CHAPTER 7

Collecting Knowledge: Annotated Material in the Library of Sir Hans Sloane

Alison Walker

1 Introduction: The Afterlife of Collections

The title of this volume emphasises that collections commonly undergo metamorphoses, or even rebirths: not static, they pass in whole or in part from one owner to the next, their significance variously changing according to use, location and context. An "archival afterlife" implies that this significance continues to be recognised by owners and users—whether individual or institutional—long after the creation of the collection. It does not necessarily mean, however, that all collections of documents, books or objects of long-term significance can be described by the specialised term of "archives." Collections of printed books rarely fall into this category, but in the case of heavily annotated material there can be a fine line between print and manuscript—one which even the original collector may find difficult to draw, or may consider unnecessary.[1] Within collections of printed material, items with marks or annotations made by owners or readers have a special kind of afterlife, reflecting the ways these marks are created and valued by their various owners, and often recording the transmission of knowledge from owner to owner.

Collections of printed material may show a variety of forms of marking and annotation. There may be reading notes, or simply marks on the page,

BL = British Library

BM = British Museum

ODNB = *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004–2016)

PROB = Records of the Prerogative Court of Canterbury

1 Sir Hans Sloane's manuscripts and printed material were numbered and stored separately, but a small number of heavily annotated items were classed as manuscripts, and continued to be so after accession by the British Museum. Some of these have now been moved to the printed collections. Sloane sometimes moved books from a manuscript number to a printed books number and vice versa; see www.bl.uk/catalogues/sloane, searching on Sloane number range MsA to MsD.

 | DOI 10.1163/9789004324305_009

indicating attention paid to the text. There may be references to other material read earlier, accounts of events or experiences, additions to, or comments on, the printed text, or expansions of the text in the light of the user's experience. In Sir Hans Sloane's library there are examples where empty space on the page, and blank interleaved pages, have been used by earlier owners to record case notes, medical remedies, or the location of botanical specimens found, and some where the books even hold the specimens themselves. All these additions to the printed text, and the collocation with similarly annotated material, can transmute print into archive.

Libraries are typically extremely rich repositories of knowledge, incorporating not only texts but also the products of the reader's experience. Often, however, library catalogues mask this, partly through the practice of simply indicating that a book contains "ms notes." There is far more to it than this. This essay will use a small number of case studies of material in Sloane's collection to show how "manuscript notes" can conceal a great variety of types of annotation, including some of those mentioned above. It will suggest that the accumulation and collocation of text and notes often creates a whole much larger and more significant than the parts, allowing information to become transmuted into knowledge.

2 Sir Hans Sloane: Collector of Knowledge

The aim of the collector in acquiring annotated copies may vary according to his scholarly or personal desires, the existing content of his collection, the opportunity offered by a brief period of availability of material or the unexpected availability of previously unknown material, and of course the content of the annotations. In the case of Sir Hans Sloane, all of these may have come into play at different times. Overall, however, he can be said to be collecting knowledge, that is, information, or facts, enriched, enhanced and given value by their context, and by their user's understanding. The acquisition of books annotated by previous owners who have already transformed information into knowledge creates multiple layers, as successive owners lay down their own evidence of usage, further adding to the significance of the original text, and building up a series of overlaid personal experiences of it.

His library was very large, and part of one of the most important scientific collections of the age. Built up over his long life (1660–1753) and career as a physician, his library functioned both as a collection in its own right, and as background and support for his collections of objects. The number of his volumes of books, manuscripts and prints were estimated in 1753 at 50,000.

Together with over 47,000 objects and specimens and approximately 23,000 coins, they became the foundation collection of the British Museum (BM).[2] Most of his library is still at the British Library (BL), but was never kept in the order in which he arranged it, and is now scattered throughout the older parts of the collection. Further dispersing the collection, several thousand volumes were disposed of as duplicates between 1769 and 1831. The Sloane Printed Books Project,[3] based at the British Library, is working to identify books from this dispersed library. Most of the items identified so far are located at the BL. The bibliographical database is enriched with copy-specific information, including evidence of previous ownership and the presence of manuscript notes. This provides a rich source of evidence for the afterlife of collections, and can be used to illustrate the survival, through sequences of ownership, of the scientific and medical knowledge which is the strength of Sloane's collection.

The number of annotated books in this collection has only been revealed by the copy-in-hand examination of his library undertaken by project staff since 2008.[4] Over 39000 bibliographical items from among Sloane's estimated 45000 printed volumes have now been identified. Over 1800 books contain annotations, of greater or lesser significance.[5] Some are significant either in their extent or by association with the person who wrote them or the person who owned the book. Others are by unidentified previous owners of the text, so remain anonymous. Others again are very slight and reveal only small traces of the writer's experience or intentions.

The selection of material from Sloane's library examined here comprises case studies which focus on annotated copies which do reveal something of

2 Arthur MacGregor, "The life, character and career of Sir Hans Sloane," in *Sir Hans Sloane, collector, scientist, antiquary, founding father of the British Museum*, ed. Arthur MacGregor (London: British Museum Press, 1994), 28–9.

