The Garden History Society

'The Museum in the Garden': Displaying Classical Antiquities in Elizabethan and Jacobean England
Author(s): Leslie W. Hepple
Reviewed work(s):
Source: *Garden History*, Vol. 29, No. 2 (Winter, 2001), pp. 109-120
Published by: The Garden History Society
Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/1587366
Accessed: 26/01/2012 15:46

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The Garden History Society is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Garden History*.

http://www.jstor.org

LESLIE W. HEPPLE

'THE MUSEUM IN THE GARDEN': DISPLAYING CLASSICAL ANTIQUITIES IN ELIZABETHAN AND JACOBEAN ENGLAND

The historical intertwining of classical antiquity and garden design is a very lengthy one, stretching back to classical Rome itself, and there are many diverse threads to the tapestry. Most threads and interwoven references are well known, but the aim of this paper is to develop the study of one aspect that has not received much attention. It concerns the 'museum garden', displaying genuine classical antiquities — rather than copies or pastiches — in England during the last years of the sixteenth century and the first decades of the seventeenth, before the Civil War. Such gardens have been associated with the importing of classical statuary and antiquities from the Mediterranean home of classical culture, both Roman and Greek, and with a small number of aristocratic and royal gardens. This paper sets out a different dimension to such display: the display of newly discovered and collected Roman antiquities from sites in the British Isles, remains of the Roman occupation.

The museum garden, originating in Italian Renaissance gardens in Florence, Rome and Venice and displaying classical statuary, altars, bas-reliefs and celebratory inscriptions, has been extensively studied.[1] Its introduction to England came late, and statuary modelled on classical examples became popular in the sixteenth century (as at Theobalds and Nonsuch).[2] Jacobean and Caroline England did see a few examples of the genuine museum-garden, based on imports from Italy and the Mediterranean. The expense and difficulties of acquisition and transport limited these examples to a few royal and aristocratic gardens, one of the most notable of which was that assembled in the gardens of Arundel House facing the Thames by Thomas, Earl of Arundel after his visit to Italy in 1614.[3] By the 1630s, Arundel House and its gardens contained some thirty-two statues and 128 busts, as well as two hundred and fifty inscriptions, altars and other fragments. These included the famous 'Arundel Marbles', later to grace the Ashmolean Museum in Oxford.[4] When Christopher Arnold visited London in 1651, he noted 'certain gardens on the Thames, where there are rare Greek and Roman inscriptions, stones, marbles: the reading of which is actually like viewing Greece and Italy at once within the bounds of Great Britain'.[5] In terms of imported antiquities and artistic quality, Arundel's museum-garden is the almost solitary pinnacle of the museum-garden in England. However, it was preceded, and influenced, by a different, more indigenous type of museum-garden based

School of Geographical Sciences, University of Bristol, University Road, Bristol BS8 1SS, UK.

on the collection and display of more humble classical antiquities. It is to this alternative type that we now turn.

WILLIAM CAMDEN AND THE DISCOVERY OF ROMAN BRITAIN

The last decades of the sixteenth century saw a remarkable flowering of historical and antiquarian scholarship in England. The formation of the Society of Antiquaries signalled this development, and William Camden's *Britannia*, first published in 1586, is its finest product. Camden was inspired by the leading continental scholar Ortelius 'to restore Britain to Antiquity and Antiquity to Britain'. Camden's study examined the diversity of Britain's history, collecting the evidence on pre-Roman Britain, the Roman occupation, Anglo-Saxon and medieval England, and the work had a major impact both within England and internationally.[6]

A central element in Camden's *Britannia* was the recording and discussion of Roman antiquities, primarily inscriptions on stone altars, tombstones and dedication-slabs. These inscriptions enabled the antiquary to link 'the visible and the invisible', the material remains of archaeology and the 'invisible' historical past recorded in classical texts. However, few such inscriptions were known when Camden began his studies in the 1570s, and his first edition of *Britannia* contained only twelve such inscriptions. However, Camden's work stimulated further discoveries and recording, and by the 1600 edition he had fifty-two and by his final edition in 1610 there were over one hundred and ten.

