

1 **Edmund Gibson's 1695 *Britannia* and Late-Seventeenth-Century British Antiquarian**  
2 **Scholarship**

3

4 *Thomas Roebuck, University of East Anglia*

5

6 **Abstract**

7 Drawing on the evidence of correspondence and draft papers preserved primarily in the  
8 Bodleian Library, Oxford, this essay gives a detailed account of the genesis and editing of one  
9 of seventeenth-century British antiquarianism's foremost works: the revised version of  
10 William Camden's *Britannia*, published in 1695. It pays particular attention to Edmund  
11 Gibson's role as editor of the project and demonstrates the diversity of kinds of antiquarian  
12 scholarship to be found within the book (showing that William Camden offered a wide-  
13 ranging model for antiquarian practice). The article then situates the *Britannia* within the  
14 context of the religio-political divisions provoked by the Glorious Revolution, showing how  
15 Edmund Gibson attempted to navigate those divisions. It concludes by assessing the 1695  
16 *Britannia*'s place within the history of antiquarian scholarship.

17

18 **Keywords:** Antiquarianism, William Camden, Edmund Gibson, Editing, History of the Book,  
19 1690s, Non-Juror

20

21 **Introduction**

22

23 At the end of 1693, the young and prodigiously productive Anglo-Saxon scholar, Edmund  
24 Gibson (bap. 1669, d.1748), was persuaded to oversee a new English edition of William  
25 Camden's antiquarian masterpiece, *Britannia* (1586-1607), the touchstone for all British  
26 antiquarian works which followed it until the early twentieth century.<sup>1</sup> Camden had begun his  
27 great work in Latin in the late 1570s, first published it in 1586, and continued to revise and  
28 republish it until it appeared, finally, in a handsome folio in 1607.<sup>2</sup> In 1610, the *Britannia* was  
29 published in an English translation by Philemon Holland (1552-1637), and was published  
30 again in a revised and expanded translation in 1637.<sup>3</sup> Begun in earnest in 1693 and printed  
31 with remarkable speed by early 1695, the new edition which Gibson oversaw was the  
32 commercial venture of the London booksellers, Abel Swale and Awnsham Churchill (the  
33 latter working in partnership with his brother, John Churchill).<sup>4</sup> With Gibson's help, they had  
34 to mobilize antiquaries from across Britain and Ireland to engage in a huge collaborative  
35 endeavour. They needed both fresh translations of Camden's original Latin and, perhaps most  
36 importantly, to bring up to date Camden's scholarship on each of the counties and British  
37 regions. Contributors were not lacking. A new edition of Camden's venerable antiquarian  
38 work was an exciting prospect for antiquaries in the 1690s, who were still reeling from the  
39 impact of the Glorious Revolution.

40 It only took three months, however, for Gibson to become a little frustrated with  
41 Britain's antiquaries. At the end of March 1694, he wrote to his mentor, the intelligencer,  
42 supporter of learned projects across Oxford, and master of University College, Arthur Charlett  
43 (1655-1722).<sup>5</sup> 'I thought', Gibson wrote, 'that this general intimation of returning such things  
44 as we may reasonably imagine Camden would not have omitted if he had known 'em, had  
45 been a rule sufficient to direct any man in that matter'.<sup>6</sup> In retrospect, that this 'rule' would not

46 be 'sufficient' to avert confusion seems inevitable. By the end of the seventeenth century,  
47 British antiquarianism had become a bewilderingly diverse pursuit, encompassing a multitude  
48 of practices under a single heading. That heading, as Kelsey Jackson Williams has pointed out  
49 in his important recent study of John Aubrey, was not the abstract 'antiquarianism', but the  
50 personal, 'the antiquary', and it encompassed a divergent array of (almost always) men, with  
51 distinct backgrounds, careers, motivations, and political and religious allegiances.<sup>7</sup> With so  
52 many contributors from across Britain and Ireland, the 1695 *Britannia* became not a single  
53 coherent work, but an unparalleled embodiment of antiquaries' many differing interpretations  
54 of Camden's legacy, of what antiquarianism might be and how it ought to be done.

55         In giving a fresh account of this book's history, then, I hope both to address some of  
56 the prevailing questions within the study of antiquarianism and to revise our understanding of  
57 the 1695 *Britannia* itself.<sup>8</sup> For Stuart Piggott, in his classic account of the versions of  
58 *Britannia* across time, the 1695 edition is, at its heart, an achievement of the Oxford  
59 Saxonists, those scholars centred on Queen's College, Oxford, who were making significant  
60 advances in the philological study of Anglo-Saxon texts. 'The story begins', Piggott writes,  
61 'among a group of scholars concerned with Old English studies who were, in the late  
62 seventeenth century, taking up the tradition of Nowell, Lambarde, and Camden'.<sup>9</sup> Rather than  
63 an achievement of Oxford scholarship, this article will position the 1695 *Britannia* as an  
64 achievement of the late-seventeenth-century book-trade. In doing so, it will build on the  
65 insights of Joseph Levine, who rightly notes, in what remains the most subtle and penetrating  
66 study of the 1695 *Britannia*, that 'it was the publishers who led the way' in the early days of  
67 the project.<sup>10</sup> For Graham Parry, the 1695 *Britannia* is the summative masterpiece of  
68 seventeenth-century antiquarian collaboration.<sup>11</sup> This article in many ways confirms Parry's

69 conclusion, but it also draws attention to the *divisions* within the antiquarian world, and the  
70 ways Gibson's *Britannia* sought to overcome those divisions.

71 Previous accounts of the *Britannia* have certainly stressed division. Levine tells the  
72 1695 *Britannia*'s story as part of his celebrated account of the division between the 'ancients'  
73 and the 'moderns' in 1690s historiography. The 'ancients' were those for whom antiquaries'  
74 pedantic erudition, their love of 'old Coins, Stones and Inscriptions' and 'Worm-eaten records  
75 and antient Manuscripts', was often the subject of half-affectionate mockery, and who saw  
76 history as a branch of rhetoric, offering great narratives of the deeds of good and wicked  
77 men.<sup>12</sup> The 'moderns', on the other hand, believed that the achievements of philology and  
78 erudition had a capacity to render the past knowable to an unprecedented degree. For Levine,  
79 the 1695 *Britannia* acted as a bridge between these groups. Ancients had to admit that a  
80 certain amount of erudite knowledge of one's own national history (politely expressed in  
81 reasonably elegant prose) was necessary; Moderns had to be persuaded that erudition should  
82 not become mountainous or inelegant. However, Levine's focus on divisions between  
83 antiquaries and those who mocked them leaves less space to draw distinctions *between* the  
84 people whom Levine calls the 'moderns'—between the scholars themselves. This article will  
85 show that Edward Lhwyd's practice of antiquarianism, say, was importantly different not only  
86 (as we might expect) from that of local antiquaries in Chester or Lancashire, but also from  
87 that of his immediate Oxford contemporaries. Moreover, the most concerted and the most  
88 interesting critiques of the 1695 *Britannia* came not from outside antiquarianism, but from  
89 within. Those critiques were motivated by religious and political commitments, as well as by  
90 scholarly disagreement. For Robert Mayhew, the *Britannia* (in its 1695 form, and even more  
91 so in its revised 1722 edition) was a gesture of political support for the post-Glorious-

92 Revolution regime.<sup>13</sup> I wish to show that, on the contrary, the 1695 *Britannia*, at least, was a  
93 complex and only partially successful attempt to steer safe passage among Britain's  
94 antiquaries whose common allegiances had been deeply fractured by the Glorious Revolution.

95 To understand antiquarianism in the late seventeenth century, it is appropriate to focus  
96 not on a brand-new work, but one which had been *republished*. Antiquaries of the sixteenth  
97 century had often been at pains to underline the newness of their pursuit in England, which  
98 had been made urgent by the dissolution of the monasteries and the concomitant dispersal of  
99 manuscripts from monastic libraries. Models for their activities were often found in  
100 continental scholarship or in the classical period: John Leland (1503-1552), for instance, who  
101 was often seen to have inaugurated British antiquarianism with his surveys of monastic  
102 libraries in the 1530s, looked to the German Benedictine abbot and bibliographer, Johannes  
103 Trithemius (1462-1516), whose work, as James Carley has shown, 'provided [Leland] with a  
104 mental framework as he examined the monastic libraries'; in describing the letter he received  
105 from the king to grant him access to monasteries across the realm as a 'principis diploma',  
106 Leland was 'no doubt thinking of the permit issued by the emperor in the late classical world  
107 entitling the bearer to use the *cursus publicus*'.<sup>14</sup> A little later in the sixteenth century, the  
108 dedicatory letter to the 'Gentlemen of Kent' of William Lambarde's pioneering antiquarian  
109 survey of that county expressed the hope that Lambarde might be persuaded 'to doe as muche  
110 for all the rest of the Counties of this Realme generally, as he hathe done for this Countie  
111 specially'.<sup>15</sup> It was Camden himself who satisfied this request, of course, but in doing so he  
112 invoked the Flemish geographer Abraham Ortelius as his most particular inspiration.<sup>16</sup>

113 But after the first publication of the *Britannia* and the ferment of antiquarian research  
114 which followed it, British antiquaries had a national antiquarian tradition to which they often

115 turned in order to explain or authorize their work. The single most distinctive feature of  
116 antiquarianism in the late seventeenth century, as opposed to the earlier period, is the  
117 particular attention which was paid to continuing, editing, or publishing *older* works of British  
118 antiquarianism. In 1664, William Dugdale (1605-1686) edited and continued the *Concilia* of  
119 the great Norfolk antiquarian, medieval philologist, and legal and ecclesiastical historian,  
120 Henry Spelman (c.1562-1641), his edition of the documents of England's church councils, and  
121 Edmund Gibson himself would print many of Spelman's unpublished papers in 1698.<sup>17</sup> The  
122 work of the Anglo-Saxon scholar, William Somner (1598-1669), on Roman military sites in  
123 Kent saw the light after it was published in Oxford in 1693, nearly 25 years after Somner's  
124 death, along with a biography of the scholar.<sup>18</sup> In the generation following the publication of  
125 the revised *Britannia*, Thomas Hearne fulfilled a long-held dream of British antiquaries by  
126 returning to the Ur-moment of the country's antiquarian tradition to publish the *Collectanea* of  
127 John Leland.<sup>19</sup> These developments in British antiquarianism are part of the wider emergence  
128 of *historia literaria* in European scholarship, which led to the editing and publishing of many  
129 scholars' lives, letters, and papers in this period, but in Britain the role it played in shaping  
130 antiquarianism was particularly important.<sup>20</sup> In this context, republishing Camden's *Britannia*  
131 with the subsequent achievements of the British antiquarian tradition grafted directly into it  
132 seems a natural decision. It seems similarly natural to offer little more of a 'rule' to  
133 contributors than that 'of returning such things as we may reasonably imagine Camden would  
134 not have omitted if he had known 'em'. British antiquarianism is defined here with brilliant  
135 simplicity: it is whatever Camden had done. Camden's own practice and writing was the  
136 overarching model for British antiquaries to follow. How they did so—and the complexities  
137 and divisions this provoked—will be the subject of this article.

138

139 **Part I: Edmund Gibson as Editor of the *Britannia***

140

141 Despite his youth, among his antiquarian acquaintances Edmund Gibson was a popular choice  
142 to take on the role of editor-in-chief of the new *Britannia*.<sup>21</sup> When the edition looked set to  
143 falter in early 1694, the Oxford Anglo-Saxon scholar, William Nicolson (who, by that time,  
144 was pursuing a clerical career in Cumbria) reassured the Leeds antiquarian, Ralph Thoresby  
145 (1658-1725), that 'I doubt not but Mr. Gibson will effectually revive it'.<sup>22</sup> Before he was  
146 twenty years old, Gibson had been moving in the circles of the Oxford Saxonists and  
147 supporting their work.<sup>23</sup> The greatest Anglo-Saxon scholar of the day, George Hickes (1642-  
148 1715), was an early mentor. In 1688, Gibson made a copy of a substantial collection of  
149 Anglo-Saxon canons and other ecclesiastical records from the Bodleian Library, and the  
150 manuscript was annotated by Hickes.<sup>24</sup> William Nicolson had not taken up the invitation,  
151 presented to him by John Mill in the late 1680s, to produce a new edition of the Anglo-Saxon  
152 Chronicle, and in due course the project fell to Gibson.<sup>25</sup> Gibson published his edition in  
153 1692. Despite its flaws, this edition comprehensively superseded its predecessor (that of the  
154 Cambridge scholar of Anglo-Saxon and Arabic, Abraham Wheelock (1593-1653)) by drawing  
155 upon a larger range of Chronicle manuscripts and offering a helpful array of supporting notes.  
156 It became the standard edition for over a century, and standard reading for the Oxford  
157 scholars involved in revising the 1695 *Britannia*.<sup>26</sup>

158 Gibson was certainly involved in the *Britannia* from the project's commencement in  
159 earnest in April 1693 (when Swale seems to have been the book's sole 'undertaker'), although  
160 in quite what capacity is not clear.<sup>27</sup> He seems to have encouraged other scholars to become

161 involved in the project. In April 1693, Gibson wrote to Edward Lhwyd (1660-1709), the  
162 keeper of Oxford's Ashmolean Museum and another figure who would become central to the  
163 *Britannia*, to say that 'Mr Swalle, the undertaker of the English Camden, is now in town to  
164 procure persons that may carry on that work. I have given him some encouragement that you  
165 will not be wanting in your assistance towards the revising Wales'.<sup>28</sup> Nicolson encouraged  
166 Thoresby to contribute his work on West Yorkshire to the book in June of the same year by  
167 writing that '[m]y friend Mr. Gibson (the publisher of the Saxon Chronicle) is deeply  
168 concerned in the undertaking; and will, questionless, discharge himself very well'.<sup>29</sup> The  
169 Northern antiquary, Thomas Machell (bap. 1647, d.1698), seems to have been approached by  
170 several people, including Gibson, to provide materials on the county of Westmorland in  
171 perhaps the early summer of 1693.<sup>30</sup> That Gibson's work went beyond assisting with project  
172 management, however, is suggested by a letter he wrote in August 1693 to his friend, the  
173 fellow Anglo-Saxonist and member of Queen's College, Oxford, Thomas Tanner (1674-  
174 1735), to tell him that he had finished his edition of Quintilian, and '[i]nstead of Oratory, I am  
175 now fell to Camden'.<sup>31</sup> He had moved from one editorial project to the next.

176         It is striking, however, that Gibson was *not* the booksellers' first choice as the project's  
177 editor-in-chief. That role was originally to have been fulfilled by James Harrington (1664-  
178 1693), a well-connected lawyer who acted on behalf of the University of Oxford in the late  
179 1680s and early 1690s, and seems likely to have helped to support the University Press in  
180 negotiations with the Stationers' Company.<sup>32</sup> Lhwyd described Harrington as 'a Gentleman of  
181 vast acquaintance and Interest'; it sounds as though he, along with Gibson, would have helped  
182 to mobilize a network of scholars to provide materials for the *Britannia*.<sup>33</sup> He would also have  
183 edited those materials once they were assembled, as is suggested by a letter sent to him in



184 September 1693 by one George Morley, who was 'glad you have been prevailed with to put  
185 *your* hand to the new Edition of Cambden'.<sup>34</sup> To 'put *your* hand' to a book seems to have  
186 meant to complete it as an editor.<sup>35</sup> Harrington's *Britannia*, however, seems likely to have  
187 been significantly different to Gibson's. Harrington published no independent antiquarian  
188 work, and his attitude towards the subject can only be gleaned by implication. He had been  
189 closely concerned in the preparation of the two volumes of Anthony Wood's *Athenae*  
190 *Oxonienses* for the press in 1690-1691, giving Wood firm advice about the book's style,  
191 structure, and content.<sup>36</sup> He wrote a preface to its first volume and an introductory essay to its  
192 second, each of which suggests something of his thinking about antiquarianism and antiquities  
193 themselves. He hoped Wood's 'love of impartiality will not be mistaken for want of Religion'  
194 (presumably he was seeking to forestall accusations that Wood's suspected Catholicism had  
195 pervaded the work). For Harrington, the best antiquarianism could only be produced out of  
196 confessional moderation: 'whoever will compare the Cento's of Bale, and Pits, with the  
197 excellent Works of Leland and Camden, must necessarily discern, how near an Alliance there  
198 is between Zeal and Ignorance, and between Learning and Moderation'. He also apologized  
199 for Wood's crabbed and archaic language, which grew inevitably out of his antiquarian  
200 subject-matter. 'It is impossible to think that men who always converse with old Authors',  
201 Harrington wrote, 'should not learn the dialect of their Acquaintance'.<sup>37</sup> As we will see,  
202 Gibson might have agreed with most of this. In the introductory essay to the second volume,  
203 however, Harrington reveals striking differences between his own understanding of British  
204 history and that of Gibson and his fellow Oxford scholars. Harrington sought to explain why  
205 Wood's volumes only covered the last two centuries of English scholarship and learning. The  
206 reason, Harrington argued, was simple: there was no English learning before the last two

207 centuries. In discussing Anglo-Saxon England, specifically, he dismissed the 'ignorance of the  
208 Age', and even in the case of Bede, 'himself the most general Scholar of that time' one would  
209 'rather admire the extent of his Learning, than approve its exactness and accuracy'.<sup>38</sup> Although  
210 Gibson himself was sceptical of some of the grander claims made by Hickes for the Anglo-  
211 Saxon era as a literary Renaissance (noting to Charlett that he had read some Anglo-Saxon  
212 poetry, 'but could never meet with any thing that relish'd half soe well as Homer or Virgil'), it  
213 would be hard to imagine he would have endorsed such a wholesale dismissal of the era's  
214 intellectual history.<sup>39</sup> It seems likely that Harrington would have brought an impressive array  
215 of connections to the project, a concern for literary polish, and a diplomacy when it came to  
216 the potential pitfalls of confessional controversy. In choosing him as editor-in-chief, however,  
217 the booksellers were clearly not concerned that the project be led by someone au fait with the  
218 latest in Oxford's Anglo-Saxon scholarship, the achievements of which seem to modern  
219 scholars (in retrospect) some of the most pioneering of the 1690s.

220 This underlines an important point: the new *Britannia* was not conceived, first and  
221 foremost, as a 'scholarly' project and did not need to be led by a noted antiquarian. It was a  
222 commercial endeavour, led by the booksellers who intended to make a profit. The booksellers  
223 approached figures—antiquaries, lawyers, clergymen—who could help them to realize this  
224 aim, not the other way around. When Camden wrote his original *Britannia* in the 1580s, he  
225 despaired in his letters to Abraham Ortelius of finding an English printer who could cope with  
226 the book's demands.<sup>40</sup> When it came to revising his book just over a hundred years later, it  
227 was the publishers who sought out antiquarian scholarship. There was a sense, quite simply,  
228 that this kind of regional antiquarianism sold. Indeed, antiquarianism was part of a wider  
229 market for history, which Swale knew to be profitable: since 1679, for instance, he had been

230 publishing several small-format editions of William Howell's *Medulla Historiae Anglicanae*,  
231 an accessible account of English monarchs.<sup>41</sup> Aiming at a more ambitious historical  
232 readership, in 1686 Swale had also reprinted the edition of the medieval chronicler, Matthew  
233 Paris, that had been produced by the clergyman, William Watts (with the help of John  
234 Selden), in 1640.<sup>42</sup> Swale and Churchill were careful to protect their financial interests in the  
235 *Britannia*. In recognition of the 'Considerable Charge' they had incurred in 'making a New  
236 Translation into English of Cambdens Britannia and in obtaining many new Discourses and  
237 Observations relating therunto and in Graving new Mapps for the same', they were issued  
238 with a 'Royal licence and Privilege for the sole Printing and Publishing the said New  
239 Translation of Cambdens Britannia in English with the Discourses Observations and Mapps  
240 relating thereunto in one or more Vollume or Volumes'.<sup>43</sup>

241         The commercial instincts of Swale (and then of Churchill) do seem to have been  
242 proved right. In August 1693, the naturalist Martin Lister (1639-1712) wrote to Lhwyd to  
243 dismiss the 'businesse' of the booksellers as nothing more than 'to gett subscriptions' and 'for  
244 that purpos to make a grate noise'.<sup>44</sup> Two months later, Lhwyd reported that the booksellers'  
245 'business [is] only to procure subscribers', and that 'they have allready done to their  
246 satisfaction'.<sup>45</sup> The project of revising the *Britannia* quickly found a considerable audience. Its  
247 strong commercial prospects were surely as much to do with the promise of the handsome  
248 maps of Robert Morden (d.1703), the cartographer, globe-maker, and dealer in scientific  
249 instruments, as they were to do with the book's scholarly credentials.<sup>46</sup> Morden's maps, made  
250 'according to the newest Surveys', were promised from the *Britannia*'s earliest days. It was  
251 even specified that '[n]othing shall be Printed on the Back of the Maps', presumably in order  
252 that they could be displayed separately (perhaps decoratively) without losing the book's

253 content.<sup>47</sup> After the *Britannia*, doubtless there seemed buoyant prospects for further historical  
254 publishing (especially in the wake of the Glorious Revolution). The *Britannia* itself contained  
255 an advertisement for a 'Compleat History of England', written by 'several hands of approv'd  
256 ability', to be published imminently by several London publishers, including Swale (although  
257 the book did not materialise in quite this form).<sup>48</sup>