3 www.bl.uk/catalogues/sloane. The database can be searched by previous owner for fuller details of items referred to in this article.

4 The various marks which identify Sloane's books are illustrated in Alison Walker, 'Sir Hans Sloane's printed books in the British Library; their identification and associations,' in *Libraries within the Library*, ed. Giles Mandelbrote and Barry Taylor (London: British Library, 2009), 89–97, and in the introduction to the database.

5 William H. Sherman, *Used Books: Marking Readers in Renaissance England* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008), 5, notes that just over 20% of the STC collection at the Huntington Library contain manuscript notes. On the face of it, Sloane's collections would seem to be much less heavily annotated, but in certain subject areas there is a high concentration of books with manuscript notes. It is also likely that not all his annotated books have yet been identified.

the writer or owner, outlining the earlier life of some collections, and showing some of the ways in which Sloane valued and acquired this annotated material.

Sloane was a life-long collector. His earliest dated acquisitions of books, two pharmacopoeias and a work on botany, are from 1680, when he was a 20-year old student. In 1682 he was buying books in London, including a handful of medical titles at the sale of the library of Richard Smyth, sold at auction that year.[6] Between 1683 and 1684 he continued his studies in France, staying at Paris, Montpellier and Toulouse, buying books in each of these cities. Accessions to his library continued until his death in 1753. In his later years, he acquired a reputation for omnivorous or indiscriminate collecting, to the extent that he was viewed as a toyman or charlatan,[7] though it is clear from his later library catalogue volumes that he also continued to build on existing strengths and interests. However, his earlier collecting career, up to 1700, shows a great deal of focus on all aspects of medicine, natural history and science. There is evidence of his personal involvement in the selection and management of material: indeed, until 1700 he wrote the catalogues of his collections himself: later, he employed a number of amanuenses to catalogue his books.[8] While never excluding objects of great beauty or value, his principal interest in this early period was in collecting material which supported and expanded his work in science and medicine.

Most of the material described here was acquired early in Sloane's collecting career. It is natural that as a student and young practitioner he should have been attracted by other scientific and medical collections, and have made significant acquisitions from the libraries of his predecessors and peers in these fields. Among these are a number of books bearing marks of ownership and evidence of the collection's organisation, or textual annotations by their earlier owners. "Clean" copies would certainly have been available, had he preferred these, but in contrast to many collectors, he seems not to have sought only

6 Smyth, Richard, Secondary of the Poultry Compter, *Bibliotheca Smithiana: sive Catalogus librorum ... quos multo cærc* [*sic*] *sibi comparavit ... Richardus Smith Londinensis. Horum auctio habebitur Londini ... Maii die 15. 1682, etc.* [London, 1682]. BL 11906.e.29. Few MS. notes [of prices].

7 Barbara M. Benedict, "Collecting Trouble: Sir Hans Sloane's Literary Reputation in Eighteenth-Century Britain," *Eighteenth century Life* 36.2 (2012): 111–142; Barbara M. Benedict, "From benefactor to entrepreneur, Sloane's literary reputation 1685–1800," in *From Books to Bezoars: Sir Hans Sloane and his Collections*, ed. Alison Walker, Michael Hunter, Arthur MacGregor (London: British Library, 2012), 41–47.

8 Amy Blakeway, "The Library Catalogues of Sir Hans Sloane: Their Authors, Organization, and Functions," *The Electronic British Library Journal* (2011), Article 16, accessed April 17, 2017 http://www.bl.uk/eblj/2011articles/article16.html.

the pristine text, elaborately bound, preserved and possibly unread. Sloane's choices imply that he valued copies annotated by previous owners, especially in the areas of his own professional and scientific activities. In both Sloane's library and others of the period, certain subjects can be found to be quite commonly annotated, often in interleaved copies, reflecting the type of active reading such topics attracted. Medicine, botany and legal works are very frequently annotated. The acquisition of annotated copies does seem to have been a feature of Sloane's early career both as a physician and as a collector. Of the 1824 items posted by a search on the Sloane database for "ms notes", 90% were printed before 1700. Of course, not all were acquired before 1700, but it is certainly an indication that he was acquiring annotated material actively at this period.

The number of previous owners whose books ended up in Sloane's library, as identified by inscriptions in the books, is over 1100. Some of these owners are well-known either as scientists or as collectors. He acquired substantial parts of the libraries of Robert Hooke (1635–1703), natural philosopher; Francis Bernard (1628–1698), apothecary and physician; James Petiver (1665–1718), botanist; Leonard Plukenet (1642–1708), botanist; Edward Sherburne (1616–1692), translator and poet; Walter Charleton (1620–1707), physician and natural philosopher; and William Courten (1642–1702), naturalist and collector. Later acquisitions included considerable numbers of books from the library of Jean-Baptiste Colbert (1619–1683), French politician, whose books were sold in 1728, and Engelbert Kaempfer (1651–1716), German naturalist, physician and traveller.[9]

In other cases, only a few books from notable libraries reached Sloane, such as those of Sir Theodore Turquet de Mayerne (1573–1655), royal physician; Herman Boerhaave (1668 –1738), Dutch botanist and physician; John Dee (1527–1609), mathematician, astrologer, and antiquary; and Constantijn Huygens (1596–1687), Dutch poet and composer, father of the scientist Christiaan Huygens.