These antiquities did not emerge from any systematic archaeological excavations. They were mainly chance finds associated with current or past robbing of Roman sites for building materials, though, as the stimulus of Camden's work took effect, there was a search of known and probable sites for such inscribed stones. Much of the impact was, however, through recognition of the significance of such stones as historical evidence.

Most of the visible Roman remains were in the north of England, from the Roman military frontier, and six of Camden's original eleven inscriptions came by reports from Cumberland. The only southern instance was an inscribed tombstone from Silchester. London-based Camden's growing epigraphical record therefore depended on reports from witnesses in the north and on his own travels through the English counties, such as his 1579 visit to Yorkshire and Lancashire, where he saw three of his first round of inscriptions. But even on his own travels, Camden was seeing with his own eyes what had been discovered or collected by others — he was following up reports, not making original discoveries, which would have been almost impossible for someone visiting any one locality only briefly. Thus, in Lancashire, he visited Salesbury Hall, Lancashire, to see an inscribed pedestal and base discovered close by and brought to the Hall.

These collections play an important role in Camden's success. Local gentry and clergy began to recognise the significance of such antiquities, a process largely stimulated by Camden's own writing of *Britannia*. The collections then provided a local archive or record that Camden was able to visit, check and report in subsequent editions of *Britannia*. Moreover, the collections provided a degree of protection to the antiquities, which otherwise would have vanished again into the walls or buildings or been split in two for farm gateposts (quite a common fate). Most of these collections were, as one would expect, in North of England, at places such as Salesbury, Ellenborough (Maryport) and Carlisle in Cumberland, Appleby in Westmorland, and Naworth close to the Roman Wall itself. The best known collection is, however, that of the great scholar and collector Sir Robert Cotton, a close associate of Camden.[7] He accompanied Camden on his

northern tour of 1599, and began to have inscribed stones transported and shipped back to his country house at Conington, Huntingdonshire.[8] The importance of these collections of Roman antiquities is increasingly recognised, and their development and significance are being related to broader historical interpretations of the practice of collecting and the origin of museums.[9] The focus here is on the display of these collections of 'indigenous' Roman antiquities in museum-gardens.

THE COLLECTION IN THE GARDEN

These antiquities are, by the standards of Rome itself, resolutely provincial in quality and cannot directly compare with the finest from the Imperial City. In the eighteenth century, Horace Walpole certainly reflected this, writing of Roman altars and tombstones discovered in Northumberland:

> Roman antiquities, . . . such as are found in this island, are very indifferent, and inspire me with little curiosity. A barbarous country, so remote from the seat of empire, and occupied by a few legions, that very rarely decided any great events, is not very interesting, though one's own country — nor do I care for a stone that preserves the name of a standard-bearer of a cohort, or of a colonel's daughter.[10]

Fortunately, Camden's network of gentry and clergy contacts thought differently. The antiquities brought the classical world to their very estates, the collections displayed and testified to their education and taste and endowed them with what Bourdieu has named 'cultural capital'. But how were they to house these bulky objects? A single altar might be brought indoors, though there may have been some reluctance to have pagan dedications within a Christian household. Northern climes were not conducive to open access and galleries between inside and outside, and anyway, estate budgets did not run to Arundel-scale constructions. The result was, as in Renaissance Italy, a form of the museum-garden, the display of the antiquities around the outside of the house and in its grounds.

The present account will focus on the four major collections and displays of the early seventeenth century: those of Sir Robert Cotton, John Senhouse, Lord William Howard and William Bainbrigg. But smaller 'collections' of one or two inscribed stones also took place in other locations. At Carlisle, Camden 'found also this inscription at Carlile [*sic*] in a stone brought from the picts wall [Hadrian's Wall] by John Myddleton and is set in his garden',[11] and at Bath, the two inscriptions found in 1592 were later 'fixed in the garden-wall of Mrs. Chives near the Cross-bath'.[12]