258         The new *Britannia*'s course was changed suddenly, however, when James Harrington  
259 died in November 1693. He was not yet thirty years old. The booksellers wasted little time in  
260 approaching Gibson to oversee the *Britannia* for the press. Before Gibson would take on this  
261 role, however, he made further demands of the booksellers, which he laid out in his own set of  
262 'proposals'. He sent a draft of these 'proposals' to Charlett, and this document survives, pasted  
263 by Charlett inside the front board of his own 1607 Latin *Britannia*.<sup>49</sup> Gibson's 'proposals'  
264 bears witness to the negotiation between commercial and scholarly imperatives which  
265 characterized the *Britannia*'s entire production. He stressed the immensity of the labour that  
266 would be required of him to produce this book. Pages must be repeatedly corrected at each  
267 stage of the proofing process, the 'last revise' being 'commonly little cleaner than the first  
268 proof'. It would be necessary to consult 'several Books, Letters, Papers &c.' to be able to  
269 make 'emendations, references, and such other notes as are to come at the bottom of the  
270 page'.<sup>50</sup> Perhaps more laborious than anything, though, would be to overcome the problem  
271 that each county was to be translated by a different person. Gibson was determined to ensure  
272 that there was a consistency of *style* in the book: 'considering the Translations are done by  
273 several persons it will require some pains extraordinary to make the stile of the whole alike'.  
274 All this justified an increased fee for Gibson of '20s per sheet'. By 24 December 1693, Gibson  
275 reported to Charlett that the booksellers 'have come up to my own Proposals in every thing'

276 and 'they have agree'd to refer all points about which any dispute may arise, entirely to your  
277 determination'.<sup>51</sup>

278         The problems of unity of style that Gibson raised in his 'proposals', however, would  
279 not be resolved easily. Style and antiquarianism are often thought to have been opposed:  
280 whereas history was rhetorically polished, antiquarianism was merely dry, factual, and  
281 unornamented by rhetoric.<sup>52</sup> This opposition is belied by Gibson's work on the *Britannia*—  
282 and even, indeed, by Harrington's concern to defend Wood's archaisms. After Gibson had  
283 gone to London in January 1694 to begin overseeing the *Britannia*, he reported to Tanner that  
284 he and the booksellers had already managed to overcome some significant disagreements  
285 regarding the practice of translation. Gibson found the 'translations that were ready done' to be  
286 'very harsh and uneven, which made me extreme uneasy'. Gibson nearly walked out of the  
287 project over this disagreement, but 'upon a private meeting', the booksellers 'generously told  
288 me that what translations I misliked they would burn or tear, and leave it entirely to me to  
289 send out proper persons who should translate it over again at their charge'. 'You cannot deny',  
290 Gibson concluded, 'but this has something in it that's above the spirit of a Bookseller'.  
291 Nevertheless, in the same letter Gibson accepted that achieving the unity of style managed by  
292 Camden (as an individual author) would be impossible with such a large group of translators.  
293 'After you have done' your translation, Gibson explained to Tanner, 'you must compare it with  
294 the Original cause I have resolv'd not to intermeddle with *that* part for fear I should give the  
295 world an opportunitie of saying I have mangl'd them'. He decided that 'Every man shall set his  
296 hand to his own Translation, and as it is accurate, or harsh, let him take the honour or the  
297 scandal'.<sup>53</sup>

298           This more laissez-faire approach seems to be borne out by the surviving drafts of  
299 individual county translations. The printer's proofs of Lhwyd's translation of Wales, for  
300 instance, which survive in Lhwyd's own hand, with Gibson's editorial corrections, show  
301 Gibson tinkering with wording, rather than more drastically attempting to bring a unity of  
302 style to the whole work.<sup>54</sup> Evidence of more extensive circulation of at least one of the  
303 translations for editorial peer-review can be seen in the fair copy of Thomas Tanner's  
304 translation of Camden's description of Wiltshire, which was given to Arthur Charlett and  
305 bears his corrections (which were incorporated in the final text).<sup>55</sup> Although Gibson later  
306 reported to Charlett that the 'Translation is soe manag'd as to answer the text, I think  
307 accurately enough' and 'we shall not much stand for nice cadencies and turns', he was also at  
308 pains to offer Tanner advice on improving both his English and Latin prose styles in his  
309 antiquarian writing, leaving Tanner feeling that, in Gibson's eyes, he 'could neither write Latin  
310 nor English'.<sup>56</sup> However, other translators would place Gibson in a far more awkward  
311 situation. In April 1694, he was amazed to find that the High-Church Cumberland cleric and  
312 antiquary, Hugh Todd (c.1657-1728), had provided not the literal translation for which  
313 Gibson was looking ('keeping to the Text close, soe far as good sense & true English will  
314 allow it'), but instead 'an odd sort of Paraphrase'. This left Gibson facing a tricky decision:  
315 either to commit an unforgiveable 'affront' to Todd by commissioning a new translation, or to  
316 publish something inadequate.<sup>57</sup> Quite what Gibson decided to do is not clear, but a draft  
317 translation of the Cumberland section of *Britannia* survives which does not correspond to the  
318 one printed in the 1695 edition; perhaps he decided to risk the 'affront'.<sup>58</sup> Efforts were made,  
319 however, to minimize stylistic variation by bringing in a small group of men specifically to  
320 translate more than one section of the *Britannia*. One of these figures was a man whom

321 Gibson identified in the *Britannia* itself only as 'Mr. W.S. of the Middle Temple', who had  
322 responsibility for 'the *Romans in Britain*, the *Rebellion of the O Neals*, and other parts'. This  
323 seems likely to have been William Salkeld, who had matriculated at St Edmund Hall in  
324 Oxford in 1687, and who then proceeded to a legal career at the Middle Temple.<sup>59</sup> Gibson's  
325 list of the translators of each county identifies a 'Salkeld' as the largest single contributor to  
326 the translation of the *Britannia*, having taken responsibility for Cheshire, Cornwall, Devon,  
327 Durham, Lincolnshire, Yorkshire, Richmondshire, and for sections of the introduction about  
328 the Britains, Scots, and Picts.<sup>60</sup> Specific care was also given to the *Britannia*'s poetry, with  
329 Basil Kennett (1674-1715) tasked with translating the book's 'old Monkish Poets' in a way  
330 which managed to 'retain the sense', but also 'set it off with something of briskness and  
331 spirit'.<sup>61</sup> Despite Camden's own multiple influences and collaborators, he ultimately imposed a  
332 stylistic unity on the work; while Gibson had to accept that such unity was impossible in his  
333 revision, he did take steps to mitigate the risks of creating an antiquarian book of 'very harsh  
334 and uneven' language.

335         The multiplicity of translation styles was only one risk posed by the multi-contributor  
336 approach taken to the revision of *Britannia*. As well as arranging for translations of each  
337 county, Gibson orchestrated a variety of scholars to take charge of making antiquarian  
338 additions to individual counties or countries. He thanked these specialists in the preface to the  
339 *Britannia*: Wiltshire was taken care of by Tanner, Wales by Lhwyd, Northumberland by  
340 William Nicolson, and so on.<sup>62</sup> In each of these three cases, the contributors prepared  
341 relatively coherent and finalized materials that required ultimately quite minimal levels of  
342 editorial shaping by Gibson.<sup>63</sup> Study of these counties alone would suggest that Gibson's work  
343 was quite straightforward and went little beyond engaging the right contributors. However,

344 that underestimates Gibson's role. One third of the counties had no individual allocated to take  
345 charge of them; moreover, many of the contributors to the counties did not synthesize their  
346 discoveries into anything resembling coherent, publishable prose.<sup>64</sup> The complexity of  
347 Gibson's task is revealed by two volumes of working papers which are now preserved in the  
348 Bodleian Library, which constitute materials gathered for additions to the English counties of  
349 the *Britannia* (with the exception of Yorkshire).<sup>65</sup> This extraordinarily rich and diverse pair of  
350 volumes, arranged according to county (ordered alphabetically, rather than in the sequence of  
351 the *Britannia* itself), gives considerable insight into the complexity of the *Britannia*'s genesis.  
352 Essentially, these volumes constitute a vast archive of every kind of antiquarian note,  
353 drawing, annotation, letter, or small collection. This dizzying array of papers, therefore,  
354 represents a huge variety of writings, all of which were envisaged to be possible  
355 contributions to the *Britannia*, produced by a widely dispersed array of English gentry and  
356 clergymen, who were all engaged in the pursuit of antiquarianism.

357         Some of this material took the form of offcuts from older antiquarian projects: letters  
358 about Gloucestershire antiquities, for example, were salvaged from materials relating to the  
359 1675 *Britannia* atlas of John Ogilby (1600-1676).<sup>66</sup> The vast majority of this material,  
360 however, was newly brought together in response to the booksellers' printed 'New Proposals  
361 for Printing by Subscription, Cambdens Britannia, English', and were sent not to Gibson, but  
362 to the booksellers themselves. Those proposals had been issued on 20 April 1693, and they  
363 asked that 'all Gentlemen that have made any such Corrections or Remarks' on Camden's  
364 *Britannia* would 'Transmit them to the Undertakers who will faithfully Insert them'.<sup>67</sup> Copies  
365 of the proposals seem to have been circulated in the regions through the efforts of local  
366 antiquaries. Edward Barnes, a man who hailed from East Carleton, just outside Norwich, and



367 seems to have had antiquarian interests, announced that he had received 'some sheets of  
368 proposalls *which* I laid out at the Coffee houses in towne'.<sup>68</sup> At the other side of the country,  
369 one John Moore wrote to Sir Jonathan Trelawny (1650-1721), who bore overall responsibility  
370 for Cornwall, acknowledging that 'I haue *received* the proposalls, for the printing of  
371 Cambdens *Britannia* which *your Lordship* ordered to be sent to me, for which I heartily thank  
372 you'.<sup>69</sup> The proposals for the *Britannia* galvanized antiquaries across England (and, indirectly,  
373 Wales, too) to contribute their scholarship to a common collaborative endeavour. 'I have often  
374 observed', wrote Tanner, in celebration of this spirit, 'that there are no men in the world [...] so  
375 ready to communicate, and do mutual offices of kindness one to another, as Antiquaries'.<sup>70</sup>  
376 Tanner was, however, describing what it was like to be at the centre of things in Oxford: the  
377 1695 *Britannia* helped to turn the relatively localized and isolated activities of antiquaries  
378 across the country into a collaborative network.<sup>71</sup>

379         These volumes of draft material for the 1695 *Britannia* encourage us to think more  
380 broadly about the forms antiquarian writing took in the seventeenth century. Not all  
381 antiquaries, perhaps not even a majority, would produce polished works for publication,  
382 whether county chorographies, monographs on particular antiquarian topics, editions of  
383 medieval texts or inscriptions, or dictionaries of medieval languages, let alone a major,  
384 systematic work such as the *Britannia* itself. Letters were one of the most important forms of  
385 antiquarian writing: dozens of letters in the *Britannia* volumes contain antiquarian  
386 discoveries.<sup>72</sup> But antiquarian writing could also take the form of annotated sketches of  
387 monuments and inscriptions (often called 'draughts'); among Gibson's *Britannia* papers, we  
388 even find one of the earliest English brass rubbings, complete with an explanatory letter.<sup>73</sup>  
389 Annotations to printed books were another important form of antiquarian writing. The

390 booksellers' proposals had originally envisaged printing the 'Manuscript Notes and  
391 Corrections' of the lawyer, antiquary, and orientalist, John Selden (1584-1654). They were  
392 presumably thinking of Selden's annotations to his own copy of the 1607 Latin *Britannia*,  
393 then and now in the Bodleian Library.<sup>74</sup> Although it seems that the booksellers never went  
394 through with this ambition, annotation would still be fundamental to the process of drafting  
395 the new *Britannia*. When contributors agreed to take on responsibility for particular counties,  
396 they were issued by the booksellers with the interleaved pages of their county taken from the  
397 1637 edition of the *Britannia* (in Holland's translation). For instance, in late September 1693,  
398 when it became clear that Thoresby would need to tackle West Yorkshire, Awnsham  
399 Churchill wrote to him to say that he had been 'so bold to send you, per Leeds carrier, carriage  
400 paid, Mr Camden's account of the West Riding of Yorkshire, interleaved', asking him if he  
401 would 'in the blank pages correct what is amiss; add what is omitted; insert what discoveries  
402 have been made since Camden corrected the map; where the possessor of any thing described  
403 in Camden is changed, to put the name of the present possessor:-- I mean, to do any thing in  
404 any manner, how or what you shall judge fit, to better this our work'.<sup>75</sup> At the very end of  
405 December 1693, Thoresby recorded that he spent '[a]ll day, writing memoirs in the  
406 interleaved *Britannia*'.<sup>76</sup> Many similar annotated interleaved pages survive among Gibson's  
407 volumes of papers.<sup>77</sup> These pages testify to the open-ended, unfinished nature of Camden's  
408 *Britannia*: it offered the structural outlines of Britain's antiquities, but it lay open (materially  
409 and intellectually) for the interventions of Camden's successors.

410           The heart of Gibson's work, therefore, in preparing the *Britannia* for the press, was  
411 editing and compiling these loose papers into coherent 'additions' to each county. He  
412 described his struggles with the inconsistency of his materials in a letter to Charlett. 'Now it

413 was my design from the beginning to put all papers into form in their several Counties',  
414 Gibson explained, because 'an inequality of stile and composition' would be the 'consequence  
415 of several different pens' and 'must needs prove a great deformitie in the whole'.<sup>78</sup> Most of the  
416 contributors to the *Britannia*, he added, 'doe not trouble themselves any farther than to send  
417 their papers without form or method'. 'It cost me noe little pains to digest them', Gibson  
418 admitted, 'and yet methinks I had much rather undergoe that, than see the book of soe many  
419 colours and faces'.<sup>79</sup> Comparison of Gibson's *Britannia* papers and the finished volumes  
420 themselves allows us to watch this process of 'digestion' in practice. The materials for  
421 Shropshire, say, begin with Gibson's own notes on some of the now standard antiquarian  
422 sources of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. He has a list of monasteries, from William  
423 Dugdale's *Monasticon Anglicanum* (1655), the great work of seventeenth-century scholarship  
424 on the documents related to the monasteries in England and their histories; alongside  
425 Dugdale, he also drew on *Historia Anglicana Ecclesiastica* (published in Douai in 1622) by  
426 the Catholic antiquary, Nicholas Harpsfield (1519-1575). John Leland's *Itinerary*, still in  
427 manuscript at this time, furnished lengthy extracts on the county. He made note of comments  
428 on the British segment of the Antonine Itinerary by the schoolmaster and antiquarian, William  
429 Burton (1609-1657), which had been published in 1658 and remained the most up-to-date  
430 published work on the Itinerary, the late Roman account of journeys across the Empire, which  
431 was used by antiquaries to reconstruct the site of Roman settlements and the route of Roman  
432 roads. He made lists of important saints, statesmen, judges (including Edmund Plowden),  
433 prelates, and learned writers who were born in the region or lived there, drawing on Thomas  
434 Fuller's *The History of the Worthies of England* (1662). He also drew material directly from  
435 his own notes on place-names in the Saxon Chronicle. Onto these core notes, he embroidered

436 additions that were sent by local antiquaries. One Thomas Lister, who mentioned his  
437 'employment of surveying' (suggesting antiquarianism to be very much a part-time activity,  
438 but one which would undoubtedly be informed by his own professional duties), wrote a letter  
439 outlining his findings on Roman remains in the region to a Shropshire bookseller, Mr Rogers,  
440 on 10 November 1693.<sup>80</sup> Gibson took Lister's material on the Roman coins discovered at  
441 Shrewsbury, which are 'call'd by the inhabitants *Dynders*, and are so worn and decay'd, that  
442 there is not one in ten found, the Inscription whereof is perfectly legible', from Lister's letter  
443 and printed it verbatim, attributing it to 'a person who has been an eye-witness'. He not only  
444 borrowed not only information from the letter, but its argument too: Camden had argued that  
445 the Vikings destroyed Shrewsbury, an Anglo-Saxon settlement, but the exclusive presence of  
446 Roman coins there, with no Anglo-Saxon ones, showed that it must have been a Roman town  
447 and destroyed at an earlier date. In addition to the letter from Lister, Gibson drew upon  
448 anonymous annotations from the interleaved pages of the Shrewsbury section of the *Britannia*  
449 for a wide and diverse array of bits of information, on topics such as the foundations of  
450 Shrewsbury Castle or boats called 'Flotes'.<sup>81</sup> Gibson's aim, therefore, was to 'digest' the diffuse  
451 and divergent energies of Britain's antiquaries—past and present—into the set of notes we see  
452 in the published *Britannia*, to give coherence to a set of fragmentary materials.

453

## 454 **Part II: Varieties of Antiquarian Scholarship in the 1695 *Britannia***

455

456 Nevertheless, all kinds of inconsistency across the *Britannia* were inevitable, reflecting the  
457 range (and sometimes the limitations) of late seventeenth-century antiquarian scholarship.  
458 Some regions simply did not have an active, engaged array of antiquaries; some lacked a

459 single specialist who was able to bring together multiple periods of a county's history, or  
460 make multiple kinds of evidence illuminate one another. Counties with no particular  
461 undertakers included Shropshire which, despite Gibson's best efforts (which we have already  
462 traced) received fewer than four columns of additional material, making it a relatively  
463 sparsely annotated county. Suffolk was also not particularly well served. Gibson was alive to  
464 these dangers of inconsistent coverage, and the frustrations it risked causing for the book's  
465 readership. '[W]e have noe particular undertakers for one third of the Counties', Gibson  
466 observed, soon after he had taken on the role of editor-in-chief, and therefore if he listed all  
467 the contributors to each of the counties, 'I bring a storm upon the book-sellers heads for not  
468 having equal regard to the whole Kingdom; or at least not being soe industrious in perfecting  
469 the work as they ought to have been'.<sup>82</sup>

470         Moreover, the ambiguity inherent in the instructions simply to add 'such things as we  
471 may reasonably imagine Camden would not have omitted if he had known 'em', meant that  
472 antiquaries approached their task differently. Take, for instance, the case of William Blundel,  
473 who wrote to Swale from Little Crosby in Lancashire, just outside Liverpool, in July of  
474 1693.<sup>83</sup> Blundel introduced himself by sending a copper-plate engraving of the Anglo-Saxon  
475 coins which his grandfather, the recusant master of the Little Crosby estate, William Blundel,  
476 had helped to discover in 1611.<sup>84</sup> That Blundel decided to do so suggests he thought this to be  
477 just the kind of material for which the booksellers were looking: it was what Camden would  
478 have included, had he known of it. Gibson did indeed make mention of Blundel's  
479 grandfather's coins.<sup>85</sup> Blundel's subsequent letters, however, strayed farther from what might  
480 seem to be core matters of antiquarian history, encompassing a rebuttal of Camden's idea that  
481 there are local fish which swim underground ('I have lived above sixty years in the

482 neighbourhood, yet I can by no enquiry hear of any such thing'), information about the  
483 economic growth of Liverpool over the last 28 years, and an account of Charlotte Stanley,  
484 countess of Derby's 'personal and successful defence' of her home from Parliamentary forces  
485 in 1644.<sup>86</sup> He was conscious that this last detail might seem an 'Addition' to the *Britannia* too  
486 far. 'You may think', Blundel commented, 'that these notes are fitter for the history of the  
487 Present State of England than for the work you are setting forth. Yet you may happily take  
488 notice all along (as Mr Camden has sometimes done) of those fatall spotts of ground where the  
489 fortunes of the Crown of England have so often layn at stake in the battailes of our late Civil  
490 warr'. Blundel was self-consciously continuing Camden's practice—'as Mr Camden has  
491 sometimes done'—even when his additions might seem to be irrelevant to what one might  
492 intuitively (and anachronistically) expect of an 'antiquarian' book. Gibson was clearly  
493 persuaded (or did not need persuading): he included all Blundel's details in the *Britannia*.<sup>87</sup>  
494 Camden was a remarkably expansive model for antiquaries to follow. It is no surprise, in this  
495 context, that Richard Parsons, chancellor of Gloucester Cathedral, requested that Gibson send  
496 him an off-print of 'a Countie finished', so that he might use it as a 'model to adjust his own  
497 materials'.<sup>88</sup> That Gibson does seem to have made an effort to send him such an off-print  
498 shows the way he exploited the protracted process of printing a book this size in order to bring  
499 some kind of coherency to it.<sup>89</sup>

500           The breadth of possible individual interpretations of the project's brief also meant that  
501 the accounts of some counties offered lots of detail on one period of history, but relatively  
502 little on anything else. The Reverend John Ouseley, for instance, sent a series of extremely  
503 detailed letters to Gibson in June and July 1694, which provided the bulk of the materials for  
504 the county of Essex. However, Ouseley's focus was on Roman antiquities, and especially on

505 identifying the sites of the 'IXth Itinerary' of the Antonine Itinerary. To support his conjectural  
506 identifications of Roman sites, he provided detailed accounts of Roman antiquities and an  
507 analysis of the Itinerary itself (although modern scholarship on the Itinerary would largely  
508 disagree with his conclusions).<sup>90</sup> Ouseley's particular focus meant that the account of Essex  
509 was concentrated on Roman antiquities; the work of the Anglo-Saxon scholar, William  
510 Nicolson, on Northumberland, however, focussed on later medieval history, including  
511 ecclesiastical history. In contrast to Blundel, where any information—from Anglo-Saxon  
512 coins to the economy of Liverpool—might be pertinent to the *Britannia*, Ouseley and  
513 Nicolson had a sense of their own more specialized scholarly remits. In this way, the makeup  
514 of the *Britannia* depended on contingent factors, including that region's antiquaries' sense of  
515 their own individual specialisms and, indeed, their conception of what antiquarianism could  
516 be.