Naturally, not all people who leave interesting marks in their books are well-known, and conversely, significant owners such as those above often leave no more than their name in their books. Many annotators are anonymous, unidentified or unidentifiable. Their annotations can still be valuable examples of the ways in which people thought about and managed knowledge, and of the kind of knowledge that was valued by Sloane. Indeed, we might be glad

9 See Hamish Todd, "Kaempfer's cat," *Asian and African Studies Blog,* British Library, February 19, 2016. Accessed March 31, 2018. http://britishlibrary.typepad.co.uk/asian-and-african/2016/02/kaempfers-cat.html.

now if Sloane himself had written more in his books as it could have helped us to a better understanding of him as a scientist, but he only rarely wrote in his own books, usually to identify or remark upon an author, or to comment on the circumstances of his acquisition.

Medicine and botany were great strengths of Sloane's collection. As noted above, many practitioners in these fields did annotate their books, and it should not be surprising that Sloane acquired many. He owned many annotated copies of classical medical authors: his library contained at least 210 editions of Galen, of which 68 have manuscript notes; 274 of Hippocrates, 49 with notes; 26 editions of Dioscorides, 7 with notes; 17 editions of Celsus, 6 with notes; 226 editions of Aristotle, 32 with notes.[10] In the great majority of cases, the annotators have not been identified, either from names inscribed in the books, or by identification of the hand. He also had significant numbers of botanical works with manuscript notes relating to specimens. Among these the works of John Ray stand out: of 33 works held by Sloane, 20 have manuscript notes. A more general search of the database for works containing the word "plantarum" finds 228 books, of which 67 have notes. The majority of these annotators are not identified.

Despite the anonymity of so many writers, there is nevertheless a huge wealth of stories to be told from the afterlives within Sloane's collection. The selection of material discussed here illustrates some of the types of evidence it encapsulates. Firstly, evidence of ownership and inheritance, through a brief look at the afterlife of two medical collections; secondly, notes left by practitioners in a particular genre which Sloane actively collected, annotated pharmacopoeias, and finally a number of books owned by a medical practitioner which combine the two themes of inheritance and professional annotations.

3 Joseph Fenton's Library: A Ready-Made Working Collection

The first case study looks at the library of Joseph Fenton. Born circa 1565/70, he was a surgeon who practised at St Bartholomew's in London, where he was a colleague of William Harvey, until his death in 1634.[11] All his books, papers, and his surgical instruments were inherited by his grandson Joseph Colston or

10 The figures given here are derived from searches of the Sloane Printed Books database (www.bl.uk/catalogues/sloane) in March 2016. As the database grows or is amended, the numbers will change.

11 Norman Moore, *The History of St. Bartholomew's Hospital* (2 vols., London: C A Pearson, 1918), vol. 2, 615.

Coleston.[12] Fenton's will[13] expressly leaves his grandson not only his medical books but also those on grammar, philosophy and "other books whatsoever." He "pray[s] God to blesse and prosper him in his studies, for his mother's sake I am thus kinde to him." Colston continued the family's medical tradition, being admitted an Honorary Fellow of the College of Physicians in December, 1664. He died childless in 1675.[14]

Sloane seems to have acquired the bulk of Fenton's library in 1686, a few years after Colston's death, and despite the reference in Fenton's will to books of grammar and philosophy, his acquisitions were mostly medical. At this stage in Sloane's collecting career, he usually recorded the date and price of purchase in code on the title page or a preliminary leaf.[15] Many books bear Sloane's acquisition date 1686, along with Fenton's signature and/or motto, the definitive proof of his ownership.[16] Some, of course, have lost parts of the evidence of ownership and acquisition through the processes of binding and rebinding.[17] Nevertheless, over 340 books from Fenton's library can be traced in Sloane's collection. The exact means of Sloane's acquisition remains unknown: there is no record of an auction of the library, suggesting it may have been sold through a bookseller, or as a private purchase.

The date of Sloane's principal acquisitions from Fenton's collection can be traced through his first library catalogue, now BL Sloane MS 3995, a small notebook which starts with the heading "A catalogue of my books taken in February 1684/5 in London." He carefully recorded the cost of each item, with a running total at the foot of each page. By the end of the section covering 1685, 307 volumes are listed. On fol. 37v he started another list, headed "1686" and it is here that many books from Fenton's library are listed. By the time he stopped using this catalogue, in 1687, it listed 2700 books and volumes of manuscripts.[18]

12 David Pearson, "Joseph Fenton and his books," *Medical History* 47 (2003): 239–248.

13 National Archives, PROB 11/165/165, 12 February 1634.

14 See *Lives of the Fellows*, Royal College of Physicians, accessed April 17, 2017, http://munksroll.rcplondon.ac.uk/Biography/Details/936; *A Cambridge Alumni Database*, University of Cambridge, accessed April 17, 2017, http://venn.lib.cam.ac.uk/.