The most significant collection, that of Cotton, comprised some twenty inscribed stones (of which fifteen survive today). As he assembled his collection from all over the North of England, he housed the stones at Conington in a specially build octagonal summerhouse in his garden. Together with the church and mansion, it was drawn in 1798 by John Carter as one of his 'Collection of sketches relating to the Antiquities of the Kingdom' (Figure 1).[13] Camden refers to Cotton and his summerhouse display in the 1607 edition of *Britannia* (here quoted from the 1610 Philemon Holland translation), as 'having gathered with great charges [cost] from all places the monuments of venerable antiquitie, hath heere begunne a famous Cabinet, whence of his singular courtesie, he hath often times given me great light in these darksome obscurities'.[14]

Nevertheless, it would be wrong to focus too exclusively on Cotton's collection and its display. Indeed, it can be reasonably argued that the sight of another collection was the stimulus to Cotton's acquisitions, for it was after Camden and Cotton visited Senhouse's display at Netherhall, on the Cumberland coast near Ellenborough, in the autumn of

Figure 1. 'West View of a Summerhouse, The Church, and Mansion at . . . Conington', sketched by John Carter (1798). Courtesy British Library, BL Add. MS 29936, f.40.

1599, that Cotton started actively to negotiate the acquisition and transport south of his first northern stones. Senhouse was a member of the north Cumberland gentry, and two Roman altars from his estate at Netherhall, which contained a Roman camp overlooking the Cumbrian coast, had been reported to Camden for the second (1587) edition of *Britannia*. The 1600 edition reported (in Latin) what they saw on their visit, and the 1610 edition translates it:

> The ancient vaults stand open, and many altars, stones with inscriptions, and Statues are here gotten out of the ground. Which I. Sinhous a very honest man, in whose grounds they are digged up, keepeth charily, and hath placed orderly about his house. In the mids of his yard their standeth erected a most beautifull foure square Altar of a reddish stone right artificially in antique worke engraven five foote or there abouts high, with an inscription therein of an excellent good letter.[15]

There were ten altars and other inscribed stones in Senhouse's grounds, including the very fine local red sandstone altar 'to the Genius of the Place, to Fortune the Home-Bringer, to Eternal Rome, and to Good Fate' (Figure 2), one of the two altars reported in 1587 and now seen in its glory (and reproduced as an engraving by Cotton in *Britannia*). Netherhall is particularly interesting, both because of the exceptionally early start of this collection and because the family continued to value it and add to it, with local excavations in both the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Later accounts are thus available to update Senhouse's original display 'in the mids of his yard'. William Stukeley's early eighteenth-century visit is notable, and he observes 'the walls of the house are incrusted over, as we may say, with inscriptions, carvings and bas reliefs, taken from the ruins of the Roman city'[16] and

> A most stately altar is placed in the middle of the garden, with a sun-dial on the discus. Some are somewhat more securely set up within the porch: many given away . . . two altars lately

found are placed ypon a farm-house which is now commonly known by the name Volantium, falsely fixed upon this station: this is by the sea-side in Mr. Senhouse's demesnes. It is much to be lamented that these fine remains should now be exposed to the weather.[17]

John Horsley of Northumberland also observed this altar: 'This is still at Elenborough Hall in the middle of the garden with a sun-dial upon it.'[18] Today, there is still an altar showing the channel mark and lead let into the top to support the dial (Figure 3). In the nineteenth century, with many new altars discovered and added to the collection, many were stored around a canopied portico, and later in small railway station that was moved and became a summerhouse.

A third museum-garden was that assembled at Naworth Castle, in east Cumberland and a short distance south of the Wall, by Lord William Howard. Lord William was the third son of Thomas Howard, 4th Duke of Norfolk, who was executed in 1572. Through his wife, Lord William inherited part of the Dacre estates in Cumberland, but only gained possession in 1603–04. Howard was a keen antiquarian and scholar and established a library and 'cabinet' at Naworth, together with a garden-display of Roman antiquities from the Wall. This was collected in the years after 1603 and Camden acknowledges

Figure 2. Red sandstone altar to 'the Spirit of the Place', placed by John Senhouse 'in the mids of his yard' and much admired by Camden and Cotton on their visit in 1599; drawing from J. C. Bruce, *Lapidarium Septentrionale* (Newcastle upon Tyne, 1875). The altar is now in the British Museum.