517 More troublingly, however, the areas of Britain that were most poorly served by  
518 antiquarian additions often reflected the power imbalances in the kingdom.<sup>91</sup> For all Camden's  
519 efforts to increase the coverage of Scotland and Scottish antiquities between the first edition  
520 of the *Britannia* in 1586 and the last Latin edition in 1607 (during which period, of course,  
521 James VI of Scotland had ascended to the English throne), the *Britannia* was always Anglo-  
522 centric in its proportionately vastly inflated coverage of English counties.<sup>92</sup> It would remain  
523 so after 1695. The revision of Scotland was looked after by Robert Sibbald (1641-1722), the  
524 leading figure in Scottish antiquities of the period.<sup>93</sup> Although he had amassed substantial  
525 materials on Scottish geography, institutions, and antiquities in the 1680s towards his  
526 projected *Atlas Scoticus*, his contributions to the *Britannia* were somewhat limited and  
527 reluctant.<sup>94</sup> His annotations often treat antiquities quite vaguely. For instance, his notes record

528 the existence of both the Camus Cross, a tenth-century free-standing stone cross in the county  
529 of Angus (in the north of Scotland), and the nearby Aberlemno stones, now thought to be  
530 earlier Pictish monuments, and observe that '[b]oth these have some antique pictures and  
531 letters upon them'. But he gave no more detail about the stone carvings and no real analysis of  
532 them. Sibbald's additions are largely restricted to descriptions of towns and the useful  
533 resources offered by the Scottish landscape. Although scholars have shown that there *were*  
534 networks of antiquaries whom Sibbald could have helped to mobilize, in parallel with  
535 England's similar mobilisation of regional antiquaries, he seems not to have done so.<sup>95</sup> Kelsey  
536 Jackson Williams has recently traced Sibbald's immense ambitions to produce an independent  
537 work of Scottish chorography in the 1680s.<sup>96</sup> Although by 1695 this work seems to have  
538 stalled, perhaps Sibbald was unwilling to see his labours entirely subsumed into the *Britannia*.

539 Another Scottish antiquary's attempt to contribute to the *Britannia* ended in failure and  
540 confusion. Sir James Dalrymple of Borthwick (1650-1719) was a legal antiquary and  
541 historian, who descended from a powerful political family.<sup>97</sup> In the preface to his celebrated  
542 1705 volume, *Collections Concerning the Scottish History*, which attempted to rebut English  
543 claims to historic supremacy over Scotland, Dalrymple reminisced about his attempt to  
544 contribute to the *Britannia*.<sup>98</sup> 'When I heard that the Learned Dr. *Gibson* was upon a design of  
545 Publishing a new Edition of *Cambden's Britannia*', he wrote, 'I was willing to promote so  
546 ingenious an Undertaking'. He had, therefore, 'prepared some Notes to be sent by my Friends  
547 then residing at *London*', but they would 'come too late' to be included in the edition.<sup>99</sup> To that  
548 end, in 1695 (after the publication of Gibson's *Britannia*) he had published his own octavo  
549 edition of Philemon Holland's translation of Camden's account of Scotland, with his additions  
550 grafted directly into the text. The volume was published by the press that had been established



551 by Andrew Anderson in 1671, the year he was appointed king's printer.<sup>100</sup> It was printed,  
552 according to its preface, 'for the benefit of the Kingdom of *Scotland*', and 'if it had been  
553 finished in due Time, as it was begun to be Printed' it 'might have been a part of the Second  
554 Edition of the whole *Britannia*'.<sup>101</sup> Nevertheless, Dalrymple felt he was 'so limited by that  
555 Authors method' (i.e., by Camden's organising structure), that he was left with 'little  
556 Opportunity to say anything new in Relation to our Ancient History'.<sup>102</sup> He produced a  
557 volume that competed quite directly for Scottish readers' attention with that published in  
558 London. Gibson himself was disappointed by the efforts of the Scottish antiquaries: 'I fear we  
559 shall be able to give but a slender account of Scotland; but 'tis there own fault: if they had  
560 return'd things more proper and in better order, their kingdom had not wanted that  
561 improvement which most of the English Counties have'.<sup>103</sup> Competing Scotland-focussed  
562 projects and a lack of co-ordinated efforts to publicise Gibson's endeavour north of the border  
563 seem to have diminished the *Britannia*'s capability to galvanize Scotland's antiquaries in the  
564 way it did England's.

565         The situation with Ireland was even worse. Gibson was initially distracted by the  
566 somewhat improbable notion that material towards Irish antiquities might be supplied by the  
567 freethinker John Toland (1670-1722), who had taken up residence in Oxford in 1693 to work  
568 on an Irish dictionary, but whose fame would rest on his endeavours in religious philosophy  
569 and politics rather than antiquities.<sup>104</sup> 'When you see Mr Toland', Gibson wrote to Tanner in  
570 April of 1694, 'doe soe much as ask him what assistance we may expect from him in the  
571 kingdom of Ireland'.<sup>105</sup> In the end, Toland provided more material for Gibson's exchanges of  
572 gossip than for the *Britannia*. Conveying a mixture of curiosity and increasing alarm, Gibson  
573 told stories of Toland's having 'remov'd to Edenburrow, and set up there for a Rosacrucian',

574 having been overheard to offer a 'very favourable opinion of Popery', the 'quarrel he had with  
575 Monsieur [Friedrich] Spanheim, upon which occasion he was hiss'd out of the School', and,  
576 more recently, his 'burning a Common Prayer book' in Oxford.<sup>106</sup> All this ultimately went too  
577 far for Gibson; he ceased to hope that Toland would make any contribution to the Ireland  
578 section of the *Britannia*.

579         The learned Catholic antiquary, Roderick O'Flaherty (1627x30-1716x18), seems not  
580 to have been involved in the project, and the annotations fell to the politician, Whig, and  
581 historian of colonial Ireland, Sir Richard Cox (1650-1733).<sup>107</sup> His additions largely refer the  
582 reader to the work of the earlier Irish antiquary, James Ware (1594-1666). By far the most  
583 interesting note on Ireland tells the story of the discovery of the Ballyshannon Sun Disc, an  
584 extremely ancient Bronze Age object, probably from around 2500-2150BCE, which was  
585 given to the Ashmolean Museum soon after the publication of *Britannia*.<sup>108</sup> The disc was  
586 discovered after the bishop of Derry and other well-connected local figures heard 'an Irish  
587 Harper' sing a song, which they had to ask a 'Herdsman' to translate for them. The song named  
588 'the very spot' where 'a man of a gygantick stature lay buried, and that over his breast and  
589 back there were plates of pure gold, and on his fingers rings of gold'. Of course they went to  
590 dig, and unearthed the sun disc on the exact spot the Harper's song had indicated. The account  
591 is accompanied with an accurate drawing of the disc.<sup>109</sup> But despite such important individual  
592 highlights, the coverage of Ireland was very patchy, and hardly represented a continuation of  
593 the great work of such earlier Irish antiquaries as James Ussher (1581-1655) or indeed Ware.

594         In England, however, discoveries of new artefacts—whether Roman, Saxon or 'ancient  
595 British'—were often vigorously debated by those interested in antiquities, and accounts of the  
596 uncovering of such treasures in England are particularly prominent among Gibson's *Britannia*

597 papers. To understand how such discoveries were reported, discussed and interpreted, I would  
598 like to look briefly at two examples from the *Britannia*: one of the discovery of a Roman  
599 artefact and one of a Saxon. Newly-discovered Roman altars were natural objects for  
600 inclusion in the revised *Britannia* as they had been of particular interest to Camden, who often  
601 took care to reproduce not only their inscriptions but also more complete drawings of the  
602 altars themselves. In 1692, the discovery of a Roman altar in Chester was causing some stir  
603 among the local community of those interested in antiquarianism. The altar is dedicated to the  
604 'Genius Loci', and its carvings show the genius of the place, with a horn in one hand and a  
605 libation bowl in the other; in the top of the altar is the bust of a man. Today the altar is  
606 preserved in the Grosvenor Museum in Chester.<sup>110</sup> It was discovered in July 1693, while Mr  
607 Samuel and Mrs Mary Heath were having their cellar dug.<sup>111</sup>

608         The discovery was reported to those responsible for the *Britannia* on three separate  
609 occasions, which is perhaps testimony to the excitement the altar generated and to the number  
610 of antiquaries who either lived in or were passing through Chester around that time.<sup>112</sup> One  
611 such antiquary who passed through was Edward Lhwyd, on his return from Wales to Oxford,  
612 who sent a 'copy of an Alter, lately found in Chester' to Abel Swale.<sup>113</sup> The earliest of these  
613 reports was sent by Randle Holme (1627-1700), a Chester herald, whose father and  
614 grandfather had both been heralds. In his letter to Awnsham Churchill describing the newly  
615 discovered Roman altar, Holme alluded to the 'draughts' of Roman and Saxon coins taken by  
616 'my father & Grandfather in their tymes': antiquarianism was often a family pursuit, as we  
617 have already seen in the case of William Blundel. Holme's letter, written soon after the  
618 discovery of the altar, went on to describe the 'Roman Alter stone' with (he thinks, wrongly)  
619 'Hercules & his club' engraved on it; he also provided the inscription.<sup>114</sup> He had been inspired

620 to send it to Churchill because 'there came to my hands a printed paper of your undertaking  
621 of Camden's *Britannia*'—the printed proposals issued in April 1693.

622           A far more detailed account of the altar, along with 'draughts' of its engravings and  
623 accounts of the Roman coins discovered along with it, was sent to Abel Swale in December  
624 1693. This description came from Henry Prescott (1649-1719), an ecclesiastical administrator  
625 in the diocese of Chester with a university education (at Trinity College, Dublin), who led an  
626 'extremely active social life' as a 'conversationalist, dinner guest, country-house visitor, and,  
627 above all, as a drinking companion', all activities that are recorded in his diary.<sup>115</sup> He clearly  
628 took a careful interest in antiquities too: as well as using the coins discovered nearby to  
629 attempt to date the altar, he accurately identified the engraving as the Genius Loci, rather than  
630 Hercules.<sup>116</sup> He also showed his awareness of the relevant recent literature on British  
631 antiquarianism, pointing to a comparable altar discovered in Chester in 1654 and described in  
632 Humphrey Prideaux's *Marmora Oxoniensia* (1676), the most thorough account of inscriptions  
633 preserved in British collections that had yet been produced (albeit one that Prideaux's fellow  
634 Oxford scholars thought rushed and careless).<sup>117</sup> It was Prescott's account that Gibson made  
635 use of in the *Britannia*, incorporating verbatim his description of the find, his account of the  
636 Roman coins discovered along with the altar, and also his transcription of the altar's  
637 inscription; sadly, there are no plates of the altar's engravings, perhaps because they would  
638 have been too expensive to produce.<sup>118</sup> This example, in other words, shows us the range of  
639 approaches to the same artefact even in a very small local context such as Chester: two  
640 antiquaries, one a herald and the other a cleric, one steeped in a family tradition of such  
641 antiquarianism and the other with the relevant recent Latin secondary literature to hand, each  
642 with slightly different abilities to identify and contextualize what they had seen.

643           What is most striking, though, in the case of such Roman antiquities is the continuity  
644 of approach between that of Camden and his successors in the 1690s. The interpretation of  
645 Anglo-Saxon artefacts, in the context of the advances made in that field by the Oxford  
646 Saxonists, went further than Camden had been able. Not long after the discovery of the  
647 Chester altar, an Anglo-Saxon artefact was making a similar stir among those of antiquarian  
648 inclinations. This was the Sutton Brooch, now known as Aedwen's Brooch, a silver circular  
649 disc dating from the early eleventh Century, about 15cm across and featuring intricate  
650 carvings along with a runic inscription, which says that 'Aedwen owns me', and curses anyone  
651 who tries to take the disc away from her. The British Museum acquired the brooch in 1951,  
652 after it had been missing for hundreds of years.<sup>119</sup> It was dug up by ploughmen in a field near  
653 Ely, along with a variety of coins and rings (the whereabouts of which today are unknown).  
654 The brooch came into the hands of John Taylor, vicar of Harlow in Essex and canon of  
655 Peterborough Cathedral, and Taylor was keen to inform others about the discovery. He seems  
656 to have passed on a letter to Gibson, which had been sent to him from one Anthony Gregory,  
657 describing the moment when the 'shear of the plow laid hold of a thin plate of lead & brought  
658 up with it severall of those small coins'; after further digging, the men discovered '3 silver  
659 plates', but Taylor's was the only one with an inscription.<sup>120</sup> A little earlier, another cleric, a  
660 canon of Ely, Francis Roper (1643-1719), had been writing to the president of Corpus Christi  
661 College, Oxford, Thomas Turner (1645-1714), a man who himself had Ely connections, to  
662 inform him about the 'Treasure-troue' discovered at Sutton.<sup>121</sup> The multitude of  
663 correspondence which survives from this period allows us to trace the ways in which this kind  
664 of antiquarian news circulated between the church and the universities, the members of which  
665 institutions were so often interested in the study of antiquities.<sup>122</sup>

666           Gibson himself seems to have seen the brooch, and despite being a proficient Saxonist,  
667 the runes proved very difficult to decipher. 'I presently perceiv'd it to be Saxon by the first two  
668 words *drihten, drihten*' [O Lord, Oh Lord], but some of them 'I could not reduce to any thing I  
669 had met with in that language'.<sup>123</sup> Even George Hickes struggled to interpret the disc when he  
670 was introduced to it by John Covel (1638-1722), master of Christ's College, Cambridge. To  
671 the first volume of his *Linguarum Veterum Septentrionalium Thesaurus Grammatico-Criticus*  
672 (1705), his great work on the morphology of the Anglo-Saxon language and on the reliability  
673 of the documents which bear witness to the language, he appended a Latin letter about the  
674 brooch addressed to Sir Andrew Fountaine (1676-1753), the gentleman coin-collector and  
675 expert on Anglo-Saxon numismatics, who had contributed a lengthy account of Anglo-Saxon  
676 coins to the *Thesaurus*.<sup>124</sup> In the letter, Hickes transcribed the inscription's runes and drew a  
677 remarkably detailed representation of the disc. But even he was somewhat at a loss about  
678 what the inscription meant or what the disc was for, arguing that the inscription 'seems to be  
679 some sort of incantation; anyone who carried the disc into battle was safe from the fear of  
680 death, thinking himself to have been made invulnerable by the charm'. He was particularly  
681 flummoxed by the crucial first words of the inscription—'Aedwen owns me'—thinking that  
682 perhaps they are 'Magic and occult kinds of words, since they signify nothing, as far as I  
683 know'.<sup>125</sup> Nevertheless, his response to the disc is considerably more detailed and accurate  
684 than Gibson's. Hickes's penetrating and original scholarship on the Anglo-Saxon language and  
685 on ecclesiastical documents (influenced by the French Benedictine scholars) could have been  
686 a transformative addition to Camden's *Britannia*.<sup>126</sup> His absence is a matter to which this  
687 article will return.

688 I have been stressing the way the *Britannia* captures a moment in time of mobile,  
689 dispersed antiquarian activity across the nation; viewed in this way, the book emerges as a  
690 printed version of a bricolage of different manuscript materials, an assemblage of letters,  
691 documents, annotated pages of earlier *Britannias*, and so on. But it must also be  
692 acknowledged that Gibson worked with some leading scholars who produced synthesized  
693 treatments of particular topics, counties, or countries. One of these figures was the naturalist,  
694 John Ray (1627-1705), the most distinguished botanist in the country by the time the 1695  
695 *Britannia* was being produced, who was engaged to provide lists of rare plants to be found in  
696 each county (published at the end of each set of 'Additions'). By the end of the seventeenth  
697 century, it had become standard practice to view natural history and antiquarianism side-by-  
698 side. As ever, Camden had shown the way here to English scholars, often including accounts  
699 of a county's flora and fauna in his *Britannia*. Later chorographic surveys of particular  
700 counties had adopted the same approach, and the Baconian influence of the Royal Society had  
701 encouraged a more systematic approach to the presentation of natural history alongside  
702 antiquities.<sup>127</sup> The pioneer here, Robert Plot (1640-1696), the first keeper of the Ashmolean  
703 Museum, organized his *Natural History of Oxfordshire* (1677) into a sequence of opening  
704 chapters on the natural world ('Earth', 'Stones', 'Plants'), before turning to human history ('Of  
705 Men and Women', 'Of Arts') and finally to 'Antiquities'. The study of antiquities and of the  
706 landscape often shaded into one another: when discussing the Oxfordshire Rollright stones  
707 and attempting to argue that they were erected to 'serve also for the *Election and Inauguration*  
708 of a *King*', he adduced in evidence the 'rising *ground*' on which they stood, which had 'the  
709 advantage of *prospect* (that the common people assembled [...] might see and witness the  
710 solemn manner of Election)'.<sup>128</sup>

711           The contributors of individual counties often mingled information about antiquities  
712 with accounts of unusual natural phenomena, in the manner of one of the eclectic issues of  
713 *Philosophical Transactions*, and indeed the contributors drew on papers published there as  
714 sources.<sup>129</sup> But Gibson was adamant that the *Britannia's* audience expected a more thorough  
715 treatment of natural history. 'Mr Ray's Catalogue of Local Plants will secure us the Botanists  
716 and Natural Philosophers', he explained to Charlett in March 1694. 'What between herbs,  
717 camps, high-ways, families &c. we shall have near for all palats', he concluded,  
718 reassuringly.<sup>130</sup> Ray was keen to circumscribe the task in hand, and he chose not to cover  
719 Scotland or Ireland's flora at all. He passed Middlesex to a specialist in London plants, James  
720 Petiver (c.1665-1718), who was also a pioneering entomologist; he attempted to pass Wales to  
721 Edward Lhwyd, but by July 1694 he had 'drawn up for Mr Churchill a Catalogue of more rare  
722 plants growing spontaneously in Wales' as Lhwyd 'seemed not willing to undertake it'.<sup>131</sup>  
723 There were still four columns of text on Welsh plants in the *Britannia*, along with detailed  
724 accounts of the wild flowers of the southern counties and of Yorkshire (with the Midlands  
725 generally treated in slightly more summary fashion). It is striking that an account of the  
726 nation's plants was provided by an individual expert in this field, rather than being devolved  
727 to the individuals who undertook each county; this indicates the extent to which Ray and his  
728 contemporaries had advanced specialized knowledge of natural history.