15 Illustrated in http://www.bl.uk/catalogues/sloane/Identifiers.aspx.

16 A representative title page with Fenton's signature and motto is illustrated in Pearson, "Joseph Fenton and his Books."

17 Sloane appears to have kept many items unbound, as evidenced by dirt still present on titlepages. The British Museum typically grouped and bound such material by subject, often with the loss of endleaves and evidence of provenance. Many have since been rebound at least once.

18 Around 1692 Sloane began a new catalogue, now BL Sloane MS 3972C,D, which continued in use unti his death in 1753. Latin medical books were listed separately in an interleaved copy of Joannes Antonides van der Linden, *Lindenius renovatus* (Norimbergæ, 1686).

In the period covered by Sloane MS 3995, his acquisitions were mostly in support of his studies in medicine and botany. The attraction of Fenton's library is clear: it offered a ready-made collection of medical classics, perfect for study and reference. Possibly too medical texts would have been a useful resource for his posting as physician to the Duke of Albemarle in Jamaica between 1686 and 1688, either to carry with him or to prepare for his duties. Sloane seems to have bought most of the library, but not all, since scattered Fenton books are to be found in other medical collections. Nor were all of Sloane's acquisitions bought in 1686: a few have purchase codes from the 1690s, probably acquired from other owners. 344 Fenton/Sloane books have now been identified at the British Library, and some 60 Fenton books in other collections. The library may have consisted of around 500 volumes.[19] The kinds of books Sloane acquired from Fenton's library continued to be strengths of his collecting throughout his career: the Greek, Roman and Arabic classic writers, such as Hippocrates, Celsus, Galen, Avicenna, and Rhasis, as well as later authors whose works became standards, including Du Chesne, Gesner, Riolan, and Fabricius.

Fenton did make notes in his books, certainly more than Sloane did, and in general they relate to his reading, being marginal notes recording an attentive reading of the text. The few exceptions, found on preliminary leaves rather than in the text, are usually references to other authors, or to sections in the text at hand. Unusually, there is an interesting list of his books on surgery, "A note of all the Bookes of Chyrurgerye that I have in my Studye,"[20] which is the nearest we have to a catalogue of Fenton's books. Unfortunately very little detail of the editions is given and only a few are identifiable.

The value for Sloane may have lain partly in Fenton's notes, which could have been a potential bibliographical resource, but principally it lay in the content of his library, an excellent collection of medical classics. Fenton had sought to ensure that his library had an afterlife in the hands of his grandson, and it acquired a later afterlife with Sloane in support of his professional education and as a core component of his medical library. Even further down the line, when Sloane reorganised his library in the 1690s he sent many duplicates, including Fenton copies, to the Bodleian Library. The reach of Fenton's legacy thus extends in time and scope far beyond what he could have foreseen.

19 Fenton used a system which placed books by size and numbered each shelf. The figure of 500 volumes is a rough estimate based on the apparent capacity of the shelves and the maximum number per shelf located so far. A more extensive article on Fenton's library is in preparation by the current author.

20 On a preliminary leaf of his copy of Eustachius Rudius, *De affectib. externarum corporis humani partium libri septem* (Venetiis, 1606). BL 548.l.3.

The authors which Sloane bought from Fenton continued to be a collecting interest throughout his life. He later recorded his ambition to update Johannes Antonides van der Linden's 1686 medical bibliography *Lindenius renovatus*,[21] by adding to the corpus texts and editions collected by him but not listed there.[22] The acquisition of a large library of medical literature early in Sloane's career could well have fuelled his interest in medical bibliography and appealed to his already established collecting habit. By 1725 he was able to note proudly in his annotated copy of *Lindenius renovatus* that he had effectively doubled the number of authors of medical works originally listed by van der Linden.[23] The afterlife of Fenton's library thus proved to be of some significance within the larger collection that Sloane built up, and may have influenced the direction taken by the collector.

4 Henry Stanley's Library: The Library of a Chemical Physician

Many of the same medical authors figure among Sloane's acquisitions from the library of Henry Stanley. Educated at Oxford and Padua, Stanley became a Fellow of the College of Physicians in 1649, and died in 1671.[24] It seems that a relatively small part of Stanley's library ended up in Sloane's collection. A few more of his

21 Joannes Antonides van der Linden, *Lindenius renovatus, sive J. van der L. … de scriptis medicis libri duo: … addita plurimorum authorum … vitæ curriculorum succincta descriptione: … continuati, … amplificati, … et … purgati a G. A. Mercklino* (Norimbergæ, 1686).