Figure 3. Altar to Jupiter, used as a sundial in the garden at Netherhall, Maryport; drawing from Bruce, *Lapidarium Septentrionale*. The altar is now in the Senhouse Roman Museum, Maryport.

Howard's contributions in the 1607 edition of *Britannia*. The stones were displayed in the garden beside the castle. Howard's fellow antiquary Nicholas Roscarrock, a resident at the castle, wrote to Camden in August 1607 concerning an inscribed milestone:

> The seconde is an inscription which you have of the twoe Philippes, which you had at Thoresby [Thursby] in Cumberlande, in which you were misinformed, both for the fashion and forme of the stoane, being four tymes as longe as broade, though my Lord William, who hath it now with a greate many more in his garden-wall at Nawarde, where he woulde be gladde to see you to reede them, hath made yt shorter . . ..[19]

Howard himself wrote to his close friend Cotton in teasing style:

> For that I much feare I shall not this yeare see you in these extreame partes, I thought good to informe you in generall but not to mention any in particuler that I have gotten and know weare to have heere about me at least 12 stones, most of them faire inscriptions that you have not yett heard of, and your pennance shalbe to come your self and pick out the contents before you gett any knowledg of them.[20]

Howard probably assembled some twenty inscribed stones in his garden. In the early eighteenth century, Stukeley visited the site and noted: 'In the garden are many altars and inscriptions; I copied all these tolerably fair'. Horsley also noted: 'This with several others mentioning the same cohort are now in the garden at Naworth.'[21] He also observed: 'as in one of those in Naworth garden'; 'This stone is without the garden at Naworth, in a wall near the back door of it'; 'This is over the back door in the garden'; and 'This with the three [inscribed stones] following, are in the garden at Naworth'.[22] Of one inscription, Horsley commented that it 'is upon a very beautiful altar, that was standing in the walk with a sundial upon it. The letters having been so long exposed to the weather are now become very obscure, though yet discernible' (Figure 4).[23] He later writes

> Several of the curious inscriptions that are in this garden, have been very fortunately preserved in a great measure from the injuries of the weather by a laurel hedge, which grows against a wall, where they are placed. But many of them have been long exposed to the weather, and suffered greatly by that means. This has rendered them obscure and difficult to read, which has been the true reason, I believe, why several of them have not been published before.[24]

The fourth garden display of antiquities was that of Reginald Bainbrigg, Headmaster of the school at Appleby. Bainbrigg was a serious antiquarian in his own right and an important correspondent of Camden. He made important exploratory tours on Roman sites on and beyond the Wall and he supplied Camden with details of many inscriptions for the 1607 edition of *Britannia*.[25] At the school in Appleby, he both collected some original inscribed stones and made (or had made) some copies. Camden wrote in 1607: 'the Maister whereof is Reginald Bainbrige, a right learned man who governeth the same with great commendation; and who of his courtesie hath exemplified for me many antique inscriptions, and brought some hither into his garden'.[26] In a letter to Camden, Bainbrigg himself wrote that he had brought an inscription to Appleby, 'and in my house, for reason of the inscription, . . . I have erected it just now in the garden, where it can now be viewed'.[27] A century later, in 1722, Hayton, an assistant master at Appleby school, catalogued Bainbrigg's stones, recording twelve Roman stones, some of which were copies, together with several *jeux d'esprit* of Bainbrigg's own invention. Horsley also saw the remaining display, noting 'This is an altar found at the station near Kirby Thure or Whelp-castle. It is at present built up in the end of the old school-house at Appleby' (Figure 5).[28]

Figure 4. Altar to Jupiter found at Birdoswald on Hadrian's Wall and taken to Naworth, where Horsley saw it 'standing in the walk with a sun-dial upon it'. It was subsequently taken to Rokeby; drawing from Bruce, *Lapidarium Septentrionale*. The altar is now even more worn and is on display on the platform in the garden at Rokeby.