729           Perhaps the two most remarkable antiquarian contributions to the *Britannia*, however,  
730 were both by young scholars in Oxford: Thomas Tanner and Edward Lhwyd. They had many  
731 things in common. Thomas Tanner (only twenty in 1694, when he was working on *Britannia*)  
732 had come up to Queen's College, Oxford, in 1689, where he met Edmund Gibson, whose  
733 work on the Anglo-Saxon chronicle he was already helping to advise in 1692.<sup>132</sup> Lhwyd came



734 from a Shropshire gentry family, spoke Welsh fluently, and came up to Jesus College in 1682.  
735 In the late 1680s he worked closely with Robert Plot at the Ashmolean Museum, and in the  
736 early 1690s, through William Nicolson, became acquainted with the same circle of Saxonists  
737 of which Gibson was a part. Nicolson was one of the Oxford experts in Anglo-Saxon who had  
738 by then taken up his ecclesiastical post in Cumberland, and Lhwyd enjoyed discussing the  
739 names and etymologies of places and landscape features with him.<sup>133</sup> Both Tanner and Lhwyd  
740 amassed exhaustive knowledge in their fields and gathered important material in manuscript,  
741 but published little beyond their 'Additions' to *Britannia*. Both men made journeys to their  
742 respective regions in order to furnish material for their contributions to *Britannia*, believing in  
743 the vital importance of this kind of first-hand observation. Lhwyd wrote to John Lloyd (1662-  
744 1726), one of his closest friends, who was a clergyman and headmaster of Ruthin Grammar  
745 School in Denbighshire, to say, very simply, that 'the doeing of it well'—making a good job of  
746 his additions to Camden's *Britannia*—'would require a journey into the Countrey'.<sup>134</sup> Both  
747 were inspired by the work of John Aubrey (1626-1697) on Britain's monuments, and  
748 borrowed materials from the *Monumenta Britannica* (lent to them in manuscript), including  
749 the nub of Aubrey's arguments that ancient standing-stone monuments like Stonehenge were  
750 not Roman or Danish, but ancient British.<sup>135</sup> Aubrey was sceptical about lending them his  
751 manuscripts, fearing (as he wrote in separate letters to them, with the same metaphor) that he  
752 would find 'all the creame skimd' from the book, and that therefore his *Monumenta* would  
753 never be published.<sup>136</sup> Both saw their contributions to the *Britannia* as a way of announcing  
754 their intention to produce larger future histories of their regions. 'I was the more willing to  
755 Undertake Wiltshire', Tanner explained in one of his letters, 'that I might have an opportunity  
756 of telling my Country' his intention, in the long term, to 'do more for my Native Country than

757 has been already done in this nature for any Country in England'.<sup>137</sup> At the very outset of  
758 Lhwyd's engagement in describing Wales, he was already justifying the project to Martin  
759 Lister by saying: 'I may pick up some materials from the Gentry and Clergy which may prove  
760 usefull an other time'.<sup>138</sup>

761         The most important difference between the two is that Tanner was ultimately, by and  
762 large, working in a field that had been highly developed over the course of the seventeenth  
763 century. His specialism in Wiltshire's medieval history, in particular, meant that he had access  
764 to a wide variety of sources in print. When he wanted to discuss the age of Marlborough  
765 Castle, for instance, he could draw upon Obadiah Walker's work on Anglo-Saxon coins (the  
766 standard reference work in the period), which was published as a preface to the Latin edition  
767 of John Spelman's *Life of Alfred* (the publication of which Walker had supervised in his  
768 capacity as Master of University College, Oxford, which Alfred supposedly founded).<sup>139</sup> The  
769 main medieval historians that Tanner drew upon, including William of Malmesbury and  
770 Nennius, were available in print.<sup>140</sup> Dugdale's *Monasticon Anglicanum* had made available a  
771 number of Saxon monastic charters, along with abbey chronicles from the Cotton Library  
772 manuscripts.<sup>141</sup> He was able to benefit from Gibson's edition of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle,  
773 to which he proposed a number of corrections to the notes on place names. The manuscript  
774 sources Tanner used in his Wiltshire account were also relatively well mapped. The  
775 Domesday Book and the Red Book of the Exchequer had been used extensively by earlier  
776 antiquaries. In the materials on Wiltshire that Tanner sent to Gibson, he also included  
777 extensive extracts from Leland's unpublished *Itinerary*, the manuscript of which was available  
778 in the Bodleian Library.<sup>142</sup> When it came to describing Stonehenge, Tanner was able to  
779 summarize a vigorous debate which involved Walter Charleton, Inigo Jones, and others,

780 before coming down on the side of Aubrey.<sup>143</sup> His effort lay in connecting all this wide range  
781 of reading to the sites he observed in Wiltshire itself. 'I may without vanity', he wrote to  
782 Aubrey just after he had returned from Wiltshire in 1693, boast that he had made a great many  
783 discoveries on his Wiltshire journey, including 'several places mentioned in the Saxon  
784 Histories'.<sup>144</sup> He matched the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle (among other histories) to the modern  
785 landscape as he found it. He did rely on correspondence a little: he sent a list of questions to  
786 Dr Robert Woodward (1653-1701), dean of Salisbury, and incorporated his answers in his  
787 account of Salisbury Cathedral.<sup>145</sup> But this was relatively incidental to Tanner's project,  
788 because so much of the real work he was doing could be done at his desk, by comparing texts.  
789 In this respect, he was a figure who emerged very directly from the work of post-Reformation  
790 English antiquarianism, much of the efforts of which had been devoted to preserving, editing,  
791 and publishing manuscripts of chronicles, charters, and chartularies. Camden was always, to  
792 some degree, an anomaly in the extent to which he made use of first-hand observation of  
793 antiquities, and that was partly because of his particular interest in Roman Britain, where  
794 written sources were slender and inscriptions vital.<sup>146</sup> The mainstream of English  
795 antiquarianism had been devoted to medieval studies, and that meant its focus had been  
796 textual. None of this is intended to diminish Tanner's work as a scholar; only to indicate that  
797 he was a brilliant practitioner within an established field.

798         Lhwyd was doing something altogether different. The study of Welsh chronicles of the  
799 early-middle ages was far less developed than the study of Anglo-Saxon documents.

800 Moreover, Lhwyd was eager to get back to even more ancient historical periods: as far back  
801 as pre-Roman Britain, to discover tantalising glimpses of the 'British', the most ancient  
802 recorded inhabitants of the island. This had long been a desideratum of Welsh antiquaries, of

803 course, but Lhwyd brought real originality to this inquiry. First-hand observations of  
804 antiquities were, in this context, vital, and Nancy Edwards has uncovered the significance of  
805 those observations in a series of articles.<sup>147</sup> His 'Annotations' build a picture of the ancient  
806 Britains as rude and barbarous, but capable of some civilization. The Neolithic long barrow of  
807 Ty Illtud, for instance, he described as being 'composed of four large stones, somewhat of a  
808 flat form, altogether rude and unpolish'd', hinting that it might have been 'erected in the time  
809 of Paganism', like the Rollright stones in Oxfordshire.<sup>148</sup> But there were also signs of ancient  
810 sophistication. His identification of pre-Roman coins showed to him that 'it's manifest the  
811 Britains had gold and silver coyns of their own, before the Roman Conquest'.<sup>149</sup> He described  
812 in detail a golden Celtic torc, discovered near the castle of Harlech in Merionethshire,  
813 correctly realising that this was a pre-Roman artefact, not a Roman one.<sup>150</sup> The discovery of  
814 50 bronze-age axes left him doubtful of whether such a tool could be produced by the pre-  
815 Roman people, and to wonder if perhaps they were actually something like the tips of Roman  
816 spears. 'But', he concluded, seeing the ancient Britains 'had gold and silver coyns' and 'the  
817 golden *Torquis* described in the last County was theirs', then 'I know not but they might have  
818 more arts than we commonly allow them, and therefore must suspend my judgment'.<sup>151</sup>  
819 Material remains, therefore, allowed him to start to piece together the cultures of the pre-  
820 Roman Britains. Such remains also gave him a glimpse of Roman and early medieval history.  
821 He described the spectacular Roman pavements around Caerleon, and drew an inscription  
822 from the Llantwit Stones in Glamorganshire, which date from the early middle ages, in order  
823 'that the curious might have some light into the form of our Letters in the middle ages'.<sup>152</sup>

824           Perhaps the most interesting of all is his account of Maen Achwyfan, an early  
825 Christian cross near Whitford in Flintshire, carved in a style which shows the influence of the

826 Vikings and is similar to crosses found in Northumberland.<sup>153</sup> Lhwyd published careful  
827 drawings of each side of this standing stone, but refused to be precisely drawn on its dating.  
828 However, he made moves in the right direction by comparing it to the 'chequer'd carving' of  
829 monuments 'erected by the Danes' recorded in Robert Plot's *History of Staffordshire*.<sup>154</sup> The  
830 'draughts' of this last discovery came to him from the antiquary Sir Richard Mostyn, a  
831 gentleman to whom Lhwyd was introduced by John Lloyd, and whom Lhwyd described as the  
832 man who had the most 'learning and ingenuity', 'Candour' and 'Judgment' 'as any I have had  
833 correspondence with, in Wales'.<sup>155</sup> Lhwyd's inquiries into Wales began in 1693 with the  
834 circulation of a questionnaire among Welsh antiquary acquaintances (and, through them, their  
835 acquaintances), in the manner of the kind of questionnaire that Lhwyd's mentor, Robert Plot,  
836 had used for his own natural historical and antiquarian investigations.<sup>156</sup> In preparing the  
837 *Britannia*, Lhwyd became engrossed in an elaborate series of overlapping correspondences,  
838 through which he politely but firmly pressed his acquaintances for drawings of inscriptions or  
839 antiquarian finds, copies of documents, and many more kinds of information.<sup>157</sup> With Lhwyd  
840 in Oxford, his remit being to describe the whole of Wales, and the particular importance  
841 placed on first-hand observation in his accounts of antiquities, it is easy to see why  
842 correspondence was such a fundamental part of Lhwyd's research as an antiquary.<sup>158</sup>

843         Perhaps most important, though, in Lhwyd's work, was his methodological rigour. In  
844 his work for the *Britannia*, he applied some of the same thinking to his study of monuments  
845 as he would later apply to his study of language for what became, in 1707, the first volume of  
846 a projected sequence, the *Archaeologia Britannica*.<sup>159</sup> His underpinning logic was simple: if a  
847 monument could be shown to appear in places that the Romans had never been (like the  
848 highlands of Scotland), then that monument could not have come from the Romans; secondly,

849 it also showed that there must have been some connection between the peoples who made  
850 similar monuments in different places. This line of reasoning led Lhwyd to place the  
851 monuments he viewed—and their names—in a broader Celtic context. The clearest example  
852 of this is in Lhwyd's discussion of cairns (piles of stones) in the county of Radnorshire, the  
853 first county of Wales that the reader encounters. It is as though this passage was placed at the  
854 outset of the work to teach the reader the fundamental methods Lhwyd would apply in his  
855 'Additions'. Lhwyd pointed out that such cairns are found in North Wales, too, where they are  
856 called 'Karnedheu', and they are 'frequent in Scotland and Ireland, being call'd there by the  
857 same British name of *Kairn*'. The word 'Kairn', Lhwyd concluded, 'is a primitive word, and  
858 appropriated to signifie such heaps of stones'. This 'primitive word' is the common  
859 etymological root of all the other words he had discussed. He went on to show that cairns  
860 were used to mark burial places for the dead, also a Roman practice. Did the cairns therefore  
861 come from the Romans? No, Lhwyd showed; it was a practice 'nevertheless usual among the  
862 Britains, before they were known to the Romans' because 'they are common also in the  
863 *Highlands* of Scotland, and in Ireland, where their Conquests never reach'd'.<sup>160</sup> These cairns  
864 could not be Roman because they are found in places the Romans did not go. They are,  
865 therefore, signs of the ancient British culture. In this example, Lhwyd synthesized his interest  
866 in monuments and his approach to etymology.

867         This comparison between Tanner and Lhwyd shows that the long-standing question of  
868 whether antiquarianism was more a matter of reading books or inspecting artefacts is not the  
869 right question for historians of scholarship to ask. Early-modern scholarly methodologies did  
870 not float free of the subjects they were designed to study. Instead, antiquaries' differing  
871 objects of study (in this case, the histories of Wiltshire and of Wales) shaped the sources and

872 methods they used. Both the study of manuscripts and the study of artefacts in the field were  
873 equally much forms of antiquarianism in this period—the vitally important matter was the  
874 period or kind of history scholars wanted to reach. His pursuit of the Celtic past led Lhwyd to  
875 place monuments and etymologies at the heart of his research. They were similarly central for  
876 William Camden, who had followed Plato's *Cratylus* in believing that the roots of names led  
877 back to the origins of things.<sup>161</sup> 'I look upon Mr Camden', Lhwyd wrote to John Lloyd, 'to  
878 have been one of the most learned, judicious and ingenious writers in his kind that ever  
879 England or perhaps any other Countrey has produc'd'. 'But as to what we can adde or correct',  
880 he went on, 'I make no question were he alive, but he would be thankfull for it: for he seems  
881 to have been a man of very candid temper'.<sup>162</sup> Perhaps more than any of the other contributors  
882 to the *Britannia*, Lhwyd followed Camden closely, adding to his work 'such things as we may  
883 reasonably imagine Camden would not have omitted if he had known 'em'.

884

### 885 **Part III: Contesting the New English *Britannia* in the 1690s**

886

887 This was the edition of the *Britannia* which Gibson moved to London in early 1694 in order  
888 to oversee. As well as responsibility for coordinating and editing the contributions to prepare  
889 them for press, he also took charge of proofreading during the year-long printing process (as  
890 he insisted on doing in his original proposals to the booksellers). 'I take care to collate every  
891 Proof with the Original', he explained to Charlett, 'and after that to examine it a second time  
892 for Litteral slips, and odd expressions'. 'The method is troublesome', he conceded, 'but there is  
893 this comfort in it that a man lets it goe out of his hands with a safe conscience'.<sup>163</sup> In the latter  
894 half of January 1695, Gibson was writing to Tanner to let him know that '[a]ll's finisht' and

895 'the Present-books' (the copies printed on Royal-paper for patrons) were 'put into the Binder's  
896 hands, at whose mercy I lie'. Tanner was asked to prepare for Gibson's return to Queen's  
897 College, Oxford.<sup>164</sup> The whole editorial and printing process had not quite met the absurdly  
898 rapid schedule set by the publishers (for the book to be ready for the start of Michaelmas  
899 Term 1694), but in an era where antiquarian projects could stretch over decades and beyond  
900 individual lifetimes, its speed was remarkable.<sup>165</sup> Indeed, for many of its first readers, the  
901 whole book was a great achievement. The ambitious and brilliant young Anglo-Saxon scholar  
902 and palaeographer, Humphrey Wanley (1672-1726), whose relatively lowly background  
903 admittedly no doubt gave him a sense of the need to ingratiate himself with the people behind  
904 the *Britannia*, wrote to Tanner to praise the 'new & most accurate Edition of Camden, by your  
905 friend Mr Gibson: I wish to God that I might be thought worthy the Honor of his  
906 Acquaintance when I come to Oxford. His Industry amazes me'.<sup>166</sup> Slightly less rapturous and  
907 more soberly admiring was John Archer, William Nicolson's nephew, in a letter to Lhwyd, in  
908 which he admitted that he had 'heard no great discourse' of Camden 'in Coffee-houses, or any  
909 other places I frequent', but 'our Booksellours tell me they sell it for above 40s bound, and one  
910 of 'em very readily offer'd me 32s for mine in sheets; which is (or at least may seem to be) an  
911 argument of its approbation here'.<sup>167</sup> There were gripes, inevitably, both small and large. The  
912 Welsh cleric, Maurice Jones, wrote to Gibson to complain that the paper the booksellers had  
913 used did not come up to scratch. 'The undertakers of Cambden', he wrote, accusatorily, 'haue  
914 basely abused both you & the whole kingdom in the paper, for it is extraordinary bad for such  
915 a great as well as good Booke'.<sup>168</sup> Another of Lhwyd's antiquarian correspondents, Edward  
916 Thomas, recorded that 'some Gentlemen' in Monmouthshire with whom he had talked about



917 the new Camden believed that 'this last Edition quite marr'd the credit of the former, as having  
918 been stuff'd with abundance of notorious errors in the additional notes'.<sup>169</sup>

919         The most concerted criticisms of the *Britannia*, however, came from one quarter in  
920 particular: the non-jurors and their associates. After the Glorious Revolution, many of the  
921 period's most notable antiquarians had refused to swear the Oaths of Allegiance to William  
922 and Mary, no doubt partly inspired by their scholarly predilection for historical precedent and  
923 continuity. George Hickes, one of the bishops of the non-juring church, was the most famous  
924 non-juring antiquary. There was also Thomas Smith (1638-1710), the librarian of the Cotton  
925 Library in the 1690s. He was a scholar with strong views on how Camden ought to be treated,  
926 having published an edition of Camden's letters in 1691 together with a prefatory biography.  
927 In the next generation, two well-known non-jurors, Thomas Hearne (1678-1735) and Thomas  
928 Baker (1656-1740), became two of the most prominent antiquaries in Oxford and Cambridge,  
929 respectively. Antiquaries' patrons and supporters, too, were often non-jurors, or at the very  
930 least sympathetic to the non-juring cause. One of these was Captain Charles Hatton, the  
931 brother of Christopher Hatton, 1st Viscount Hatton (bap. 1632-d.1706), who became the last  
932 peer to take the oath of Solemn Association in 1696.<sup>170</sup> Hatton was a supporter of Thomas  
933 Smith, and was delighted, in particular, by Smith's edition of Camden's letters, which he  
934 called 'one of the most intertaining, instructiue, valuable Bookes I euer perused'.<sup>171</sup> Divisions  
935 such as these meant that antiquaries needed to tread carefully. Dedictees had to be carefully  
936 chosen and dedications tactfully worded. George Hickes's original and fulsome dedication of  
937 his 1689 Saxon Grammar to William Sancroft (1617-1693), the non-juring archbishop of  
938 Canterbury and friend of many Oxford scholars, including antiquaries, was cancelled. Hickes  
939 reinstated the full dedication by hand in a copy of the book that may have been intended for

940 Sancroft himself.<sup>172</sup> Offence was easily taken by the non-jurors themselves, too. William  
941 Nicolson, who had given his endorsement to the new regime, seems to have caused offence to  
942 Hicke by failing to include the Jacobites' favourite historian, Robert Brady (c.1627-1700), in  
943 his bibliography of British historians and antiquaries.<sup>173</sup> 'I know not by what misfortune I  
944 came to omit Dr Brady's History', he wrote to Hicke, 'which I had read, and whereof I had (in  
945 my loose papers) given such an *Account* as I have some Cause to hope would not have been  
946 unacceptable to your self & the rest of the *Doctor's* learned Friends'.<sup>174</sup> Perhaps the omission  
947 was genuinely accidental (and Nicolson instated Brady in the book's second edition), but in  
948 the climate of suspicion of the 1690s, it could not but have seemed deliberate and politically  
949 pointed.

950         From the outset, non-jurors and their friends had greeted the idea of producing a new  
951 *Britannia* in English with considerable scepticism. This was voiced first by Oxford's Savilian  
952 professor of astronomy, Edward Bernard (1638-1697), a man who was not a non-juror  
953 himself, but was friends with many who were, and who hesitated over swearing the necessary  
954 oaths to the new regime.<sup>175</sup> In about April or early May 1693, Bernard wrote from Oxford to  
955 his oldest friend, Thomas Smith, to tell him that 'Swale is here with big words about the  
956 *Britannia* in English', which would include 'great & accurate maps of each county'. Bernard,  
957 however, wished the publisher would take a different approach to the project: 'it would be  
958 more for the honor of Mr. Cambden & the use of scholars to have that immortal worke  
959 represented againe in his Latine & with his additions'.<sup>176</sup> This is a theme to which Bernard's  
960 non-juror friend could warm. Smith agreed that if the publishers 'consulted the honour of the  
961 nation or of Mr Camdens memory: they should print this great work in Latine'. This would  
962 allow them to benefit from 'corrections and additions' to the book 'made by the Author

963 himself': Camden's own marginal additions to his copy of the Latin 1607 *Britannia*, which  
964 included new inscriptions and other corrections. This is a book which Sir John Cotton  
965 (grandson of Sir Robert Cotton, the collector of the library which bears his name, to whom  
966 Camden had left many of his papers) had lent to Smith.<sup>177</sup> The failure to print the new edition  
967 in Latin, for Smith, signalled the limitations of the contemporary book-trade. 'Wee want an  
968 Archbishop Laud & such like men of publick spirit', Smith wrote, 'to encourage the printing  
969 books of learning', and to avoid having 'to depend upon the phansyes & humors of paltry  
970 Booksellers, who designe nothing but their profit, without any regard to the honour of the  
971 nation'. 'I have reason to believe', Smith went on, that it is this search for 'their profit'—as  
972 opposed to desire to print books of learning or to augment 'the honour of the nation'—which  
973 'is the onely motive of the designe of reprinting Camdens Britannia in English'. Books printed  
974 by subscription had largely been disastrous 'since the Biblia Polyglotta', the London Polyglot  
975 Bible of Brian Walton, published almost forty years earlier, in 1657. Rather than issuing  
976 proposals which sought to solicit contributions from everyone with an interest in antiquities  
977 across Britain, it would have been better simply to state '[t]wo or three good names of  
978 scholars & Gentlemen thoroughly versed in the study of antiquities of this nation' who would  
979 be involved in the edition. These few names would 'prevayle more with all considering  
980 persons' than the current proposals.<sup>178</sup>

981         Smith's capacity for complaining was legendary—he once wrote to Bernard to beg his  
982 forgiveness for 'my melancholy temper, *which* I have indulged too much'—and there were  
983 admittedly very few scholarly works he admired.<sup>179</sup> However, his scholarly critiques are  
984 worth taking seriously because behind them lies a set of implicit ideals of what scholarship  
985 should be and scholars do. That the few British scholarly works published after 1690 which

986 he did admire were generally by non-jurors shows the extent to which ideals of scholarship,  
987 politics, and religion were bound up together.<sup>180</sup> This particular letter of Smith's represents a  
988 profoundly different vision of the *Britannia* to that of Gibson. For all that Gibson reprinted  
989 Camden's original text (in translation) and reassured Charlett that in the edition 'nothing shall  
990 be said to the disparagement of Mr Camden', the new *Britannia* did present Camden as in  
991 need of correction, emendation, and addition. This process of supplementing the *Britannia*  
992 was, for Gibson, directly inspired and authorized by Camden himself. Gibson encapsulated  
993 his conception of Camden in the book's preface to the reader: '[i]f Mr. Camden had liv'd to  
994 this day, he had been still adding and altering'.<sup>181</sup> Camden embodied the need for constant  
995 incremental additions to knowledge. He became a kind of shorthand for 'antiquarianism' itself,  
996 a way of looking at the world which anyone in Britain with an interest in antiquities could  
997 adopt. In this respect, Gibson's Camden was inherently both unfinished and collaborative.  
998 Smith, on the other hand, saw Camden as something closer to an authorial masterpiece with  
999 the status of a fixed classic. The most necessary 'corrections & additions' to the book were  
1000 those 'made by the Author himself'. His own words and language ought to be preserved.  
1001 Moreover, keeping the work in Latin preserved Camden's conception of scholarship as an  
1002 international, pan-European endeavour. Indeed, Smith seems to conflate Camden with the  
1003 whole earlier seventeenth-century tradition of learned patronage, embodied for him in  
1004 Archbishop Laud, which enabled learned Latin works to be printed in England. Loss of Latin  
1005 printing, in this context, is loss of connection to early seventeenth-century learned culture  
1006 (and perhaps, implicitly, loss of connection to the political traditions of the Stuarts, too). The  
1007 knowledge of antiquities necessary to inhabit Camden's scholarship sufficiently in order to  
1008 supplement him was not diffused across the nation: it was found only in '[t]wo or three good

1009 names of scholars and Gentlemen'. This was a High Church vision of the *Britannia* to answer  
1010 Gibson's.