22 This is explained in the introduction to the second volume of his *Voyage to Jamaica* (London, 1725): "In *van der Linden de Scriptis Medicis* put forth by *Mercklin* in 1687 [sic] are 3937 Authors, to which in my Library are added 3734, all such as have in Greek or Latin treated of the Medical Art, Natural History, Chymistry, Anatomy, *&c.* which are come to my knowledge; so that my Library consists of 7671 Greek and Latin Physical Authors, besides a great Number of Latin Books publish'd by the Authors already mentioned in *Mercklin's van der Linden*, and Editions, not taken Notice of by him, and other Physical Books publish'd in the *European* Languages. An Account of all these may perhaps be given hereafter by myself; or by some-body else from the Things themselves, and the Memoirs left with them, which I hope may be for the Benefit of Mankind."

23 BL 878.n.8, vol. 8, first unnumbered leaf. Sloane notes that van der Linden had listed 3937 works, and he had added a further 3734.

24 Munk's Roll describes him thus: "b.? d.24 February 1671 MD Padua(1637) MD Oxon(1641) LRCP(1646) FRCP(1649) Henry Stanley, MD, was the son of Henry Stanley of Chichester, gent, by his wife Ann, daughter of William Madgick of Southampton, gent, and was educated at New college, Oxford; but was a doctor of medicine of Padua of 10th July, 1637; incorporated on that degree at Oxford 2nd April, 1641. He was admitted a Licentiate of the College of Physicians 3rd July, 1646; a Candidate 22nd December, 1646; and a

books have been identified through the British Armorial Bindings database,[25] bearing various forms of Stanley's crest. The Victoria and Albert Museum has a few, as do the Bodleian Library, Oxford, and Cambridge University Library. Probably there are many more scattered, unrecognised, perhaps having lost the owner's binding mark, but since Stanley punctiliously recorded the bindings he commissioned, we may assume that most of the books in his library bore his crest. Stanley cared for the outward appearance of his books, and indeed shows all the characteristics of a book collector. He recorded his purchase and its binding, occasionally also noting the provenance of his copy: several were said to come from the library of a Dr John Moore. He noted whether the book was bought in sheets, its cost, and what he paid for the binding, or what he paid for embellishment to an existing binding, and remarked on improved editions. He noted, for example, of Bernardus de Gordonio, *Opus Lilium Medicinae*, 1574, "I have this in a later & better edition Frankfurt 1617."[26]

His library was almost certainly larger and probably more varied than Fenton's. Most of the books have an alphanumeric mark, almost certainly a shelfmark, in Stanley's hand, consisting of a letter and two numbers, e.g. M.7.5. It starts with folio volumes, such as B.2.2–3, an expensive 1619 edition of Aristotle for which Stanley paid £2 plus 3s 6d for "filleting," embellishment of the binding, and ends with octavos and duodecimos at the end of the alphabet. If it can be assumed that the letter represents a bay of bookshelves, the first number a shelf and the second a number on the shelf, there is a system which identifies the place of each book.[27] In itself, this type of tripartite numbering system: bay, shelf, place on shelf, is not uncommon- indeed, the British Museum Library followed the same type of scheme. It allows us to posit that this must have been a substantial library, though at present only 48 items from the collection have been identified.

Fellow 7th December, 1649. He was Censor in 1653 and 1669. Dying 24th February, 1671, he was buried at Little Gadesden, co Herts, where there is a monument with the following inscription: Henr: Stanley, MD celeberrimi utriusque Coll: Novi primum in Univ: Oxon: Medicorum deinde in civitate Lond: ob: 24 Feb: 1671. Dr Stanley bequeathed to the College fifty pounds, which was received 1st October, 1672."

25 *British Armorial Bindings*, University of Toronto Libraries, https://armorial.library.utoronto.ca/.

26 BL 773.b.18, blank preliminary leaf.

27 On the basis of the shelfmarking system, some calculations can be made about the size of the library, say 24 bays, each with up to 10 shelves, and up to 14 books (for the smaller categories) per shelf, which gives a maximum of 3360 volumes. The realistic total is likely to be fewer, given that folio and quarto books would require fewer shelves per bay and fewer items per shelf.