Figure 5. The Kirkby Thore altar discovered by Bainbrigg and reported to Camden; drawing in Bruce, *Lapidarium Septentrionale*. The alter is now very worn and remains in the wall in Chapel Street, Appleby.

In each of these English museum-gardens, the details of the layout of the display are largely unknown, but the same is true for Arundel's collection from the Mediterranean and for many of the Italian displays themselves. The significance lies in the existence of these collections, at this early date, and the ways gardens were used as the context for the display, with tombstones set in garden walls, or propped against the walls, and altars used as sundial bases and focal points.

THE FATE OF THE MUSEUM-GARDENS

The fate of most of these provincial museum-gardens is similar to the fate of many of the early collections and 'cabinets of curiosities': after the enthusiasm and interest of their original collectors, subsequent generations lost interest and the antiquities became neglected. As large and heavy objects, the Roman altars and tombstones 'walked' and vanished from sight less rapidly than more portable antiquities. However, in general, the story is not a happy one. Even Cotton's museum-garden became damaged and rundown

by the early eighteenth century, and in 1731, James West found the place ruined and desolate and the Roman stones broken and trodden under foot.[29] Shortly afterwards, Horsley reported: 'When I looked round me in that summer-house, and observed particularly the inscriptions which had been removed from our own country and neighbourhood, it gave me for some time a great deal of pleasure; tho' it was afterward much abated, by reflecting on the ruinous state both of the house and inscriptions.'[30] Items had gone missing, but in 1750 the surviving collection was given to Trinity College, Cambridge, where it was stored indoors in the entrance to the Wren Library.

Lord William Howard's Naworth collection also drew eighteenth-century laments. Stukeley visited, observing, 'With much regret I saw these noble monuments quite neglected and exposed; some cut in half to make gate-posts.'[31] The Howard family, in the persons of the Earls of Carlisle, showed little concern for their Naworth collection. When the 4th Earl's brother-in-law, Sir Thomas Robinson, started building his own collection of antiquities and statuary at Rokeby Park, North Yorkshire, during the late 1730s, the Howards gave him the bulk of the Naworth stones to display at Rokeby. In 1763, Richard Gough recorded the collection as 'preserved in a Museum built by Sir Thomas on purpose adjoining to his House',[32] but the Naworth stones later fell into disfavour as Robinson's successors, J. B. Morritt and his son, acquired more elegant antiquities from Greece, Italy and Turkey. In 1823, Thomas Whitaker described the Naworth collection as simply 'several stones in the back-yard of the house at Rokeby'.[33] He went on: 'These rude remains of Roman Britain . . . now remaining at Rokeby, are so completely thrown into the back-ground by the collection of Greek and Roman inscriptions, urns etc, in marble, brought by the taste of the present owner from Greece or Italy, that they are scarce likely to meet with the degree of attention to which from local circumstances they are entitled.'[34]

During the nineteenth century, at some date after 1823, the Naworth stones were restored to a more elegant, garden setting, with the altars set out on a stone platform on the lawns adjacent to the house. Here they were recognised and recorded by J. B. Bailey,[35] and they remain there today, not in their original Jacobean garden context at Naworth but still forming a type of museum-garden (Figure 6). As noted, not all the inscribed stones were taken from Naworth to Rokeby, and a few still survive in the garden walls at Naworth, so worn that it is very difficult to find and identity the stones as a now-illegible altar and a slab.

Bainbrigg's display in the school-garden at Appleby was also in some disarray by the time Horsley visited. He noted: 'Under this stone [a Bainbrigg inscription noted in *Britannia*] had been another inserted in the wall, whence the inscriptions at Appleby were taken, though now they are lying loose upon the ground', and 'I was told of two or three stones with inscriptions upon them, which the masons had lately destroyed at Appleby'.[36] More have vanished since then, but a number of very worn stones (including the Kirkby Thore altar), together with Bainbrigg's copies and made-up inscriptions, survive, built into a wall in Chapel Street, adjacent to the site of the old school (Figure 7).