1011           The idea of producing a new Latin *Britannia* seems to have predated the project to  
1012 produce an English one by at least a couple of years. In July of 1690, Bernard wrote from  
1013 Oxford to Smith that 'Cambdeni Britannia is not yet set upon here: & beleive [sic] never will  
1014 be. Chiswell at London designing it & their Typography being more ready for so great a  
1015 worke'.<sup>182</sup> That Bernard gives the work a Latin title ('Cambdeni Britannia') suggests he is  
1016 thinking of a Latin edition. He was sceptical that Oxford University Press had the resources to  
1017 produce such a book, and suspected that Richard Chiswell (who would publish Smith's edition  
1018 of Camden's letters) would be better placed to undertake it. Among the non-jurors themselves  
1019 it was Smith's protege, Thomas Hearne, who would most earnestly take up the idea of the  
1020 Latin *Britannia*.<sup>183</sup> 'If you designe to print Camdens Britannia in Latine', Smith wrote to  
1021 Hearne about a year before he died, 'I will furnish you with a great many curious additions  
1022 made by his owne hand in the margin of his last edition 1607 *which* I have now in my study,  
1023 and perchance one day may come into your hands for public use, if you will undertake this  
1024 great worke'.<sup>184</sup> Hearne replied to confirm that 'there's no Book will be more agreeable to me  
1025 than Camden's Britannia, which I am sensible might be much improv'd and I am glad that his  
1026 own Additions are fallen into so good Hands as your's'.<sup>185</sup> He contemplated the idea of the  
1027 new Latin *Britannia* for the next decade, but in the end he produced only a new edition of  
1028 Camden's *Annales* of Elizabeth's reign.<sup>186</sup>

1029           The man who most earnestly advocated for the production of a Latin *Britannia* in the  
1030 1690s was not himself a non-juror. He was the erudite scholar of Greek philosophy and Latin  
1031 medieval British historiography, Thomas Gale (1635/1636?-1702). Gale was, however, one of

1032 the few scholars with whom Smith remained friends in the 1690s, and was also a regular  
1033 visitor to the household of another well-known Jacobite, Samuel Pepys (1633-1703), who was  
1034 Gale's kinsman.<sup>187</sup> Although he achieved preferment to the deanery of York in 1697, it is hard  
1035 to imagine that in private Gale (like Bernard) did not express some sympathy with the  
1036 principled stance of the non-jurors. Rumour had it in 1691 that Gale might be intending to  
1037 'reprint at the Theater Camdens Britannia', although Smith did not believe it.<sup>188</sup> However, by  
1038 the middle of the 1690s, Gale was certainly advocating for the production of a new Latin  
1039 edition. When Gale died, Smith wrote in condolence to Pepys, expressing hope that his sons  
1040 would publish his papers in due course, 'especially those which relate to the illustrating of  
1041 Camden's Britannia, which he has formerly shown me'.<sup>189</sup> Those papers would never be  
1042 published; Gale's son, Roger Gale, would only posthumously publish his father's book about  
1043 the British Antonine Itinerary.<sup>190</sup> This project seems likely to have been related to Gale's work  
1044 on Camden. After Smith spent a Saturday showing to Gale Camden's own annotated copy of  
1045 the *Britannia*, he noted that Gale 'is publishing the itinerary of Antoninus, so farr as concernes  
1046 Britaine'; the implication is that this work would be informed by Camden's annotations which  
1047 Smith had shown him.<sup>191</sup> For Smith, the Latin *Britannia* raised largely theoretical questions  
1048 about how scholarship ought to be written and published; for Gale, the risk was more  
1049 immediate, because he must have feared (quite rightly) that the English *Britannia* would leave  
1050 no market for his Latin one.

1051         The non-jurors and those close to them, therefore, were the custodians of the idea of a  
1052 new Latin *Britannia* from the 1690s to the late 1710s. Gibson had to ensure consensus formed  
1053 around the production of an English *Britannia* instead. It appeared at first that Gale might be  
1054 persuaded to contribute his own work to the new English *Britannia*. Soon after Gibson had

1055 formally taken over as editor-in-chief in January of 1694, Nicolson wrote to Gibson to suggest  
1056 that, 'I know no one person in the kingdom better qualified to assist you than Dr. Gale: who,  
1057 no doubt, will not grudge you his friendship'.<sup>192</sup> Gale sent a note to Gibson, at some point in  
1058 1694, to ask his advice on how to interpret the Sutton Brooch; that note is archived among  
1059 Gibson's papers relating to the *Britannia*.<sup>193</sup> But these promising initial signs do not seem to  
1060 have resulted in anything more substantial. Nicolson had already changed his mind about  
1061 Gale's willingness to support Gibson's enterprise by the time he was writing to Thoresby on  
1062 12 Feb 1693. 'It seems there were some', he wrote, 'had thoughts of giving us a new Latin  
1063 edition; and, to that end, had collected a deal of materials, which they do not think fit to  
1064 impart'. To Nicolson, this seemed a betrayal of the collaborative spirit of antiquarianism itself.  
1065 'Ambitious and narrow-spirited private interests', he went on, 'will be always interfering with,  
1066 and spoiling, the public'.<sup>194</sup> Crucial to Gibson's diplomatic efforts to ensure the *Britannia*'s  
1067 acceptance across the scholarly, religious, and political spectrum was his recruitment to the  
1068 project of Samuel Pepys. Although he was a non-juror and friend (or perhaps patron) of  
1069 Smith, Pepys clearly did not share all Smith's scholarly predilections. Pepys's contributions on  
1070 the development of the navy in England were among those which took the *Britannia* furthest  
1071 from its Latinate roots in the study of Roman Britain's antiquities.<sup>195</sup> He also believed in the  
1072 value of a new English *Britannia*. In May 1694, Gibson reported to Charlett that 'I din'd today  
1073 with Mr Pepys', who, Gibson explained, 'stoutly defended the design of an English Camden  
1074 according to our model, against a certain Doctor in company'—who must be Thomas Gale—  
1075 'that insisted upon a Latin one'.<sup>196</sup> Pepys acted as a mediator and promoter of the *Britannia* to  
1076 one of its foremost detractors. Nevertheless, little trust was established between Gibson and  
1077 Gale. By the end of 1694, Gibson was writing to Tanner to say that 'the Doctor' was

1078 'outwardly civil & kind to me', but had 'told his mind to a third person'. 'Tis a way of dealing,  
1079 not soe ingenuous as one would desire', Gibson wrote, 'but I'll endeavour to carry fair for fear  
1080 of a mischief'.<sup>197</sup> In the end, the 1695 *Britannia* was no doubt a lesser work for the lack of  
1081 involvement of one of the leading contemporary medieval scholars, but Gale also did nothing  
1082 significantly to undermine the new English *Britannia*.

1083         This is just one example of the astute diplomacy with which Gibson steered his  
1084 *Britannia* through an antiquarian landscape riven by religious, political, scholarly, and  
1085 personal divisions. In attempting to do so, Gibson perhaps showed the influence of Charlett,  
1086 Oxford's leading Trimmer. Charlett had navigated his own way within the complexities of  
1087 Oxford politics, a place which was often deeply hostile to the Williamite regime, which was,  
1088 in turn, hostile to Oxford in the 1690s.<sup>198</sup> Gibson was eager to make sure that the book  
1089 embraced contributors from a range of religious positions.<sup>199</sup> There was Obadiah Walker, who  
1090 was well-known to have been a Catholic. There was the non-conformist Ralph Thoresby.  
1091 There were non-jurors, too, not only Samuel Pepys, but also Nathaniel Johnston, who worked  
1092 in retirement and impoverishment on Yorkshire antiquities, struggling to compile his  
1093 contributions to the *Britannia*.<sup>200</sup> Another contributor, who sympathized with the non-jurors,  
1094 but was not himself a Jacobite, was the prebendary of the church of Worcester and close  
1095 associate of George Hicke (formerly dean of Worcester), William Hopkins (1647-1700).  
1096 Hopkins, a scholar of Anglo-Saxon, seems to have treated the new *Britannia* with a measure  
1097 of suspicion, insisting when sending his contributions 'that nothing might be altered or  
1098 omitted without my knowledge & consent'.<sup>201</sup> This was likely due to concerns that the  
1099 booksellers' commercial imperatives would lead to crude abbreviation, however, rather than



1100 about the book's religio-political stance. Nevertheless, the roster of thanks in the *Britannia's*  
1101 preface reflects a remarkably broad cross-section of England's antiquaries.

1102         The two most notable historical scholars who did not play any role in the *Britannia*  
1103 came from opposite ends of the political spectrum. One was James Tyrrell (1642-1718),  
1104 whose *General History of England*, which provided historical and intellectual underpinnings  
1105 for the Glorious Revolution, began to emerge not long after the *Britannia*.<sup>202</sup> Tyrrell had  
1106 signalled to John Locke in October 1693 that he was considering providing 'some  
1107 observations' for 'the intended Edition of the *Britannia*', which would have been related to  
1108 'seats of ancient Families, and some natural things'.<sup>203</sup> He seems not to have followed through  
1109 on this. Gibson never mentioned Tyrrell, and was likely unaware of his potential willingness  
1110 to contribute to the *Britannia*. The appearance of his name in the book's preface would have  
1111 tipped its balance more decisively toward those associated with the Revolution. The scholar  
1112 whose absence was the greatest loss to the *Britannia* was George Hickes himself.  
1113 Circumstance must partly have prevented his involvement: Hickes spent much of the 1690s in  
1114 hiding; he was also focussed on ecclesiastical controversy as well as on his own clerical work  
1115 within the non-juring church. It was only in 1699 that formal legal proceedings against him  
1116 were called off, allowing him to settle in London.<sup>204</sup> Hickes was nevertheless frequently  
1117 mentioned in Gibson's correspondence during the preparation of the *Britannia*. Despite the  
1118 immense respect for his scholarship, there was a degree of gentle mockery in Gibson's  
1119 treatment of him. 'I had a note from him this morning', he told Charlett, which was 'writ with  
1120 soe much kindness and affection, as may satisfie me that being an Apostate has not quite  
1121 cashier'd me'.<sup>205</sup> As Richard Harris notes, Gibson 'seems to have found it difficult to take  
1122 seriously Hickes's intensity of opinion on political issues'.<sup>206</sup> Hickes, however, seems to have

1123 been unwilling to lend the *Britannia* project his support. In his several letters to Charlett in  
1124 1694 and 1695, he never mentioned the *Britannia*, despite sending his regards to Gibson on  
1125 occasion.<sup>207</sup> He must have known about the book and Gibson's editorship. Perhaps he saw the  
1126 work as a distraction from more intellectually and ecclesiastically urgent work to which  
1127 Gibson's talents ought to be devoted. In October 1695, he was encouraging Gibson (via a  
1128 letter to Charlett) to continue his editorial work on Sir Henry Spelman by producing a new  
1129 edition of Spelman's *Concilia* (1639), his collection of Anglo-Saxon councils and other  
1130 ecclesiastical documents.<sup>208</sup> Nevertheless, during his work on the *Britannia*, Gibson was  
1131 obviously extremely concerned to remain on good terms with the man who had mentored him  
1132 as he prepared his edition of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle. After he feared he may have  
1133 offended Hickes, he was pleased when 'Captain Hatton did me the honour to call at my  
1134 Chamber, and assure me I have still a share in the Dean's affections'.<sup>209</sup> That Hickes was  
1135 absent from the *Britannia*, however, shows how the political and religious tumult of the 1690s  
1136 set limitations on the era's scholarship.

1137 Gibson took several important decisions about the book's content which helped to  
1138 minimize possibilities for controversy. The first of these was taken very early in the period of  
1139 Gibson's general editorship of the *Britannia*: it must have been one of the first major decisions  
1140 he made. In January 1694, Gibson wrote to Tanner to explain that he had hit upon a  
1141 'contrivance', which would both help his friend, but also, surely, the *Britannia* too. He  
1142 explained that he had decided 'the accurate search after Monasteries throughout Camden, I  
1143 will industriously decline'. '[M]y reason for it in the Preface shall be this', he explained, 'that  
1144 your labour upon that subject has superseded all enquiries of that nature'.<sup>210</sup> He did indeed  
1145 decide to point the reader, in the preface, towards Tanner's forthcoming *Notitia Monastica*, 'an

1146 excellent *Manual*' of everything to do with the country's religious houses.<sup>211</sup> In doing so, he  
1147 helped not only to save time, but also to steer the book clear of the controversial waters of  
1148 ecclesiastical history. Gibson was well aware that antiquarianism (especially the study of  
1149 Anglo-Saxon) could be used to bolster the authority of the Church of England. In 1705, we  
1150 find him reminding an anonymous correspondent of what 'great service to the Church' might  
1151 be done by preparing a 'little Treatise' in Latin illuminating 'our Saxon-Records' for 'foreign  
1152 Churches (Protestant and Popish)'.<sup>212</sup> In taking this decision to omit ecclesiastical foundations  
1153 from the *Britannia*, then, he fundamentally changed the character of the book. He additionally  
1154 steered it away from the study of medieval manuscripts and other kinds of written documents,  
1155 which were the fundamentals of seventeenth-century British antiquarianism, towards both  
1156 ancient artefacts, on the one hand, and more modern history on the other.

1157         Secondly, Gibson took care over how he presented Camden's own religio-political  
1158 commitments in his prefatory biography, 'The Life of Mr Camden'. Although Gibson  
1159 incorporated details from Anthony Wood's life of Camden in the *Athenae Oxonienses*, the  
1160 majority of his biography is a free translation of Thomas Smith's Latin 'Vita Camdeni', which  
1161 Smith had prefixed to his edition of Camden's correspondence.<sup>213</sup> He does occasionally  
1162 acknowledge Smith for a specific point, but the general reader would not know that the  
1163 substantial part of the biography is a translation. Into Smith's biography Gibson wove three  
1164 substantial additions of his own. One of these is an extended account of the history of  
1165 antiquarian scholarship in Europe and Britain, which offered intellectual background to  
1166 Camden's *Britannia*.<sup>214</sup> The second is an account from Henry Spelman of the Elizabethan  
1167 Society of Antiquaries and its failure under James I.<sup>215</sup> He also printed three letters from  
1168 Thomas James, Bodley's librarian, to Camden, which Smith had not included in his edition,

1169 but which, according to Gibson, 'we cannot doubt, but if these had come to hand, the excellent  
1170 Editor of his *Epistles* would have allow'd them a place among the rest'.<sup>216</sup> Tanner had pointed  
1171 out these letters (which were in the Bodleian Library) to Gibson, who was very pleased with  
1172 them. 'I doe not remember, that either by the Life or Letters publisht by Dr Smith, it appears  
1173 the he had the least correspondence with Dr James', Gibson noted. 'And yet', he went on, 'one  
1174 would wonder how Mr Camden should almost live without having constant intelligence out of  
1175 the Bodleian Library'.<sup>217</sup> Here, Gibson perhaps showed the limitations of his knowledge of the  
1176 genesis of the *Britannia* or of the Bodleian's history, since the *Britannia* was substantially  
1177 complete by the time the Bodleian was founded. Most striking, however, in Gibson's 'Life of  
1178 Mr. Camden' are not his additions to, but his omissions from, Smith's 'Vita'. For Smith,  
1179 Camden was the ideal scholar, not only in his scholarship, but also in the way he adhered to  
1180 his religio-political principles. Smith's Latin biography draws implicit parallels between  
1181 Camden and Smith himself as a non-juror. For instance, Smith gave a contemporary inflection  
1182 to the story of young Camden's rejection from a fellowship at All Souls College by the  
1183 Catholic party there. 'All academics and the remainder of the Clergy', Smith wrote, 'had sworn  
1184 an oath to practice the sacred rites and subscribe to the Articles of the Reformed Church of  
1185 England under penalty of removal of their fellowship'. But, he went on to explain, while 'they  
1186 had offered conformity, in their hearts they retained a love of the original superstitions'. 'We  
1187 ought not to marvel that Ardelios of that sort are able to hide in the University', Smith  
1188 concluded, pointedly, 'who preferred to betray their conscience than to lose their fortune'.<sup>218</sup>  
1189 Smith had published the 'Vita Camdeni' just as he refused to swear the Oaths of Allegiance  
1190 and was deprived of his fellowship at Magdalen College, Oxford. Like Camden, he would not  
1191 tolerate the empty mouthing of oaths in the university. The significance of these passages

1192 must have been obvious to Gibson, who did not translate them. While Gibson's presentation  
1193 of Camden's religion (including note of his 'zeal against Popery') remained closely based on  
1194 Smith's 'Vita', Gibson neutered the biography's contemporary resonances.

1195 Gibson was, finally, at pains to choose the book's dedicatee as carefully as possible, in  
1196 order not to offend any side. Gibson described his and the booksellers' deliberations to  
1197 Charlett, noting that 'the subject requires a publick Patron: and the only person we can think  
1198 of is my Lord Keeper', John Somers (1651-1716). He is 'a scholar himself, a Lover of  
1199 learning, a generous man, one that has a very fair character, and is (what my Lord Burghley  
1200 Mr Camden's Patron was) Prime-Minister o' State'.<sup>219</sup> The parallel with Camden is especially  
1201 important here: Camden provided a complete example of an antiquarian scholar, right down  
1202 to his relationship to the worlds of politics and patronage. But Somers was also clearly a  
1203 candidate because, despite being so intimately associated with William III's government, he  
1204 was also acceptable to oppositional figures. In another letter, Gibson hinted darkly that 'Mr P-  
1205 --ys, the Captain, Dean &c. will not endure' a dedication that looks too partisan: these names  
1206 lightly conceal Pepys, Captain Charles Hatton, George Hickes, and the 'etc.' presumably  
1207 encompasses other non-jurors. 'For tho' my Lord [Keeper] acts with a great deal of evenness  
1208 and temper', he went on, 'yet you know a bare compliance will be objected enough with them'.  
1209 Quite what Gibson is exactly saying here is obscure, but it is clear that he was worried that  
1210 this group would seize any opportunity to take offence, and so the dedicatee needed to be  
1211 rigorously justified. He fell back, finally, on the essential, irrefutable parallel with Camden:  
1212 'Mr Camden dedicated the first Edition to my Lord Burghleigh'.<sup>220</sup> Somers was certainly a  
1213 man able to negotiate complex religio-political commitments: even while he fulfilled the  
1214 highest offices of state, he remained 'friendly with George Hickes'.<sup>221</sup> Indeed, it was Somers

1215 who would call a halt to the legal action against Hickes in May 1699.<sup>222</sup> He was thus an ideal  
1216 choice, who enabled the *Britannia*, simultaneously, to offer a show of loyalty to the new  
1217 regime on the part of Oxford's scholars, and at the same time not to provoke the ire of those  
1218 who had been opposed to the new *Britannia* or, at the very least, had taken little part in it.

1219         However, little could have stopped the reactions to the new *Britannia* breaking down  
1220 along partisan lines. Although Smith initially warmed ever so slightly to the notion of the new  
1221 *Britannia* on hearing that Gibson was to take over the general editorship (calling him 'a fitter  
1222 person to be employed in that work, than Mr Harrington'), he was left fuming at the  
1223 substantial incorporation of the translation of his 'Vita Camdeni'.<sup>223</sup> At the end of 1695, Smith  
1224 was writing to Robert Cotton's grandson, Philip Cotton, about the Latin life of his grandfather  
1225 he was printing, which would be prefixed to his history of the Cotton Library.<sup>224</sup> Smith felt he  
1226 ought to translate this life into English, 'least some disingenuous man or other' should 'borrow  
1227 all the historical notices & disguise the whole with meere flourish, without the addition of  
1228 new matter, as has been done to the life of Mr Camden, prefixt to the new edition of his  
1229 *Britannia* in English'.<sup>225</sup> Smith's fellow non-juror Thomas Hearne also found little to admire in  
1230 the book, just as he found little to admire in almost every other publication of the period that  
1231 was not primarily written by a non-juror. In 1706, he recalled in an account of Edmund  
1232 Gibson's life in his *Diary* that 'when some Roguish Booksellers had a Design to cheat the  
1233 World, with a new Edition of Camden's *Britannia* in English', Gibson was put in charge.  
1234 Nevertheless, 'excepting what the Learned Mr Lhuyd of the Ashmolean Museum did', 'there  
1235 was 'nothing of any great moment appearing throughout the whole book'.<sup>226</sup> Lhwyd was a  
1236 scholar so clearly admirable that he was often exempted from the scorn of Hearne and other  
1237 non-jurors. In the sixth volume of his edition of Leland's *Itinerary*, Hearne printed a 16-page

1238 letter by another non-juror, Francis Brokesby (1637-1714). In this letter, Brokesby offered all  
1239 manner of politely but firmly worded criticisms of Gibson's *Britannia*, ranging from details of  
1240 the etymologies of river names to the description of Liverpool and the accuracy of Morden's  
1241 maps. 'These few things I instance in,' Brokesby concluded, 'that if ever there should be a new  
1242 Edition of the *Britannia*, greater care should be taken herein, and due Information procur'd  
1243 from judicious and observing Persons'. Brokesby, interestingly enough, also exempted Lhwyd  
1244 from criticism, and indeed he was left wishing that Gibson 'had had as diligent, accurate and  
1245 faithful Informers of things in other Parts of *England*, as he had in *Wales* from your learned  
1246 Friend, who was fitted for such a Performance'.<sup>227</sup> But the most far-reaching attack on the  
1247 book came from another Jacobite, Francis Atterbury (1663-1732), who took exception to  
1248 some of William Nicolson's 'Additions' to the county of Northumberland, especially his  
1249 comments on the Anglo-Saxon Synod of Twyford, which seemed to imply the separation of  
1250 England's parliament and its ecclesiastical synod.<sup>228</sup> Nicolson's additions to this county are an  
1251 interesting moment at which Gibson let something rather more potentially politically and  
1252 religiously controversial into the book: Nicolson also cited *The History of the Reformation* by  
1253 Gilbert Burnet (1643-1715), a figure of loathing for non-juring scholars. That for all Gibson's  
1254 diplomacy the *Britannia* could not but still appear unsatisfactorily Whiggish was a testament  
1255 to the divisions within 1690s historical culture.