Stanley's texts are not heavily annotated, but his concern to record acquisition and provenance prefigures his later efforts to ensure that his library continued an afterlife. His nephew Dr Nicholas Stanley, also a medical practitioner, was willed not only his uncle's books and papers but the book presses and other library furniture, his doctor's gowns and cap, the drugs and medicinal preparations and all the equipment used in his "Repository," which seems to have been a laboratory in his house. Among the equipment were furnaces, vessels, instruments used for distillation and other chymical operations and pharmaceutical preparations, together with his mathematical and surgical instruments.[28] Such details tell us much about Stanley's medical style. Stanley must have been a wealthy man, and made other bequests to medical persons and organisations. He was certainly concerned that his nephew should continue his work as a chemical physician. Nicholas Stanley became a successful practitioner in Winchester, and died in 1687. His son, also Nicholas, at one time a Fellow of All Souls, Oxford, continued in practice at Winchester, and died in 1710. His grandson, a third Nicholas, graduated from Oxford in 1713. It seems likely that some of Henry Stanley's library stayed in the family, its final dispersal coming at auction in 1722.[29] However, the auction catalogue contains a relatively small proportion of medical works for a physician's library: only 257 out of 889 lots are medical books. Possibly this is the rump of the library, since most of Sloane's copies, nearly all medical books, were bought in 1697, and were presumably disposed of by Stanley's great-nephew.

Again, Sloane's purchases cover medical classics, Aristotle, Hippocrates, Riolan, Sebisch, Sennert, and a few more recent authors. He also acquired some non-medical books, including an edition of Rabelais' (himself a physician) *Gargantua and Pantagruel* of 1605. On the whole, though, Sloane's approach to Stanley's library follows the pattern of classics and working texts established in his purchases from Fenton's library, already perhaps inspired by his nascent ambitions to update Lindenius, and thus a "collector's choice."

These two case studies represent examples of medical professionals who were also collectors, organisers, who valued the literature of classical medicine, and sought to ensure the survival of their libraries by passing them to persons who would value and use them. This should sound familiar, because this is exactly what Sloane himself did, in ensuring his collection remained intact

28 National Archives PROB/11/338/383, 26 March 1672.

29 *Catalogus bibliothecæ viri eruditissimi H. Stanley, M.D., or a Catalogue of the Library of the learned Dr Henry Stanley, which will begin to be sold at Dick's Coffee house, 12th Feb, 1722/23,* (London, [1723]).

and available for study after his death.[30] The afterlife of their collections, and the preservation of the knowledge embodied in the context of the collection was of great importance to all three men.

5 Annotated Pharmacopoeias: Collecting Archives of Practice

Next, pharmacopoeias, a body of material collected extensively by Sloane, but acquired from a variety of different sources rather than a single previous owner, and typically containing a very different type of annotation. Pharmacopoeias were produced in many European cities from the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century as an important mechanism for the local and national regulation of medicinal products: Sloane had copies from Augsburg, Messina, Blois, Amsterdam, Leiden, Paris, Lille, Brussels, Utrecht, Stockholm, Bordeaux, Edinburgh, Strasbourg, and many others, including, of course, London.[31] It is no surprise that he should have owned so many of these, given his interest in collecting medical texts, nor is it surprising that many owners should have annotated their copies. Indeed, the standard format, consisting of short, well-spaced lists of medicinal ingredients and formulations, lent itself perfectly to the addition of notes about the content or the writer's medical practice. Many copies were interleaved, allowing even more notes to be added. Within Sloane's library, the types of publication most often found in interleaved format are pharmacopoeias, medical text books and botanical works, all commonly used to record the findings of professional life.

Sloane's copies of the London pharmacopoeia are notable for the amount of annotation they contain. The *Pharmacopoeia Londinensis* was first published by the College of Physicians in 1618. Of the seven editions between then and 1678, Sloane had at least 15 copies, of which 12 contain manuscript notes. Five of the 12 annotated copies are interleaved. Three are so heavily annotated that Sloane classed them as manuscripts.[32] Of these, two have notes by

30 Marjorie Caygill, "Sloane's will and the establishment of the British Museum," in Arthur MacGregor, ed., *Sir Hans Sloane Collector, Scientist, Antiquary* (London: British Museum, 1994), 45–68.

31 Many of Sloane's pharmacopoeias are shelved in close proximity at the BL. A search on the Sloane database for the truncated shelfmark 777* reveals 195 items of which a considerable number are pharmacopoeias. Others can be found by searching for 'Pharmacopoeia'. The approximate number of pharmacopoeias owned by Sloane is around 95.

32 BL 777.k.7, 1627 edition, has Sloane's numbers Ms 1872 (deleted) and Ms A 237. BL 777.k.5, 1618 edition, has Ms 305 (deleted), Ms A 238. BL 777.d.1 has Ms 487 (deleted) and Ms B 945.

the Huguenot Royal physician, Theodore Turquet de Mayerne. A copy of the 1650 edition has notes by Christopher Merrett, the first Harveian librarian of the College of Physicians and a founding member of the Royal Society.[33] Some volumes have annotations in more than one hand, the volume having been used by several practitioners. Other medical collections, naturally enough, also have interleaved and annotated pharmacopoeias, acquired from various sources over the years. The Royal College of Physicians in London, for example, has a considerable number, though on a brief examination they seem to be less heavily annotated than Sloane's.