Senhouse's collection at Ellenborough (or Netherhall, as the estate became known) has a rather different history. The Senhouse family line continued there for the following four hundred years and several generations showed interest in antiquities and archaeology. So, although there were undoubtedly long periods of neglect, the kernel of the collection survived and was added to, with significant excavations in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. By the nineteenth century, the display was largely around the portico and in a summerhouse. In 1990, a trust took over the collection and formed the Senhouse Roman

Figure 6. Roman altar display on a platform in the garden at Rokeby, June 2001. All altars originated in the early seventeenth-century collection of Lord William Howard at Naworth. The 'sundial' altar is in the centre of the display.

Museum, to display it indoors at the Sea-Battery next to the Roman fort.[37] No longer in a garden setting, the antiquities are finally protected from the Cumbrian elements, and the collection contains one of the original inscribed stones noted in the 1587 *Britannia*.[38]

FROM THE BORDER TO THE STRAND

These provincial museum-gardens have been introduced and described here as an alternative strand to the grander, cosmopolitan form of Arundel House and the King's gardens. However, the two strands were not separate, and the links between them need examination. Of course, both strands draw upon a common growth of interest in the classical world. But, chronologically, the provincial gardens, displaying 'indigenous' Roman antiquities, preceded the cosmopolitan gardens in England by at least a decade. The initial collections of Cotton, Senhouse and Bainbrigg date from the last decade of Elizabeth I, that of Lord William Howard from the early years of James I, whereas Arundel's collections date from 1614 onwards. If there is a direct connection, it has to be from the provincial and indigenous to the cosmopolitan and imported.

That connection comes through the actors involved: Cotton, Camden and Howard. The connection of these three to Lord Arundel is well known, but it is worth recalling briefly in the present context. Cotton and Camden were central figures in London-based scholarly circles. Sir Robert was active in numerous aspects of Jacobean political and intellectual life.[39] Among these activities, he acted as adviser to the younger Lord Arundel, developing his antiquarian knowledge and tastes. Thus, Mary Hervey, in her study of Arundel, notes 'Sir Robert Cotton was perhaps the most intimate of Lord Arundel's

Figure 7. Part of the 'Bainbrigg Collection' in the Chapel Street wall, Appleby, June 2001. The now-indecipherable Kirkby Thore altar is in the lower row, second left. Lower row, far right, is the careful copy of the Brougham milestone. Most of the stones are copies or *jeux d'esprit* made for Bainbrigg, and variations in the standard of lettering are still very apparent; perhaps some of the crudest were Bainbrigg's own attempts.

literary friends' and 'Arundel relied much on his judgement'.[40] Camden was the elder statesman of antiquarian studies and, as such, was asked to draft Latin inscriptions to be placed over the entrance to the sculpture gallery at Arundel House.[41] Howard was both Lord Arundel's uncle and brother-in-law to Lord Arundel's mother (the two sisters were the joint heiresses of the Dacre estates). He often resided at Arundel House when in London and became a close confident of his nephew.[42]

The interests and scholarship of these three thus had a formative influence on the younger Lord Arundel. This he was able, and inclined, to develop in foreign rather than national directions. But this simply gave them a widening field to be involved in. It became a two-way connection. When Arundel's agent, William Petty, sent the 'Arundel Marbles' with their Greek inscriptions back to England in 1627, it was Cotton who first saw them, and he was so excited that he hurried off to Selden late in the night and set up a dawn meeting in the gardens at Arundel House.[43] Indeed, the connection may be even more intertwined, for Howarth has speculated that Petty in his youth may have known Bainbrigg, though there is no direct evidence of this.[44] Whatever the truth of this specific acquaintance, the patterns of connections — and their sequencing — do confirm Sharpe's suggestion of a significant link between antiquarian scholarship in England and the beginnings of an aesthetic interest in collecting Roman statuary.[45] Thus, the garden

displays of Arundel House and the royal gardens should be seen not only as modelled on Italian examples, but also as partly inspired by antiquarian activities within England and by the example of the provincial museum-gardens examined here.