1256

## 1257 **Conclusions**

1258

1259 The process of revising Camden's *Britannia* in the middle of the 1690s offers much insight  
1260 into the nature and practice of antiquarianism in late seventeenth-century Britain. Unlike some

1261 other more specialized forms of scholarship, antiquarianism had left the confines of university  
1262 presses to be taken up by the commercial book-trade. It was something done by a huge variety  
1263 of figures, from gentleman amateurs (who might have their own family traditions of  
1264 antiquarianism to draw upon) to clergymen to university scholars, all of whom had their own  
1265 different relationships to the body of established antiquarian knowledge. Its methodological  
1266 priorities were driven by the particular historical periods that were the subject of  
1267 investigation. Antiquarianism had a rich sense of its own national traditions, but differences  
1268 emerged in how scholars interpreted and continued those traditions. Many contemporary  
1269 antiquaries were willing, literally, to write their own contributions into the margins and  
1270 interleaved pages of the greatest achievement of that tradition, Camden's *Britannia*. Others  
1271 saw that work as having greater canonical fixity to it. Antiquaries were divided by passionate  
1272 religio-political commitments brought about by the Glorious Revolution, but such  
1273 commitments were often inflected as much by personal animosities, ambitions, and rivalries,  
1274 as they were by ideology. Camden was a far-reaching model for what antiquaries might be  
1275 and do, suggesting everything from their scholarly remits to their relationship to church and  
1276 state. As such, it was no surprise that antiquaries' divisions found expression in their  
1277 approaches to a scholar at once so monumental, and yet whose legacy was the topic of such  
1278 debate. Gibson navigated all this with considerable social tact. He also benefited from the fact  
1279 that he was preparing a work of antiquarianism and *not* history. For many commentators, the  
1280 separation between antiquarianism and history shows antiquaries' failure to become  
1281 historians. For Levine, none of the 'contributors to the *Britannia*' had managed to show how  
1282 'antiquities might be used for historical purposes'.<sup>229</sup> The quickness with which Atterbury  
1283 drew out the implications of Nicolson's 'Additions' to Northumberland suggests that readers



1284 were all *too* ready to link antiquities to great historical narratives. When they were expanding  
1285 *Britannia*, antiquaries were not so much failing to write history as choosing not to do so. As  
1286 such, the 1690s *Britannia* could at least attempt to cut across the divisions of 1690s culture.

1287         Indeed, in spite of factionalism, Gibson's book had the effect of joining many  
1288 antiquaries from around the country into a community. This is how Ralph Thoresby described  
1289 the effect of his participation in the *Britannia* project on him personally when he wrote his  
1290 autobiography. His involvement became 'the happy occasion of making him known to many  
1291 learned and great men, which has since been of use to me and my poor family, particularly  
1292 Dr. Gibson, (now Bishop of London,) Dr Nicholson, Bishop of Carlisle, Dean Gale, of York,  
1293 and Dr Hickes, the non-juring Bishop-Suffragan of Thetford'.<sup>230</sup> Despite the fact that these  
1294 two latter scholars were not even involved in the *Britannia*, the work offered an entrée into  
1295 the whole world of antiquarianism. For Edward Lhwyd, the *Britannia* had the effect of  
1296 focussing his attention on the history of Wales and the Celtic regions, and began the process  
1297 of drawing together the correspondents and fellow researchers in this field who would support  
1298 his work until Lhwyd's early death in 1709. As the *Britannia* was gradually completed over  
1299 the course of 1694, many of the leading scholars involved became engaged in a new  
1300 communal antiquarian endeavour (one inevitably fraught with many of the same religio-  
1301 political divisions as *Britannia*): to produce the union catalogue of British manuscripts that  
1302 became known as 'Bernard's Catalogue', and was published in 1697.<sup>231</sup> As Charlett acted as  
1303 the great 'promoter' of both the *Britannia* and the catalogue, the correspondence network  
1304 which had formed to support the *Britannia* was able seamlessly to underpin the new  
1305 manuscript catalogue, too. Just as the proposals for the new *Britannia* had galvanized

1306 antiquarian scholarship across Britain, so, too, the *Britannia* itself continued to inspire new  
1307 scholarship.

1308           More than anything else, the great speed with which the *Britannia* was edited set the  
1309 edition's parameters. While some new work clearly went into it (as we have seen in the case  
1310 of Tanner and Lhwyd, for instance), the project was essentially a vast effort of *collecting* what  
1311 was already available. This could take the form of antiquarian histories that had been written  
1312 since Camden's lifetime, notes that scholars had been compiling over years, materials that had  
1313 lain in the possession of individual families, or snapshots of the antiquarian news circulating  
1314 in Britain. This tendency towards compilation is clear in the book's treatment of Anglo-Saxon  
1315 numismatics, where Obadiah Walker was prevailed upon to recycle materials from his printed  
1316 description of Anglo-Saxon coins, which were then in turn supplemented by coins already  
1317 described in print (Plot's *Natural History of Oxfordshire*) and by a small number of new coins  
1318 which were sent to Walker by Ralph Thoresby.<sup>232</sup> In its combination of John Ray's work on  
1319 natural history with accounts of antiquities, its emphasis on descriptions of new  
1320 archaeological discoveries, its mingling of ancient history with contemporary accounts of the  
1321 'present state' of the nation, the *Britannia* showed the diversity of kinds of knowledge which  
1322 might come under the heading of antiquarianism in the late seventeenth century. Camden's  
1323 original *Britannia*, as we have seen, was always a capacious model for scholars to follow.  
1324 Many continuities can be perceived between the approach of Camden himself and that of the  
1325 'Additions': tracing etymologies of place names, for instance, remained a central practice in  
1326 both editions. Despite the continuities, however, the new *Britannia* became even more  
1327 heterogeneous than the old. Gibson succeeded in containing all these practices in a single  
1328 volume, but he was working on the brink of a time in which accounts of a region's

1329 contemporary economy would not necessarily be contained in the same volume as accounts of  
1330 its prehistoric artefacts or Anglo-Saxon administrative divisions.

1331           It is also worth emphasizing what the *Britannia* did *not* have in it. It lacked the kind of  
1332 profound original scholarship on medieval manuscripts which constituted the cutting-edge of  
1333 British antiquarianism in this period. This was the work in which George Hickes and  
1334 Humphrey Wanley were engaged. Its absence from the *Britannia* left plenty of space for their  
1335 *Thesaurus Linguarum Septentrionalium* (1705), with its combination of history of the Anglo-  
1336 Saxon language, accounts of authentic and fake charters, and Wanley's great catalogue of  
1337 Anglo-Saxon manuscripts. The form of Hickes and Wanley's work—lengthy, learned  
1338 disquisitions about the study of charters, and a manuscript catalogue, respectively—gave  
1339 opportunity for in-depth studies of particular *documents*, which the *Britannia*'s structural  
1340 focus on places did not permit. The *Britannia* was also a book more or less exclusively  
1341 produced by men. If it had been published twenty years later, this might not have been so.  
1342 While seventeenth-century aristocratic women like Anne Clifford (1590-1676) were certainly  
1343 engaged readers of antiquarian texts and co-ordinated family history projects that drew  
1344 extensively on antiquarian research, women in seventeenth-century Britain were not yet  
1345 engaged in publishing antiquarian scholarship in their own right.<sup>233</sup> This would all change in  
1346 1709, with the publication by Elizabeth Elstob (1683-1756) of Aelfric's Anglo-Saxon life of  
1347 Pope Gregory the Great.<sup>234</sup> Ultimately, though, Gibson's *Britannia*, published in revised form  
1348 in 1722, became the standard *Britannia* of the eighteenth century. It also remained the  
1349 touchstone which each generation of antiquarians needed to revise and to which they needed  
1350 to respond: the leading British antiquary and collector of the late eighteenth-century, Richard  
1351 Gough (1735-1809), produced a new edition in 1789, and the leading expert on Roman

1352 Britain in the early twentieth century, Francis J. Haverfield (1860-1919), was 'still collecting  
1353 the material for a new *Britannia*'.<sup>235</sup> Gibson's achievement was to ensure that the book  
1354 remained the antiquarian work which summed up the particular qualities, culture, strengths,  
1355 and limitations, of each generation's antiquarian scholarship.

---

<sup>1</sup> For Gibson's biography, with a particular focus on his ecclesiastical career, see *Edmund Gibson, Bishop of London, 1669-1748: a Study in Politics and Religion in the Eighteenth Century* (London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press, 1926). For conversations on this topic or comments on this article, I am grateful to Sophie Butler, Mordechai Feingold, Jack Humphrey, and William Rossiter, as well as two anonymous peer reviewers for this journal.

<sup>2</sup> The best account of Camden's *Britannia*'s intellectual genesis remains F. J. Levy, 'The Making of Camden's *Britannia*', *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance* 26 (1964), 70-97.

<sup>3</sup> Oliver D. Harris, 'William Camden, Philemon Holland and the 1610 Translation of *Britannia*', *The Antiquaries Journal* 95 (2015), 279-303.

<sup>4</sup> On Swale see H. R. Plomer, *A Dictionary of the Booksellers and Printers who Were at Work in England and Ireland from 1641 to 1667* (London, 1907), 174. On the Churchills see H. R. Plomer, *A Dictionary of the Printers and Booksellers Who Were at Work in England, Scotland and Ireland from 1668 to 1725* (London, 1922), 69-70.

<sup>5</sup> On Charlett's correspondence and the range of reactions he provoked among Oxford's antiquaries see Stanley George Gillam, 'The Correspondence of Arthur Charlett (Master of University College, 1692-1722) in its Antiquarian and Historical Aspects' (B. Litt. Thesis, Oxford, 1949).

<sup>6</sup> MS Ballard 5, fol. 23r: letter of Gibson to Charlett, 31 March 1694. All manuscripts cited are in the Bodleian Library, Oxford, unless otherwise noted, and are transcribed semi-diplomatically.

<sup>7</sup> Kelsey Jackson Williams, *The Antiquary: John Aubrey's Historical Scholarship* (Oxford, 2016), 3-4.

<sup>8</sup> The foundational work here is Arnaldo Momigliano, 'Ancient History and the Antiquarian', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 13 (1950), 285-315, although the article, which is concerned specifically with the division between classical antiquities and history, cannot be straightforwardly applied to the example of British history.

<sup>9</sup> Stuart Piggott, 'William Camden and the *Britannia*', in *Ruins in a Landscape: Essays in Antiquarianism* (Edinburgh, 1976), 45.

<sup>10</sup> Joseph M. Levine, *The Battle of the Books: History and Literature in the Augustan Age* (Ithaca, 1991), 327-336, quotation at 327.

<sup>11</sup> 'Oxford and London were still the vital centres of antiquarian study, but now there were reputable antiquaries in every shire, communicating with one another, and bringing their notes, discourses and observations to the press, certain now that a sufficient audience existed for their works', in Parry, *Trophies*, 357.

<sup>12</sup> The quotation is from *The New Canting Dictionary of the Canting Crew* (1699), and is quoted in Stuart Piggott, 'Antiquarian Studies', in *The History of the University of Oxford: Volume 5: The Eighteenth Century*, eds L.S. Sutherland and L.G. Mitchell (Oxford, 1986), 757-777, at 757. For Levine's account of historiography in this period, see *Battle*, 267-413.

<sup>13</sup> Robert Mayhew, 'Edmund Gibson's Editions of *Britannia*: Dynastic Chorography and the Particularist Politics of Precedent, 1695-1722', *Institute of Historical Research* 73 (2000), 239-261, 251.

<sup>14</sup> John Leland, *De uiris illustribus = On famous men*, ed. James P. Carley, trans. Caroline Brett (Toronto, 2010), lxi, liii.

<sup>15</sup> William Lambarde, *A Perambulation of Kent* (London, 1576), ¶¶v.

<sup>16</sup> 'Abraham Ortelius the worthy restorer of Ancient Geographie arriuing here in England, aboute thirty foure yeares past, dealt earnestly with me that I would illustrate this Ile of Britaine, or (as he said) that I would restore antiquity to Britaine, and Britaine to his antiquity' ('The Author to the Reader', in William Camden, *Britain*, trans. Philemon Holland (London, 1610). A selection of the letters between Camden and Ortelius were published in Thomas Smith, ed. *V. Cl. Gulielmi Camdeni, et Illustrium Virorum ad G. Camdenum Epistolae* (London, 1691).

---

<sup>17</sup> Henry Spelman, *Concilia, Decreta, Leges, Constitutiones In Re Ecclesiarum Orbis Britannici*, ed. William Dugdale (London, 1664); Henry Spelman, *Reliquiae Spelmannianae. The Posthumous Works of Sir Henry Spelman Kt.*, ed. Edmund Gibson (Oxford, 1698).

<sup>18</sup> William Somner, *A Treatise of the Roman Ports and Forts in Kent* (Oxford, 1693).

<sup>19</sup> John Leland, *Joannis Lelandi Antiquari De Rebus Britannicis Collectanea* (London, 1715). For the history of Leland's papers, see Oliver Harris, "'Motheaten, mouldye and rotten': the early custodial history and dissemination of John Leland's manuscript remains", *Bodleian Library Record* 5 (2005), 460-501.

<sup>20</sup> On the rise of *historia literaria* in England, see Kelsey Jackson Williams, 'Canon before Canon, Literature before Literature: Thomas Pope and the Scope of Early Modern Learning', *Huntington Library Quarterly* 77 (2014), 177-199 and Alexander Wright, 'William Cave (1637-1713) and the Fortunes of *Historia Literaria* in England' (Ph.D. Diss., University of Cambridge, 2018).

<sup>21</sup> The best account of the narrative of the composition of the *Britannia* can be found in Gwyn Walters and Frank Emery, 'Edward Lhuyd, Edmund Gibson, and the printing of Camden's *Britannia*, 1695', *The Library* 32 (1977), 109-137 and in Levine, *Battle of the Books*, 327-336. Letters quoted in this article (especially those in MS Ballard 5 and MS Tanner 25) are often quoted in these essays.

<sup>22</sup> Letter of John Ray to Tankred Robinson, n.d., in *The Correspondence of John Ray*, ed. E. Lankester, Ray Society, 14 (1848), 273-274, 273. Letter of William Nicolson to Thoresby, 25 Jan. 1693/4, in *Letters of Eminent Men Addressed to Ralph Thoresby, F.R.S.*, ed. Joseph Hunter, 2 vols (London, 1832), 1: 124.

<sup>23</sup> The best overview of the Oxford Saxonists is David Fairer, 'Anglo-Saxon Studies', in *University of Oxford*, eds Sutherland and Mitchell, 807-829. More recently on seventeenth-century Anglo-Saxon studies, see John D. Niles, *The Idea of Anglo-Saxon England 1066-1901* (Chichester, 2015), 109-146.

<sup>24</sup> British Library [BL] MS Harley 441: Gibson's note in the flyleaf records that 'This copy was transcribed in the Bodleian Library in 1688' ('Scriptum erat hoc Apographum in Bibl. Bodl. An. D. MDCLXXXVIII'). The original is MS Junius 121. Hickes's notes can be found on e.g. fol. 60v and fol. 61v.

<sup>25</sup> See MS Add. C. 217, fol. 68r: letter of John Mill to William Nicolson, 10 Oct. 1686: 'I should have been glad to have found you warmer in the Concern of the Saxon Chronicle: You are capable of doing your self a great deal of right, without any manner of trouble. 'tis barely the translateing of that part of it unprinted in Wheelock. As to Notes and references 'tis no matter. And if any thing of that kind be judg'd necessary, do but finish the translacion; and leave the rest to me here'.

<sup>26</sup> Angelika Lutz, 'The Study of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle in the Seventeenth Century and the Establishment of Old English Studies in the Universities', in *The Recovery of Old English: Anglo-Saxon Studies in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, ed. Timothy Graham (Kalamazoo, Mich., 2000), 1-82, esp. 60-64. Copies of Gibson's *Chronicon Saxonicum* which belonged to scholars involved in editing the 1695 *Britannia* include that of Edward Lhwyd (with some annotations in what is likely to be his hand) preserved in the library of Blickling Estate in Norfolk (National Trust), inscribed on the title page 'E Libris Edw: Lhuyd. A.M. It passed, presumably after Lhwyd's death, to the Lincolnshire antiquary William Pownall, and from him to Sir Richard Ellys (1688?-1742), the owner of the collection now at Blickling Hall.

<sup>27</sup> For the surely correct insight that Swale originally acted as sole publisher of the project, see Walters and Emery, 'Edward Lhuyd', 111.

<sup>28</sup> Throughout this essay, transcriptions of Edward Lhwyd letters are by Brynley F. Roberts, Richard Sharpe, Helen Watt, et al., eds 'The Correspondence of Edward Lhwyd', in *Early Modern Letters Online*, Cultures of Knowledge, <http://emlo-portal.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/collections/?catalogue=edward-lhwyd>, accessed 23 April 2020. MS Ashmole 1815, fol. 77: letter of Edmund Gibson to Edward Lhwyd, 15 April 1693, transcription by Brynley F. Roberts and Helen Watt, in *Early Modern Letters Online*, Cultures of Knowledge, <https://databank.ora.ox.ac.uk/emlo/datasets/lhwyd-transcripts/1693-04-15%20Gibson%20Ashm%201815%20F77.pdf>, accessed 23 April 2020.

<sup>29</sup> Thoresby, *Letters*, 1: 137: letter of Nicolson to Thoresby, 23 June 1693.

<sup>30</sup> MS Eng. b. 2043, fols 398-399, letter of Thomas Machell to John Houghton, 3 Aug. 1693. Machell asks his correspondent to 'tell Mr Swale (the undertaker of Camdens Britannia) that (upon the request of <Dr Mill> Mr Gibson of Q. Colledge in Oxon & Yours), I intend to Assist him in relacion to Westmoreland'. Machell goes on to outline his plans, '[a]ll which are agreeable to the design which Mr Gibson sent me from Oxford'. However, he has not received 'Camdens Westmorland of the last Edition which hee published in his life time & Hollands translation of the same, both which Mr Gibson promised long since to send me down'. If Gibson had promised them 'long since' in August 1693, it seems possible that he had written to Machell in early summer of 1693.

<sup>31</sup> MS Tanner 25, fol. 78r: letter of Gibson to Tanner, 18 Aug. 1693.