The fact that Sloane had five annotated copies of the 1650 edition of the *Pharmacopoeia Londinensis* is persuasive evidence that his interest was at least as much in the notes as in the printed text, confirming the general finding that added information was a major attraction for Sloane across a wide range of material. In some cases, as with Merrett and Mayerne, they can be seen in the context of manuscript collections from the same owners also acquired by Sloane.[34] Heavily annotated printed books were barely distinguished from manuscripts. How and when Sloane acquired these various editions, and how he used them, is more opaque. Unfortunately, many have lost his numbering, through wear and rebinding, and it is therefore difficult to date his acquisitions[35] and understand how Sloane organised this type of publication. It is clear, however, that they were acquired over many years, and not from a single source. There is also an implication of choice. Even though Sloane's acquisitions were less precisely targeted after 1700 than before, it can be seen from his catalogues that there was very little buying of duplicate copies or editions. We must assume that Sloane made a deliberate choice in acquiring so many copies of the same text, and that the presence of annotations was an incentive.

The annotated copies of the 1650 *Pharmacopoeia Londinensis* can be used as a case study to demonstrate a certain number of clearly defined types of annotation. Chief among these is commentary on the formulations and their uses, either by reference to other sources or to experience of their use in practice. Thus in BL 777.i.14, an unidentified annotator has filled almost all the interleavings with notes on the formulations, including examples of their use,

33 BL 777.k.9.

34 For details of Sloane's considerable holdings of Mayerne's manuscripts, and the rather fewer number of Merrett's, see "British Library Catalogue, Archives and Manuscripts," accessed 5 December 5, 2016, searcharchives.bl.uk.

35 As the Sloane Printed Books Catalogue continues to grow, and further information from Sloane's manuscript catalogues is incorporated, it will become easier to map this type of information.

sometimes with references to printed sources of authority.[36] The great majority of the notes in this example are in Latin, but occasionally in English or Italian. There are frequent occurrences of additional formulations, and, less frequently, formulations credited to particular physicians, among whom is Theodore Turquet de Mayerne. BL 777.i.15, a copy without interleaving, shows a quite different form of annotation, consisting mainly of references alongside the formulations to printed sources or authorities for them.[37] It is less obvious what Sloane would have learned from these annotations since they consist in bibliographical references with very little in the way of comment or interpretation. BL 777.i.13 is also not interleaved, but annotated in the text and on the endleaves by one or more unidentified owners. The majority of the notes relate to the use of the various formulations, or give additional examples. No bibliographical references or authorities are offered, though a small number of formulations are credited to "Browne"[38] and one refers to Turquet de Mayerne.[39] BL 777.i.16, not interleaved, and again annotated by an unidentified owner, offers a more systematic set of additions to the text. The annotator has created an index of abbreviations explaining the benefits of the various formulations,[40] though this is used only in the Catalogus Simplicium. He has also created a set of codes to refer to his authorities. Not all can be deciphered, but they include: Wecker, Augustan, Cordus, Culpeper, Schroder, Morellus, Brugis, Hartman, Montagn: (possibly Montagnana), Fernelius, Bauderon and Mesue (Yuhanna Ibn Masawah). There is considerable overlap with the authorities used in the copies above.

BL 778.k.8, not interleaved, has a relatively small amount of annotation, adding the English names of plants, additional formulations, and suggestions for medical conditions in which they might be used. This unidentified annotator does not refer to printed sources to any great extent, only referring to two unguents attributed to Ruland.[41] BL 778.k.9, again not interleaved, shows

36 This annotator makes extensive use of the following sources, referencing them throughout: Nicholas Culpeper, Jean de Renou ('Renod'), Martin Ruland, Joseph du Chesne, Hanss Jacob Wecker, Schroeder (presumably the *Pharamacopoea Schrodero-Hoffmannia*) and Zwelfer (presumably the *Pharmacopoeia Augustana* edited by Joannes Zwelfer).

37 Many of the same sources occur here, for example Wecker, the *Pharmacopoeia Augustana*, Schroeder and Renou, but others also figure: Johann Tilemann, van Helmont, Thomas Sydenham, Guillaume Rondelet and William Vaughan's *Directions for Health*.

38 BL 777.i.13, e.g. on the preliminary leaf facing the title page.

39 BL 777.i.13, title page verso.

40 BL 777.i.162, preliminary leaves.

41 BL 778.k.8, 163.

two very different forms of annotation. It was owned by Christopher Merrett (1614–1695), who was admitted to Fellowship of the College in 1651 and quickly took an active role in its affairs. He would later become a founding member of the Royal Society. There are very few notes in the text, but on blank leaves at the end of the volume he notes the number of each type of remedy, headings which he thought were required, and lists additional or omitted medications. On blank leaves at the front, however, he notes the names of Fellows (possibly in 1659), and names from the election in 1672. At the end of the volume there is a short list of the Gulstonian lecturers. Merrett has used the volume not only for his medical practice but also as a convenient place to record events relating to the College.