CONCLUSIONS

After Camden's time, in the later seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the same process of collection, and then more systematic excavation, led to other museum-gardens in the North and elsewhere. But the Elizabethan and early Jacobean gardens studied here were the pioneering examples and, although generally they make poor aesthetic companions to the Arundel Roman statuary or the Arundel Marbles in the Ashmolean Museum, they are of comparable historical significance and perhaps greater national significance. Whatever one's judgement on them — and there is no necessity to make such comparisons — these Elizabethan and Jacobean museum-gardens deserve a place in the history of the English garden.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author is grateful to Sir Andrew Morritt, the owner of Rokeby, for allowing a visit Rokeby and to photograph the Roman altars in the grounds; to the Trustees of the Senhouse Roman Museum for inviting the author to give the Camden Lecture there in September 2000, which gave an opportunity to view and discuss the Senhouse collection; and to Dr Jan Woudstra and referees for their helpful comments on an earlier draft of the paper.

REFERENCES

[1] M. L. Gothein, *A History of Garden Art* (London: J. M. Dent, 1928); Sir Roy Strong, *The Renaissance Garden* (London: Thames & Hudson, 1979); John D. Hunt, 'Curiosities to adorn cabinets and gardens', in *The Origins of Museums: The Cabinet of Curiosities in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century Europe*, eds Oliver Impey and Arthur MacGregor (Oxford: Clarendon, 1985), 193–203; *idem*, *Garden and Grove: The Italian Renaissance Garden and the English Imagination* (London: J. M. Dent, 1986). The Venetian museum-gardens are described in Krzysztof Pomian, *Collectors and Curiosities: Paris and Venice, 1500–1800* (Cambridge: Polity, 1990), 78–98.

[2] For Theobalds and Nonsuch, see Elizabeth Woodhouse, 'Spirit of the Elizabethan garden', *Garden History*, 27 (1999), 10–32; and *The Diary of Baron Waldstein*, trans. and annotated G. W. Groos (London: Thames & Hudson, 1981), 157, 87. Also Hunt, *Garden and Grove*, 103–9.

[3] David Howarth, *Lord Arundel and His Circle* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1985). Also *idem*, *Images of Rule: Art and Politics in the English Renaissance, 1485–1649* (London: Macmillan, 1997).

[4] D. E. L. Haynes, *The Arundel Marbles* (Oxford: Visitors of [the] Ashmolean Museum, 1975).

[5] Quotation in Hunt, *Garden and Grove*, 81.

[6] On Camden and his significance, see, among others, R. Helgerson, *Forms of Nationhood: The Elizabethan Writing of England* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992); T. D. Kendrick, *British Antiquity* (London: Methuen, 1950); G. Parry, *The Trophies of Time: English Antiquarians of the Seventeenth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995); Stuart Piggott, 'William Camden and the *Britannia*', *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 37 (1951), 199–217; William Rockett, 'The structural plan of Camden's *Britannia*', *Seventeenth Century Journal*, 26 (1995), 829–41; *idem*, 'Historical topography and British history in Camden's *Britannia*', *Renaissance and Reformation*, 26 (1990), 7–80; and Hugh Trevor-Roper, *Queen Elizabeth's First Historian: William Camden and the Beginnings of English Civil History* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1971).

[7] On Cotton's various collections (inscriptions, coins, manuscripts), see C. J. Wright (ed.), *Sir Robert Cotton as Collector: Essays on an Early Stuart Courier and his Legacy* (London: British Library, 1997). Two essays review Cotton's collection of Roman inscriptions: David McKitterick, 'From Camden to Cambridge: Sir Robert Cotton's Roman inscriptions, and their subsequent treatment', 105–28; and Glenys Davies, 'Sir Robert Cotton's collection of Roman stones: a catalogue and a commentary', 129–67.

[8] Leslie Hepple, 'Sir Robert Cotton, Camden's *Britannia*, and the early history of Roman Wall studies', *Archaeologia Aeliana*, 5th ser., 27 (1999), 1–19.

[9] Leslie Hepple, 'William Camden and early collections of Roman antiquities in England', *Journal of the History of Collections* (submitted).