- <sup>32</sup> For Harrington and his possible support of the University Press see Matthew Kilburn, 'The Fell Legacy 1686-1755', in *The History of Oxford University Press: Volume 1: Beginnings to 1780*, ed. Ian Gadd (Oxford, 2013), 107-137, 112-113.
- <sup>33</sup> National Library of Wales [NLW] MS Peniarth 427, fol. 93: letter of Edward Lhwyd to John Lloyd, early February 1693/4, transcription by Helen Watt and Brynley Roberts, in *Early Modern Letters Online*, Cultures of Knowledge, <https://databank.ora.ox.ac.uk/emlo/datasets/lhwyd-transcripts/1694-00-00%20EL%20to%20John%20Lloyd%20Pen%20427%20F93%20AC%201861%20132-3.pdf>, accessed 23 April 2020.
- <sup>34</sup> MS Eng. b. 2043, fol. 305r: letter of George Morley to James Harrington, 13 Sept. 1693.
- <sup>35</sup> Compare e.g. MS Smith 50, p.165: John Hudson letter to Thomas Smith, 27 Aug. 1708: 'Mr Hearn, being a little too hasty in sending the sheets to the carrier: they came without my last hand to them'.
- <sup>36</sup> MS Tanner 27, fols 216-217: letter of James Harrington to Anthony Wood, 22 Oct. 1690.
- <sup>37</sup> Anthony Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses*, 2 vols (Oxford, 1691), 1.a1v.
- <sup>38</sup> Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses*, 2.A1v.
- <sup>39</sup> MS Ballard 5, fol. 85r: letter of Gibson to Charlett, 10 Jan. 1694/5
- <sup>40</sup> See Camden's draft letter to Ortelius: BL Add. MS 36294, fol. 12r.
- <sup>41</sup> William Howell, *Medulla historiae Anglicanae. Being a comprehensive history of the lives and reigns of the monarchs of England* (London, 1679). The English Short Title Catalogue records three subsequent editions, with printings and reprintings for Swale in 1681, 1683, 1687, and 1694.
- <sup>42</sup> Matthew Paris, *Matthaei Paris monachi Albanensis Angli, historia major. Juxta exemplar Londinense 1640. verbatim recusa* (London, 1686).
- <sup>43</sup> TNA SP/343, fol. 307, n.d.
- <sup>44</sup> MS Ashmole 1816, fols 167-168: letter of Lister to Lhwyd, shortly before 15 Aug. 1693, transcription by Helen Watt and Brynley Roberts, in *Early Modern Letters Online*, Cultures of Knowledge, <https://databank.ora.ox.ac.uk/emlo/datasets/lhwyd-transcripts/1693-08-00%20Lister%20Goulding%20348-9%20A%201816%20F167.pdf>, accessed 23 April 2020.
- <sup>45</sup> NLW MS Peniarth 427, fols 17-20: letter of Edward Lhwyd to John Lloyd, 10 Oct. 1693, transcription by Helen Watt and Brynley Roberts, in *Early Modern Letters Online*, Cultures of Knowledge, <https://databank.ora.ox.ac.uk/emlo/datasets/lhwyd-transcripts/1693-10-10%20EL%20to%20John%20Lloyd%20Pen%20427%20F17%20G%2075.pdf>, accessed 23 April 2020.
- <sup>46</sup> Laurence Worms, 'Morden, Robert (d.1703)', *ODNB*, online edn.
- <sup>47</sup> See the 'New Proposals for Printing by Subscription, Cambdens Britannia, English', dated 20 April 1693: Wood 658, fol. 816r. On Morden's maps see R. A. Skelton, *County Atlases of the British Isles, 1579-1850: A Bibliography*, Part I: 1579-1703 (London, 1970), 191-198.
- <sup>48</sup> See Levine, *Battle*, 305-306.
- <sup>49</sup> Bodl. I 2.2 Med. Thanks are due to Jack Humphrey for drawing my attention to this document, which is cited in Harris, 'Holland', 293.
- <sup>50</sup> At this stage, it seems likely that the 'additions' to each county were envisaged to be added as footnotes, rather than endnotes to the county as a whole.
- <sup>51</sup> MS Ballard 5, fol. 13.
- <sup>52</sup> Though for an important exception see Harris, 'Holland', 292: '[Gibson] was sensitive to matters of style: early in 1694, one of his conditions for accepting the editorship of the new edition [...] was that the translations made so far, which he found "harsh and uneven", should be abandoned'.
- <sup>53</sup> MS Tanner 25, fol. 114r-v: letter of Gibson to Tanner, 25 Jan. 1693/4.
- <sup>54</sup> Cardiff Central Library MS 4.172 (Lhwyd's translations of Wales, with his additions). On Gibson's editorial changes to Lhwyd's additions see Emery and Walters, 'Edward Lhuyd', 117-122.
- <sup>55</sup> MS Top. Wilts. e. 4. On this manuscript, which is incorrectly identified in the Bodleian Summary Catalogue as a manuscript of Tanner's additions to the *Britannia* (rather than his translation of Camden), see M.J. Sommerlad, 'The Historical and Antiquarian Interests of Thomas Tanner' (Ph.D. Diss, University of Oxford, 1962), 119.
- <sup>56</sup> MS Ballard 5, fol. 44: letter of Gibson to Charlett, 4 June 1694; MS Tanner 25, fol. 218r: letter of Gibson to Tanner, 1 Sept. 1694.
- <sup>57</sup> MS Ballard 5, fol. 27: Gibson to Charlett, 9 April 1694.
- <sup>58</sup> MS Eng. b. 2042, fols 189r-269a.
- <sup>59</sup> William Camden, *Camden's Britannia, Newly Translated into English: with Large Additions and Improvements*, ed. Edmund Gibson (London, 1695), a2r. On Salkeld see Joseph Foster, *Alumni Oxonienses: The Members of the University of Oxford, 1500-1714*, 4 vols (Oxford: Parker, 1891-1892), 4: 1302.

---

<sup>60</sup> MS Eng. b. 2042, fol. iiii: this is Gibson's list of the English counties (along with Wales), with a letter 'T' beside each of them, followed by their translator. The name 'Salkeld' appears here by all the counties mentioned. As Nicolson was the rector of Salkeld near Penrith, it is worth asking whether 'Salkeld' could have been a way of referring to him; however, we can rule out this possibility, as Gibson specifically attributes the translation of Northumberland to 'Nicholson'. That Salkeld was a member of the Inns of Court is hinted by a letter from Gibson to Tanner, which closes with Gibson's polite notice that 'Mr Worsley and Mr Salkeld are very much at your service' (MS Tanner 25, fol. 251v, 21 Oct. 1694), as though they were associated together as a pair. Worsley was a member of Lincoln's Inn who provided additions to Hampshire and translated that county.

<sup>61</sup> Camden, *Britannia*, ed. Gibson, a2r.

<sup>62</sup> For the list of contributors to the 'Additions' of the *Britannia* see Camden, *Britannia*, A2v-a1r.

<sup>63</sup> For instance, Tanner's submitted materials took the form of two long letters (dated 10 and 12 April 1694) and a further booklet, all of which Gibson turned into notes attached to particular passages of Camden's text (see MS Eng. b. 2043, fols 401r-422r). Nicolson's autograph tidily-organised booklet of material on Northumberland (with his additions as footnotes) can be found in MS Eng. b. 2043, fols 131r-164r.

<sup>64</sup> As Mayhew writes, 'Gibson's hand was dominant in the *Britannia*' ('Edmund Gibson's Editions of *Britannia*', 242).

<sup>65</sup> MS Eng. b. 2042-2043. These papers' former shelf-mark was Dep c.225-226, which is how Levine refers to them (*Battle of the Books*, 329-330). They are essentially papers which belonged to Gibson's descendants. For their complex custodial history and index to their contents, see the finding aid prepared by Ruth Burchnell, 'Archive of Edmund Gibson, Bishop of London, and his descendants', Bodleian Library, <https://archives.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/repositories/2/resources/3215>, accessed 23 April 2020.

<sup>66</sup> MS Eng. b. 2042, fols 375r-377v: letters from ?Nathaniel Friend, dated 31 Oct 1673, and addressed 'For his very good freind Mr Gregory King At the house of John Ogilby Esqr in the White-Fryers London'.

<sup>67</sup> Wood MS 658, fol. 816r.

<sup>68</sup> MS Eng. b. 2043, fol. 110r: letter of Edward Barnes to Timothy Child, 20 Oct. 1693. Child was another bookseller who worked with Swale: he clearly helped to disseminate the proposals for the new *Britannia*, and received letters in response (e.g. a letter from Philip Cotton, Robert Cotton's grandson, about the history of Huntingdonshire). Barnes's letter is cited in Levine, *Battle of the Books*, 331.

<sup>69</sup> MS Eng. b. 2042, fol. 155r: letter of John Moore to Jonathan Trelawny, n.d.

<sup>70</sup> MS Tanner 25, fol. 117v: draft letter of Tanner to Gibson, n.d.

<sup>71</sup> Compare Rosemary Sweet, *Antiquaries: The Discovery of the Past in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (London and New York, 2004), 160: 'The process of correcting and updating Camden's original text gave those already interested in antiquarian matters a purpose and a goal towards which to direct their researches and accelerated the process by which networks of correspondence between antiquaries were established, as individuals engaged on a common project exchanged information, advice and materials'.

<sup>72</sup> Elizabeth Yale, *Sociable Knowledge: Natural History and the Nation in Early Modern Britain* (Philadelphia, 2016) brings together contemporary approaches to the history of the book with the study of antiquarianism, in order to explore the ways in which antiquaries circulated knowledge, used the letter as a form of publication, and created archives of papers for future generations.

<sup>73</sup> See MS Eng. b. 2042, fols 106, 108a.

<sup>74</sup> Selden's 1607 Latin *Britannia*, with his own annotations, is Bodl. C 1.4 Art. Seld.

<sup>75</sup> Letter of Awnsham Churchill to Thoresby, 21 Sept. 1693, in Thoresby, *Letters*, 1: 141.

<sup>76</sup> Ralph Thoresby, *The Diary of Ralph Thoresby, F.R.S., Author of the Topography of Leeds (1677-1724)*, ed. Joseph Hunter, 2 vols (London, 1830), 1: 249.

<sup>77</sup> e.g. MS Eng. b. 2042, fols 25v-28v (Bedfordshire) and MS Eng. b. 2043, fols 260r-269v (Somersetshire).

<sup>78</sup> See also Levine, *Battle*, 334.

<sup>79</sup> MS Ballard 5, fol.21r: letter of Gibson to Charlett: 1 Feb. 1693/4.

<sup>80</sup> MS Eng. b. 2043, fols 230r-232v: letter of Thomas Lister to 'Mr Rogers, Bookseller in Salop', 10 Nov. 1693. Lister asked that his notes be passed to 'the gent. who is the Author or designer of the new Book'.

<sup>81</sup> The interleaved pages are MS Eng. b. 2043, fols 234r-240r.

<sup>82</sup> MS Ballard 5, fol.21r: letter of Gibson to Charlett, 1 Feb. 1693/4.

<sup>83</sup> MS Eng. b. 2043, fol. 4b (ult.): letter of William Blundel to Abel Swale, 6 July 1693.

<sup>84</sup> The copper-plate engraving is preserved at MS Eng. b. 2043, fol. 5. The fascinating episode of Blundel's discovery of a small hoard of Anglo-Saxon coins is discussed in Daniel Woolf, *The Social Circulation of the Past: English Historical Culture 1500-1730* (Oxford, 2003), 246-255. I am very grateful to one of this essay's

---

peer-reviewers for making the connection between Blundel's grandson, discussed here, and the elder Blundel, discussed by Woolf.

<sup>85</sup> Camden, *Britannia*, ed. Gibson, col. 801.

<sup>86</sup> MS Eng. b. 2043, fols 14r-v: letter of Blundel to Swale, 17 Aug. 1693; fol.6r: letter of Blundel to Swale, 17 Oct. 1693.

<sup>87</sup> Camden, *Britannia*, ed. Gibson, cols. 801-802.

<sup>88</sup> MS Ballard 5, fol. 21r: letter of Gibson to Charlett, 1 Feb. 1693/4. See Emery and Walters, 'Edward Lhuyd', 113.

<sup>89</sup> MS Ballard 5, fol. 40v: letter of Gibson to Charlett, 31 May 1694.

<sup>90</sup> A. L. F. Rivet and Kenneth Jackson, 'The British Section of the Antonine Itinerary', *Britannia* 1 (1970), 34-82, especially 52-53.

<sup>91</sup> For what follows on Scotland, I am particularly grateful to both peer reviewers of this essay for their advice.

<sup>92</sup> A point made by Rosemary Sweet, *Antiquaries*, 190.

<sup>93</sup> On Sibbald see Charles W. J. Withers, 'Geography, Science and National Identity in Early Modern Britain: The Case of Scotland and the Work of Sir Robert Sibbald (1641-1722)', *Annals of Science* 53 (1996), 29-73.

<sup>94</sup> For more on Sibbald's contributions to the *Britannia* specifically see John Cramsie, *British Travellers and the Encounter with Britain, 1450-1700* (Woodbridge, 2015), 419-20.

<sup>95</sup> Roger L. Emerson, 'Sir Robert Sibbald, Kt, The Royal Society of Scotland and the origins of the Scottish enlightenment', *Annals of Science* 45 (1988), 41-72.

<sup>96</sup> Kelsey Jackson Williams, *The First Scottish Enlightenment: Rebels, Priests, and History* (Oxford, 2020), 195-203 (see 202-3 for Sibbald and 1695 *Britannia*).

<sup>97</sup> David Allan, 'Dalrymple, Sir James, of Borthwick (1650-1719)', *ODNB*, online edn.

<sup>98</sup> For the wider context of the 1705 dispute, see Williams, 165-171.

<sup>99</sup> Sir James Dalrymple of Borthwick, *Collections Concerning the Scottish History, Preceding the Death of King David the First, in the Year 1153* (Edinburgh, 1705), A4r.

<sup>100</sup> On Anderson, see Plomer, *Dictionary [...] 1641-1667*, 5.

<sup>101</sup> *A Second Edition of Camden's Description of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1695), ¶2r.

<sup>102</sup> Dalrymple, *Collections*, A4r.

<sup>103</sup> MS Ballard 5, fol.70r: letter of Gibson to Charlett, 13 Nov 1694.

<sup>104</sup> See Piggott, 'William Camden', 47. For Toland in Oxford, see Stephen H. Daniel, 'Toland, John (1670-1722)', *ODNB*, online edn.

<sup>105</sup> MS Tanner 25, fol. 138r: letter of Gibson to Tanner, 20 April 1694.

<sup>106</sup> MS Ballard 5, fol. 48r: letter of Gibson to Charlett, 21 June 1694; MS Ballard 5, fol. 27r: letter of Gibson to Charlett, 9 April 1694.

<sup>107</sup> On O'Flaherty and Irish antiquarianism in this period, see Richard Sharpe, ed. *Roderick O'Flaherty's Letters: to William Molyneux, Edward Lhwyd, and Samuel Molyneux, 1696-1709* (Dublin, 2013); for the possibility that he sent papers relating to *Britannia* to Lhwyd, see 334.

<sup>108</sup> More information on this artefact can be found at Ashmolean Museum, <https://www.ashmolean.org/ballyshanon-sun-disc-0>, accessed 23 April 2020.

<sup>109</sup> Camden, *Britannia*, ed. Gibson, cols 1021-1022.

<sup>110</sup> R. G. Collingwood and R. P. Wright, *The Roman Inscriptions of Britain. I, Inscriptions on Stone* (Oxford, 1965), inscription 450.

<sup>111</sup> MS Eng. b. 2042, fol. 89r.

<sup>112</sup> Edmund Halley also subsequently published an account of the altar: 'Part of a Letter from Mr Halley at Chester, October 26th, 1696. giving an Account of an Animal resembling a Whelp voided per Anum, by a Male Greyhound, and of a Roman Altar found there, &c.', *Philosophical Transactions* 222 (1697), 316-318.

<sup>113</sup> MS Eng. b. 2042, fol. 92r: letter of Edward Lhwyd to Abel Swale, 3 Oct. 1693.

<sup>114</sup> MS Eng. b. 2042, fol. 90r: letter of Randle Holme to Awنشam Churchill. Holme mentions that 'the 19. of this Instant', which implies that the letter (although undated) was sent in the same month as the altar was discovered (July 1692).

<sup>115</sup> Alan G. Crosby, 'Prescott, Henry (1649-1719)', *ODNB*, online edn.

<sup>116</sup> MS Eng. b. 2042, fol. 86r: see the draught of the altar, with Prescott's comment that 'On the Right hand this Genius'.

<sup>117</sup> Humphrey Prideaux, *Marmora Oxoniensia* (Oxford, 1676), 282. For an example of the criticisms, see MS Smith 61, p.5: letter of Thomas Smith to Edmund Halley, 17 Sept. 1705, in which Smith notes that Prideaux has 'very inconsiderately corrupted' one of the inscriptions he printed. Hearne described the book in his *Diary* as



---

'wonderfully defective' (quoted in Hugh de Quehen, 'Prideaux, Humphrey (1648-1724)', *ODNB*, online edn). I am grateful to one of this essay's peer-reviewers for pointing out this quotation.

<sup>118</sup> Camden, *Britannia*, ed. Gibson, col. 570.

<sup>119</sup> Leslie Webster, et al., *The Golden Age of Anglo-Saxon Art 966 to 1066* (London, 1984), 105. R. L. S. Bruce-Mitford, 'Late Saxon disc brooches', *Dark-Age Britain*, ed. D. B. Harden (London, 1956), 193-8.

<sup>120</sup> MS Eng. b. 2043, fol. 79b: Letter of Anthony Gregory to John Taylor, 3 Aug. 1694.

<sup>121</sup> MS Rawl. Letters 91, fol. 236v: letter of Francis Roper to Thomas Turner, 22 May 1694.

<sup>122</sup> Compare this example of the way an antiquarian discovery led to a flurry of letter-writing with that documented in Joseph Levine, *Doctor Woodward's Shield: History, Science, and Satire in Augustan England* (Cornell: Cornell UP, 1991).

<sup>123</sup> Camden, *Britannia*, ed. Gibson, col. 415.

<sup>124</sup> On the genesis of Hickeys's *Thesaurus* see Richard L. Harris, ed. *A Chorus of Grammars: The Correspondence of George Hickeys and his Collaborators on the Thesaurus Linguarum Septentrionalium* (Toronto, 1992), and for the Sutton Brooch specifically see 84.

<sup>125</sup> 'Tertio, ipsa Inscriptio, quam Incantamenti genus esse constat; quo quisquis Clypeum in proelio portabat, à metu Mortis securus factus, se invulnerabilem esse putabat'; 'sic ista [Aeduwen mea gagehy o drihten drihten hine a waerie the me hire aet ferie bvton hyom selle hire agenes willes], quae suppositis punctis notavi, ex Magico isto & occulto verborum genere esse censeo, utpote quae nihil, quid scio, significant' (George Hickeys, 'Clarissimo Viro Andreae Fountaine Equiti Aurato Georgius Hickeysius S. P. D.', appended to 'Georgii Hickeysii S. T. P. De Antiquae Litteraturae Septentrionalis Utilitate, sive De Linguarum Veterum Septentrionalium Usu Dissertatio Epistolaris ad Bartholomaeum Showere', in *Linguarum Vett. Septentrionalium Thesaurus Grammatico-Criticus et Archaeologicus*, 2 vols (Oxford, 1705), 1: 187-188).

<sup>126</sup> On Hickeys's extension of the diplomatic methods of Mabillon and other French Benedictine scholars, see Alfred Hiatt, 'Diplomatic Arts: Hickeys against Mabillon in the Republic of Letters', *Journal of the History of Ideas* 70 (2009), 351-373.

<sup>127</sup> See Stanley G. Mendyk, *"Speculum Britanniae": Regional Study, Antiquarianism, and Science in Britain to 1700* (Toronto, 1989).

<sup>128</sup> Robert Plot, *Natural History of Oxfordshire* (Oxford, 1677), 339.

<sup>129</sup> For instance, the 'Additions' to the Cumberland section of *Britannia* (cols 840-41) reproduce a letter from Nicolson to William Dugdale published as 'A Letter from Mr Nicolson to Sir William Dugdale; concerning a Runic Inscription on the Font at Bridekirk', *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society* 15 (1685), 1291-1295. On the significance of this and another Nicolson letter published in the same issue, see R. I. Page, 'William Nicolson, F.R.S., and the Runes of the Bewcastle Cross', *Notes and Records of the Royal Society of London* 14 (1960), 184-90.

<sup>130</sup> MS Ballard 5, fol. 14r: letter of Gibson to Charlett, 19 March 1693/4.

<sup>131</sup> MS Ashmole 1817a, fols 225-226: letter of John Ray to Edward Lhwyd, 10 July 1694, transcription by Helen Watt and Brynley Roberts, in *Early Modern Letters Online*, Cultures of Knowledge, <https://databank.ora.ox.ac.uk/emlo/datasets/lhwyd-transcripts/1694-07-10%20Ray%20Ashm%201817a%20F225.pdf>, accessed 23 April 2020.

<sup>132</sup> On Tanner's biography, his papers, and his various scholarly projects, including the Wiltshire sections of the *Britannia*, see Sommerlad, 'Thomas Tanner'. More recently on his bibliographical scholarship see Richard Sharpe, 'Thomas Tanner (1674-1735), the 1697 Catalogue, and *Bibliotheca Britannica*', *The Library* 7th series 6 (2005), 381-421. For Tanner's advice to Gibson on the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle see MS Tanner 25, fols 14r-v.

<sup>133</sup> e.g. MS Ashmole 1816, fols 459-60: letter of William Nicolson to Edward Lhwyd, 6 Oct 1692, transcription by Helen Watt and Brynley Roberts, in *Early Modern Letters Online*, Cultures of Knowledge, <https://databank.ora.ox.ac.uk/emlo/datasets/lhwyd-transcripts/1692-10-06%20Nicolson%20Ashm%201816%20F459.pdf>, accessed 23 April 2020: 'I am now and then busy'd in scraping together the names of our Mountains; which I promise myself as great satisfaction in from you. But I do not find so many of them to be British as I expected. I suspect they have lost their old names (most of 'em) and some few that still retain them have them vilely corrupted'.

<sup>134</sup> NLW MS Peniarth 427, fols 14-15: letter of Edward Lhwyd to John Lloyd, 16 June 1693, transcription by Helen Watt and Brynley Roberts, in *Early Modern Letters Online*, Cultures of Knowledge, <https://databank.ora.ox.ac.uk/emlo/datasets/lhwyd-transcripts/1693-06-16%20EL%20to%20John%20Lloyd%20Pen%20427%20F14%20AC%201848%20243-5.pdf>, accessed on 23 April 2020. On Lhwyd's correspondents and the *Britannia* see Brynley F. Roberts, 'Edward Lhwyd's Protégés', *The Transactions of the Honourable Society of Cymmrodorion* 14 (2008), 21-57, especially 21-27.

---

<sup>135</sup> See Williams, *Antiquary*, 71-72.

