliano's own framework for thinking about antiquarianism, this is not surprising. For Momigliano, the firm distinction between history and antiquarianism only pertained to the writing of *classical* antiquities. 'The authority of the ancient historians was such the nobody was yet seriously thinking of replacing them', he writes. 'The situation was different', he goes on, when it came to medieval history. 'No cult of the Middle Ages had yet developed to compete with the idealization of Antiquity. No mediaeval chronicle', he argues, 'could claim such authority as to prevent the re-writing of mediaeval history'.[[56]](#footnote-56) As we have seen, it is medieval history with which, ultimately, most British antiquaries were engaged. And as such, by the end of the seventeenth century, many would not have seen themselves purely to be writing 'antiquarianism' as opposed to 'history'.

 One who certainly did not seem to draw such a firm distinction was the Cambridge scholar and physician, Robert Brady (c.1627-1700). Master of Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge, he was physician-in-ordinary to both Charles II and James II. Out of a mass of historical evidence from Tower Records, in particular, he developed a historiographical theory which bolstered James II's absolutist ambitions. In 1684, Brady published his *Complete History of England*, the work in which his theory and practice as a historian were most fully developed. Whereas Whig-leaning historians were arguing that England's political liberties pre-dated the Norman conquest, for Brady, any such liberties flowed directly from the Anglo-Norman kings themselves, and were thus royal gifts. The Saxon period, to Brady, was one of servitude. These were arguments Brady continued to expound after the Glorious Revolution. His synthesis of deep research in historical sources, argument, and narrative have won him the respect of modern historians, although perhaps this synthesis was a little less original than is sometimes suggested.[[57]](#footnote-57) For Levine, his *Complete History* was 'a new form of historical narrative that combined the annalistic form of the medieval chronicle with the antiquarian compilation of sources'.[[58]](#footnote-58) Brady was certainly seen by contemporaries as both historian and antiquary. Thomas Smith, the Cotton Librarian and non-juror whom we have already encountered, corresponded with Brady in the 1690s, in letters which make little effort to disguise their loyalty to James II. In one letter, Smith defends Brady from the accusations of the Whig historian, James Tyrrell (1642-1718), that Brady had failed to make reference to a crucial Tower record. According to Smith, Tyrrell was 'most disingenuously upbraiding you with your want of the knowledge of it, as if during those few years you had the custody of that inestimable treasure, you had been obliged to have read over every parchm*en*t there'. That inordinate task 'would take up the whole life-time of an Antiquary or Historian', as though Brady might be well described as either and as though both would be interested in the Tower records.[[59]](#footnote-59)

 Many of the problems and tensions we have explored in this essay -- between a rhapsodic digressiveness and a striving after unity, between a prose of polyvocal embrace of medieval documents and a prose of polite, modern smoothness, between antiquities and history -- come together in Brady's work. Brady gives voice to some of these tensions himself in his *Complete History*'s 'Letter to the Reader'. 'Through the whole Course of the History', he writes, 'I have not Laboured after an Exact and Even Style'. He goes on to explain why 'an Exact and Even Style' has not proved attainable: 'nor can it be Expected where there is such Variety of Matter, and where Men are confined to, and limited by the Translation of other Mens Language'. 'There is nothing my own', he disclaims, 'but the Method and Version, and whether the last be Faithful and Just, as it ought to be, I Submit my self to the Censure of the Impartial Reader'. From a stylistic point of view, Brady, at least in his own estimation, did not even try to master the array of medieval documents with which his work bristled. There was simply too much 'Variety of Matter' and too much of 'other Mens Language'. But what he did have was 'Method', and in this he had a significantly easier job of mastering the diffuse energies of antiquarianism than did, say, Gibson, as he attempted to minimise 'inequalitie of stile and composition' in the revised *Britannia*. In other words, the rigorous argument Brady unfolded in his work was what allowed him to draw together the melee of Tower Records available to him into a 'Complete History'. Nevertheless, the documents which crowd the margins, footnotes, and italicized quotations of his work show that 'an Exact and Even Style' was not obtainable. The simultaneous need to give antiquarianism a driving argument *and* to make sure that argument was bolstered by exact references emerged from the sharp divisions of seventeenth-century political culture, not least, in this case, those which precipitated the Glorious Revolution. Just as politics gave antiquarianism an argumentative focus, it also gave renewed energy to its polyvocality. However, to give antiquarianism such argumentative focus also seems contradictory to the nature of antiquarianism as a pursuit: to amass materials precisely *without* driving them toward such a conclusion. These are probably irresolvable tensions within the whole idea of 'antiquarian' writing, but perhaps they were never more acute or explored with greater self-consciousness than in the period of this volume.
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