[10] Horace Walpole to William Cole, 13 March 1780; W. S. Lewis (ed.), *Horace Walpole's*

Correspondence with the Rev. William Cole (Oxford, 1937), II, 204.

[11] William Camden, *Britannia*, 5th edn (London, 1600), 706.

[12] The stones were moved to a garden soon after discovery, but the quotation comes from John Horsley, *Britannia Romana* (London, 1732), 326.

[13] British Library Add. MS 29936 f.40. This is part of volume XII of the sketches, for the counties of Huntingdon, Northampton and Kent. The drawing is also discussed in McKitterick, 'From Camden to Cambridge', 119.

[14] William Camden, *Britannia*, 7th edn (London, 1610), 500.

[15] Camden, *Britannia* (1610), 769.

[16] William Stukeley, *Iter Boreale (northern tour of 1725), published posthumously in Itinerarium Curiosum*, 2nd edn (London, 1776), 49.

[17] Ibid., 50.

[18] Horsley, *Britannia Romana*, 279.

[19] British Library: Cotton Julius C. v. 77. On Roscarrock and his role at Naworth, see Nicholas Orme, *Nicholas Roscarrock's Lives of the Saints: Cornwall and Devon*, n.s., vol. 35 (Devon and Cornwall Record Society, 1992), 1–17.

[20] Quoted in Hepple, 'Sir Robert Cotton', 11.

[21] Horsley, *Britannia Romana*, 254.

[22] Ibid., 257 (all four quotations).

[23] Ibid., 254.

[24] Ibid., 255.

[25] F. Haverfield, 'Cotton Iulius F. VI. Notes on Reginald Bainbrigg of Appleby, and on William Camden and some Roman inscriptions', *Transactions of the Cumberland and Westmorland Archaeological Society*, ser. 2, 11 (1911), 343–78.

[26] Camden, *Britannia* (1610), 761.

[27] Haverfield, 'Cotton Iulius F. VI', 360 (original letter in Latin; present author's translation).

[28] Horsley, *Britannia Romana*, 298.

[29] McKitterick, 'From Camden to Cambridge', 118.

[30] Horsley, *Britannia Romana*, 182.

[31] Stukeley, *Iter Boreale*, 58.

[32] Bodleian MS Top. Gen. e.25, Gough's Tours, volume X: 'Warwick to York', f.279.

[33] Thomas D. Whitaker, *A History of Richmondshire in the North Riding of the County of York* (York, 1823), I, 150.

[34] Whitaker, *History of Richmondshire*, 184.

[35] J. B. Bailey, 'Lost and re-found Roman altars', *Transactions of the Cumberland and Westmorland Archaeological Society*, 1st ser., 16 (1899), 138–45.

[36] Horsley, *Britannia Romana*, 297 (both quotations).

[37] For the current collection and display, see *A Guide to the Netherhall Collection* (Maryport: Senhouse Roman Museum, 1998). Other surveys of the Maryport discoveries and the collection are: J. B. Bailey, 'A catalogue of the Roman inscribed and sculptured stones, coins, earthenware, etc., discovered in and near the Roman fort at Maryport, and preserved at Netherhall', *Transactions of the Cumberland and Westmorland Archaeological Society*, ser. 2, 15 (1915), 135–72; and Michael G. Jarrett, *Maryport, Cumbria: A Roman Fort and its Garrison* (Kendal: Titus Wilson, 1976).

[38] The other 1587 altar, the finer of the two and the one Camden and Cotton enthused about, is now in the British Museum.

[39] Keith Sharpe, *Sir Robert Cotton* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979).

[40] Mary F. S. Hervey, *The Life, Correspondence & Collections of Thomas Howard, Earl of Arundel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1921), 138 (both quotations).

[41] Howarth, *Lord Arundel*, 2.

[42] Hervey, *The Life, Correspondence*, 137–8.

[43] Ibid., 280–1.

[44] Howarth, *Lord Arundel*, 127–48.

[45] Kevin Sharpe, 'Introduction: rewriting Sir Robert Cottons', in Wright, *Sir Robert Cotton as Collector*, 1–39 (on p. 7).