<sup>136</sup> See MS Tanner 25, fol. 118r: letter of Aubrey to Tanner, 6 Feb. 1693/4. For Aubrey's use of the same metaphor about the printing of his *Monumenta's* core arguments, see MS Ashmole 1814, fol. 100r, letter of Aubrey to Lhwyd, 19 Oct. 1693, transcription by Helen Watt and Brynley Roberts, in *Early Modern Letters Online*, Cultures of Knowledge, <https://databank.ora.ox.ac.uk/emlo/datasets/lhwyd-transcripts/1693-10-19%20Aubrey%20Ashm%201814%20F100.pdf>, accessed on 23 April 2020. For more detail on these letters and their context, see Michael Hunter, *John Aubrey and the Realm of Learning* (London, 1975), 84-85. I am grateful to one of the essay's peer reviewers for this reference.

<sup>137</sup> MS Tanner 25, fols 101r-101v: letter of Tanner to John Byrom, n.d. (December 1693?).

<sup>138</sup> MS Lister 36, fols 51-52: letter of Lhwyd to Lister, 23 May 1693, transcription by Helen Watt and Brynley Roberts, in *Early Modern Letters Online*, Cultures of Knowledge, <https://databank.ora.ox.ac.uk/emlo/datasets/lhwyd-transcripts/1693-05-23%20EL%20to%20Lister%20G%2071.pdf>, accessed on 23 April 2020.

<sup>139</sup> John Spelman, ed. *Alfredi Magni Anglorum Regis Invictissimi Vita Tribus Libris Comprehensa* (Oxford, 1678), c2v. The coin used by Tanner is Table III, no. 30.

<sup>140</sup> William of Malmesbury's *Gesta Regum*, *Gesta Pontificum* and *Historia Novella* were published in Henry Savile, ed. *Rerum Anglicarum Scriptores* (London, 1596); Nennius was published in Thomas Gale, ed. *Historiae Britannicae, Saxonicae, Anglo-Danicae, Scriptores XV* (Oxford, 1691).

<sup>141</sup> For instance, Tanner makes use of the twelfth century *Abingdon Chronicle*, printed in William Dugdale, *Monasticon Anglicanum*, 2 vols (London, 1682), 1: 97-108, which claims that the seat of the Bishop of Berkshire and Wiltshire was initially to be found in Malmesbury (1: 97).

<sup>142</sup> Leland's *Itinerary* manuscripts are MS Top. Gen. e. 8-15.

<sup>143</sup> Camden, *Britannia*, ed. Gibson, cols 108-110. On the Stonehenge debates, see Angus Vine, *In Defiance of Time: Antiquarian Writing in Early Modern England* (Oxford, 2010), ch.4 (and literature cited there).

<sup>144</sup> MS Tanner 25, fol. 83r. This is Tanner's draft, written within one of Aubrey's letters.

<sup>145</sup> In the final booklet of material which Tanner submitted to Gibson for the edition, he acknowledged the work of 'the Revd. Dr. Rob. Woodward the present worthy Dean, than whom none is better versed in the History of this Church', although in the printed text, Gibson omits Woodward's name (*Britannia*, col. 107). See also the letter from Woodward in response to a variety of Tanner's 'Queries' dated 14 April 1694 (MS Tanner 25, fol. 136v-137r), which must have been designed to help with his contributions to Tanner's Wiltshire. The Queries largely concern Roman antiquities.

<sup>146</sup> William Rockett, 'The Structural Plan of Camden's *Britannia*', *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 26 (1995): 829-841.

<sup>147</sup> The following remarks on Lhwyd's scholarship are much indebted to this invaluable pair of articles: Nancy Edwards, 'Edward Lhwyd and the Origins of Early Medieval Celtic Archaeology', *The Antiquaries Journal* 87 (2007), 165-96; Nancy Edwards, 'Edward Lhwyd: An Archaeologist's View', *Welsh History Review* 25 (2010), 20-50. Many of the specific examples of important archaeological discoveries discussed here are drawn from these articles.

<sup>148</sup> Camden, *Britannia*, ed. Gibson, cols 593-594.

<sup>149</sup> Camden, *Britannia*, ed. Gibson, col. 648.

<sup>150</sup> Camden, *Britannia*, ed. Gibson, cols 658-659.

<sup>151</sup> Camden, *Britannia*, ed. Gibson, col. 672. In this insight, Lhwyd followed the work of his mentor, Robert Plot: *The Natural History of Oxfordshire* (Oxford, 1677), 309-312.

<sup>152</sup> Camden, *Britannia*, ed. Gibson, col. 603 and Camden, *Britannia*, ed. Gibson, col. 618.

<sup>153</sup> See David Griffiths, 'Maen Achwyfan and the Context of Viking Settlement in North-East Wales', *Archaeologia Cambrensis* 155 (2006), 142-62.

<sup>154</sup> Camden, *Britannia*, ed. Gibson, col.694 (discussion of Maen Achwyfan) and 697, images 1 and 2 (for the engravings).

<sup>155</sup> NLW MS Peniarth 427, ff.34-35: letter of Edward Lhwyd to John Lloyd, 8 Sept. 1694, transcription by Helen Watt and Brynley Roberts, in *Early Modern Letters Online*, Cultures of Knowledge, <https://databank.ora.ox.ac.uk/emlo/datasets/lhwyd-transcripts/1694-09-08%20EL%20to%20John%20Lloyd%20Pen%20427%20F34%20G%20110.pdf>, accessed on 23 April 2020. Edwards, 'Celtic Archaeology', 178-179.

<sup>156</sup> Edwards, 'Celtic Archaeology', 179. On the use of antiquarian questionnaires in general, see Adam Fox, 'Printed Questionnaires, Research Networks, and the Discovery of the British Isles, 1650-1800', *Historical Journal* 53 (2010), 593-621.

- 
- <sup>157</sup> On Lhwyd's correspondence, see especially F. V. Emery, 'Edward Lhuyd and Some of his Glamorgan Correspondents: A View of Gower in the 1690s', *Transactions of the Honourable Society of Cymmrodorion* (1965), 59-114 and Brynley F. Roberts, 'Edward Lhwyd's Protégés', *The Transactions of the Honourable Society of Cymmrodorion* 14 (2008), 21-57.
- <sup>158</sup> On the importance of correspondence to Lhwyd see also Elizabeth Yale, *Sociable Knowledge*, 55-88.
- <sup>159</sup> For Lhwyd's thought on language and etymology see Edward Lhwyd, *Archaeologia Britannica: Texts & Translations*, eds Dewi W. Evans and Brynley F. Roberts (Aberystwyth, 2009), esp. 12-13. For his place in the history of etymology and linguistics see David Cram, 'Edward Lhuyd and the Doctrine of the Permutation of Letters', in *Sprachdiskussion und Beschreibung von Sprachen im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert*, eds Gerda Haßler and Peter Schmitter (Münster: Nodus, 1999), 317-335.
- <sup>160</sup> Camden, *Britannia*, ed. Gibson, col. 588.
- <sup>161</sup> On Elizabethan antiquaries and etymology see *Defiance of Time*, ch. 2.
- <sup>162</sup> NLW MS Peniarth 427, fols 17-20: letter of Lhwyd to Lloyd, 10 Oct 1693, transcription by Helen Watt and Brynley Roberts, in *Early Modern Letters Online*, Cultures of Knowledge, <https://databank.ora.ox.ac.uk/emlo/datasets/lhwyd-transcripts/1693-10-10%20EL%20to%20John%20Lloyd%20Pen%20427%20F17%20G%2075.pdf>, accessed on 23 April 2020.
- <sup>163</sup> MS Ballard 5, fol. 45r: postscript to a letter of Gibson to Charlett, 4 June 1694. Quoted in Emery and Walters, 'Edward Lhuyd', 116. On proof-reading see Percy Simpson, *Proof-Reading in the Sixteenth, Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries* (London, 1935).
- <sup>164</sup> MS Tanner 25, fol. 292r: letter of Gibson to Tanner, 19 Jan. 1694/5. See Emery and Walters, 'Edward Lhuyd', 114.
- <sup>165</sup> On the initial plan to publish by Michaelmas 1694, see a letter from Tanner to John Byrom (n.d., but c.Dec 1693), in which he notes that the publishers 'intend to have it out by the beginning of next Michaelmas term' (MS Tanner 25, fol. 101r).
- <sup>166</sup> P.L. Heyworth, *Letters of Humfrey Wanley: Palaeographer, Anglo-Saxonist, Librarian 1672-1726* (Oxford, 1989), 11.
- <sup>167</sup> MS Ashmole 1829, fols 16-17, letter of John Archer to Edward Lhwyd, 22 April 1695, transcription by Helen Watt and Brynley Roberts, in *Early Modern Letters Online*, Cultures of Knowledge, <https://databank.ora.ox.ac.uk/emlo/datasets/lhwyd-transcripts/1695-05-02%20Archer%20Ashm%201829%20F16.pdf>, accessed on 23 April 2020.
- <sup>168</sup> MS Rawl. D. 908, fol. 23r: letter of Maurice Jones to Edmund Gibson, 24 July 1695.
- <sup>169</sup> MS Ashmole 1817b, fols 45-46, letter of Edward Thomas to Edward Lhwyd, 12 Nov. 1695, transcription by Helen Watt and Brynley Roberts, in *Early Modern Letters Online*, Cultures of Knowledge, <https://databank.ora.ox.ac.uk/emlo/datasets/lhwyd-transcripts/1695-11-12%20ThomasE%20Ashm%201817b%20F45.pdf>, accessed on 23 April 2020.
- <sup>170</sup> For the Hatton family's letters, see E. M. Thompson, *The Correspondence of the Family of Hatton*, 2 vols (London, 1878).
- <sup>171</sup> MS Smith 50, p. 31: letter of Charles Hatton to Smith, 27 April 1691.
- <sup>172</sup> Tanner 317: *Institutiones Grammaticae Anglo-Saxonicae, et Moseo-Gothicae* (Oxford, 1689). The dedication clearly circulated among sympathetic readers: Thomas Tanner owned a copy (MS Tanner 25, fol. 314r-315r). See discussion in Harris, *Chorus of Grammars*, 23-24.
- <sup>173</sup> William Nicolson, *The English Historical Library* (London, 1696).
- <sup>174</sup> MS Add. C. 217, fol. 4r: letter of Nicolson to Hickes, 18 Sept. 1696. Printed in Harris, *Chorus of Grammars*, 164-165.
- <sup>175</sup> On Bernard's life-long scholarly project, his edition of Josephus, see Thomas Roebuck, "'Great Expectation Among the Learned': Edward Bernard's Josephus in Restoration Oxford", *International Journal of the Classical Tradition* 23 (2016), 307-325. For Bernard's own reluctant decision to take the oaths, see MS Smith 47, p.59: letter of Bernard to Thomas Smith, n.d. (but between 24 and 30 Jan 1689/90).
- <sup>176</sup> MS Smith 47, p.108: letter of Bernard to Smith, n.d. Although this letter is bound between one dated 22 March 1691/2 and one dated 24 April 1692, its reference to the publication of 'Somners life & his tract of the Maritime ports of Kent', which came out in 1693, confirms that it in fact dates from that year.
- <sup>177</sup> Camden's own copy of the *Britannia* is now MS Smith 1.
- <sup>178</sup> MS Smith 57, p. 341: letter of Smith to Bernard, 11 May 1693.
- <sup>179</sup> MS Smith 57, p. 178: letter of Smith to Bernard, 22 Nov. 1690.

- <sup>180</sup> Despite thinking the title of Hicckes's *Thesaurus* (1705) to be 'pompous', Smith had to concede, after spending three weeks with the book, that it is 'an excellent work, and truly dos exceed my exspectation' (MS Smith 127, p. 45 and p. 77).
- <sup>181</sup> Camden, *Britannia*, ed. Gibson, A2v.
- <sup>182</sup> MS Smith 47, p. 68r: letter of Bernard to Smith, 9 July 1690.
- <sup>183</sup> Theodor Harmsen, 'High-Principled Antiquarian Publishing: The Correspondence of Thomas Hearne (1678-1735) and Thomas Smith (1638-1710)', *Lias* 23 (1996), 69-98, especially 85-86.
- <sup>184</sup> MS Smith 127, p. 323: letter of Smith to Hearne, 28 May 1709.
- <sup>185</sup> MS Rawl. Letters 37-38, letter 135: Hearne to Smith, 4 June 1709.
- <sup>186</sup> William Camden, *Annales Rerum Anglicarum et Hibernicarum Regnante Elizabetha* (Oxford, 1717). On Hearne and the Latin *Britannia* see Theodor Harmsen, *Antiquarianism in the Augustan Age: Thomas Hearne, 1678-1735* (Oxford, 2000), 170.
- <sup>187</sup> On Pepys's Jacobitism in general see Claire Tomalin, *Samuel Pepys: The Unequalled Self* (London, 2003), 352-360; on Gale's visits to Pepys, 357.
- <sup>188</sup> MS Smith 57, p. 224: letter of Smith to Bernard, 4 Aug. 1691.
- <sup>189</sup> Letter of Smith to Pepys, 16 April 1702, printed in R. G. Howarth, ed. *Letters and the Second Diary of Samuel Pepys* (London, 1932), 344. Smith's draft of this letter can be found at MS Smith 65, p. 59.
- <sup>190</sup> Roger Gale, ed. *Antonini Iter Britanniarum Commentariis Illustratum Thomae Gale, S.T.P. nuper Decani Ebor.* (London, 1709). On this work see Williams, *Antiquary*, 136-140.
- <sup>191</sup> MS Smith 57, p. 148: letter of Smith to Edward Bernard, 22 July 1690.
- <sup>192</sup> William Nicolson, *Letters on Various Subjects, Literary, Political and Ecclesiastical to and from William Nicolson*, 2 vols (London, 1809), p. 38: letter of Nicolson to Gibson, 18 Jan. 1693/4.
- <sup>193</sup> MS Eng. b. 2043, fol. 76r.
- <sup>194</sup> Thoresby, *Letters*, 1: 127: letter of Nicolson to Thoresby, 12 Feb 1693/4
- <sup>195</sup> Camden, *Britannia*, ed. Gibson, cols 133, 229-230, 359. As Kate Loveman has shown, Pepys 'long cherished the ambition to write a great history of the navy, and he saw his holdings on maritime affairs as the research material for this'. Small offcuts of this material appear in the 1695 *Britannia* (see 'Pepys's "Retirement"', in *Samuel Pepys: Plague, Fire, Revolution*, ed. Margarette Lincoln (London, 2015), 245).
- <sup>196</sup> MS Ballard 5, fol. 35r: letter of Gibson to Charlett, 12 May 1694.
- <sup>197</sup> MS Ballard 5, fol. 82r: 28 Dec 1694.
- <sup>198</sup> On Oxford politics in this period in general see G.V. Bennett, 'Against the Tide: Oxford under William III' in *University of Oxford*, eds. Sutherland and Mitchell, 31-60, esp. 45-46 (on Charlett).
- <sup>199</sup> A point made in Mayhew, 'Edmund Gibson's Editions of *Britannia*', 242.
- <sup>200</sup> Mark Goldie, 'Johnston, Nathaniel (bap.1629?, d.1705)', *ODNB*, online edn. On 30 Jan. 1693/4, we find Johnston writing to Thoresby to say that he 'will give some assistance' to the 'new edition of Camden's *Britannia*, but '[w]ant of books and money are great hindrances to me' (see Thoresby, *Letters*, 1: 146).
- <sup>201</sup> MS Ballard 13, fol. 9r: letter of Hopkins to Charlett, 3 March 1693/4.
- <sup>202</sup> James Tyrrell, *The General History of England, both Ecclesiastical and Civil*, 3 vols (London, 1697-1704).
- <sup>203</sup> E.S. de Beer, ed. *The Correspondence of John Locke*, 8 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976-1989), 4: 732-34, letter of James Tyrrell to John Locke, 26 Oct. [1693]. I am grateful to Marcello Cattaneo for his kind help with this reference.
- <sup>204</sup> Harris, *Chorus of Grammars*, 52-53.
- <sup>205</sup> MS Ballard 5, fol. 31r: letter of Gibson to Charlett, 1 May 1694.
- <sup>206</sup> Harris, *Chorus of Grammars*, 44.
- <sup>207</sup> For those letters see MS Ballard 12, fols 53r-64r.
- <sup>208</sup> Harris, *Chorus of Grammars*, letter 5, 155-156.
- <sup>209</sup> MS Ballard 5, fol. 27r: letter of Gibson to Charlett, 9 April 1694.
- <sup>210</sup> MS Tanner 25, fol. 116r-v: letter of Gibson to Tanner, 30 January 1693/4.
- <sup>211</sup> Camden, *Britannia*, ed. Gibson, a1v.
- <sup>212</sup> MS Eng. hist. b. 2, fol.99r: letter of Gibson to anonymous correspondent, 5 Aug. 1705.
- <sup>213</sup> Smith, ed. *Camdeni Epistolae*, i-lxxvii. For Wood's life of Camden see *Athenae Oxonienses*, 1: 408-413. Gibson adds details from Wood, e.g. that Camden may have been a chorister at Magdalen College (1: 408). Gibson also reprinted two manuscript treatises of Camden's that Smith had printed as appendices to his edition of Camden's letters: 'A posthumous Discourse concerning the Etymologie, Antiquity, and Office of *Earl Marshal of England*. by Mr. *Camden*' (clxc) and 'The Original and Dignity of the *Earl Marshal of England*' (cols cxxxix-cxcvi).

- <sup>214</sup> Camden, *Britannia*, ed. Gibson, b1v-b2r.
- <sup>215</sup> Camden, *Britannia*, ed. Gibson, d1r-v.
- <sup>216</sup> Camden, *Britannia*, ed. Gibson, d1r.
- <sup>217</sup> MS Tanner 25, fol. 231r: letter of Edmund Gibson to Tanner, 6 Oct. 1694.
- <sup>218</sup> 'ut omnes Academici reliquique è Clero, interposito juramento, ritibus sacris uterentur, & articulis Religionis Ecclesiae Anglicanae Reformatae subscriberent sub poenâ amotionis, conformes reddidissent, intus in pectore pristinorum superstitionum amorem retinere [...] Nec mirum cuiquam videri debet, ejusmodi Ardeliones in Academia delitescere potuisse, qui conscientiam laedere quàm fortunis suis exui maluissent' (Smith, *Camdeni Epistolae*, v-vi). I have referred to the translation of Smith's 'Vita' by Dana F. Sutton, 'Thomas Smith, *Viri Clarissimi Gulielmi Camdeni Vita* (1691)', University of Birmingham, <http://www.philological.bham.ac.uk/smith/>, accessed 23 April 2020.
- <sup>219</sup> MS Ballard 5, fol. 69r: letter of Gibson to Charlett, 10 Nov. 1694.
- <sup>220</sup> MS Ballard 5, fol. 72r: letter of Gibson to Charlett, 13 Nov. 1694.
- <sup>221</sup> Stuart Handley, 'Somers, John, Baron Somers (1651-1716)', *ODNB*, online edn.
- <sup>222</sup> Theodor Harmsen, 'Hickes, George (1642-17115)', *ODNB*, online edn.
- <sup>223</sup> MS Smith 57, p. 384: letter of Smith to Bernard, 10 Feb. 1693/4.
- <sup>224</sup> Thomas Smith, *Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Cottonian Library 1696 = Catalogus librorum manuscriptorum bibliothecae Cottonianae*, ed. C. G. C. Tite (Cambridge, 1984).
- <sup>225</sup> MS Smith 59, p. 277: letter of Smith to Philip Cotton, 3 Dec. 1695.
- <sup>226</sup> Thomas Hearne, *Remarks and Collections of Thomas Hearne*, 11 vols (Oxford, 1885), 1:217.
- <sup>227</sup> Francis Brokesby, 'A Letter from the Reverend Mr. Francis Brokesby to the Publisher, Containing an Account of some Observations relating to the Antiquities and Natural History of England', in *The Itinerary of John Leland, the Antiquary: Vol. the Sixth*, ed. Thomas Hearne (Oxford, 1711), 76-92, 92, 77.
- <sup>228</sup> Mayhew, 'Edmund Gibson's Editions of *Britannia*', 251.
- <sup>229</sup> Levine, *Battle*, 341.
- <sup>230</sup> Quoted in Thoresby, *Diary*, 247.
- <sup>231</sup> R. W. Hunt, 'Historical Introduction', in F. Madan, et al. *A Summary Catalogue of Western Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library at Oxford*, 7 vols (Oxford, 1895-1953), 1.xxv-xxxv.
- <sup>232</sup> For Walker's essay on coins in the *Britannia* along with a series of engraved plates see cols cxxxvi-clii. For his original essay on coins, see Spelman, *Aelfredi Magni [...] Vita*, c1r-d2r. For one of Thoresby's see Table VIII, coin 25 (col. cl); for the use of Plot's *Oxfordshire* see Table VIII, coin 40, col. cli. I am very grateful for the advice of Andrew Burnett on the revised *Britannia*'s (lack of) contribution to the study of numismatics.
- <sup>233</sup> Anne Clifford spent time 'reding, or ouer loking' John Selden's *Titles of Honor* in early 1638/39 (Folger Shakespeare Library, STC 22178 Copy 3).
- <sup>234</sup> On Elstob see Jacqueline Way, "'Our Mother-Tongue": The Politics of Elizabeth Elstob's Antiquarian Scholarship', *Huntington Library Quarterly* 78 (2015), 417-440.
- <sup>235</sup> H. Stuart Jones, 'The Foundation and History of the Camden Chair', *Oxoniensia* 8-9 (1943-1944), 169-192, 191.