Since Turquet de Mayerne is mentioned by several annotators as a contemporary authority it is worth looking at his own annotated copies of the *Pharmacopoeia Londinensis*. His copy of the 1618 edition,[42] not interleaved, contains numerous formulations for syrups, pills and powders, written in various inks, showing additions and amendments. His copy of the 1627 edition[43] is interleaved and includes many remedies used by him. In both copies the notes are neatly set out with headings and other emphases in red, and longer text in black. Only rarely does he cite sources or authorities: the remedies are principally a record of his own formulations. As Vera Keller discusses in this volume, Mayerne (1573–1655) was a pre-eminent physician, the most successful and expensive in London in his day, the source of knowledge quoted by others, and here we see him too using his copies of the *Pharmacopoeia* to record his own practice.[44]

The various forms of annotation in Sloane's copies of the 1650 *Pharmacopoeia Londinensis* exemplify forms which occur in other pharmacopoeias and in other medical texts: additional remedies and formulations, occasions for their use and references to other sources or practitioners who describe the remedies or have used them with success. The annotators use references to printed sources both to locate additional information and to give authority to the remedies cited. These references tell us what texts practitioners were reading and using, and emphasise that practice was both what we might term "evidence-based" and highly reliant on the authority of others, whether contemporary or classic. The pharmacopoeias are a particularly striking example of how knowledge evolves from the original text when combined with added information,

42 BL 777.k.5. Sloane number MS 1872 (deleted); MS A 236.

43 BL 777.k.7. Sloane number MS 305 (deleted); MS A 238.

44 Hugh Trevor-Roper, "Sir Theodore Turquet de Mayerne (1573–1655)," *ODNB*; see Keller, "Scarlet Letters," for further biographical and historiographical references.

the context of professional experience, and the recognised authority of medical authors. Sloane's choice of so many annotated copies of the same edition shows that he specifically valued the information and experience embodied in the notes.

6 Luke Rugeley's Library: Chemical Medicine and the Search for a Remedy for Sore Eyes

Finally, a collection of books which further illustrate these types of annotation, but with a specific context for Sloane, books from the library of Luke Rugeley.[45] Rugeley (1616–1696) was a well-known physician with a reputation for curing eye disease, son of the chemical physician Thomas Ridgeley or Rugeley, c.1576–1656. Luke Rugeley and Sloane were neighbours at opposite sides of Southampton Square (now Bloomsbury Square), both associated with the Royal College of Physicians. Sloane too had an interest in eye disease, and would have dearly liked to have the recipe for a particular remedy used by Rugeley. His failure in this was still rankling when he wrote *An Account of a Most Efficacious Medicine for Soreness, Weakness and several other Distempers of the Eyes,* London, 1745, and recounted his attempts. In the end, he says, he bought the remedy from a former employee of Rugeley's, and found it to be nothing particularly innovative. However, when Rugeley's library was sold in 1697, soon after his death, Sloane purchased at least 50 items, of which 17 are annotated, and it seems probable that the potential for finding the remedy among these was an attraction here.

The search was not successful. Indeed, Sloane must have realised quite quickly that the significant annotations were not by Luke Rugeley himself. He made some suggestions: Thomas Rugeley, Luke's father?[46] Or Jonathan Goddard, founder Fellow of the Royal Society?[47] Or, as suggested later by one of Sloane's assistants, Theodore Turquet de Mayerne?[48] Probably none of these, and there is as yet no firm identification of their author, but it does seem

45 For a more detailed account of Sloane's acquisitions from Rugeley's library, and a list of those identified, see Alison Walker, 'Sir Hans Sloane and the library of Dr Luke Rugeley', *The Library*, 7th series, 15.4 (December 2014): 384–409.

46 In Matthaeus Silvaticus, *Pandectae Medicinae* (Lugduni, 1541). BL 544.h.5.

47 In Pietro Rostinio, *Trattato di mal francese* (Vicenza, 1623). BL 1174.b.7.

48 In Hieronymus Braunschweig, *New volkommen Distillierbuch* (Frankfurt, 1597). BL 717.l.38.(1).

likely that the annotated books were brought together by Thomas Rugeley, and inherited by Luke.

Sloane's purchases at the Rugeley sale were very different from the type of book he was buying from Fenton and Stanley, even though Rugeley's library had many of the Greek, Roman and Arabic classic authors, as can be seen from the printed catalogue of the sale.[49] What Sloane chose to buy was something new to his library, mainly late sixteenth and early seventeenth century chemical and alchemical books from German-speaking countries, many in the German language. It was from Rugeley's collection that Sloane first acquired works of Bartholomaus Carrichter (1510–1567), Swiss physician and astrologer; Johann Wittich (1537–1596), German court physician; and an important work on distillation by Hieronymus Braunschweig (ca. 1450—ca. 1512), German surgeon, alchemist and botanist. The popular *Artzneybuch* of Oswald Gaebelkhover (1539–1616) and chemical works by Johann Popp, Johann Pharamund Rhumel and Fidejustus Reinneccerus all entered Sloane's collection from Rugeley's library. In all of these cases, the copies Sloane bought had manuscript notes.

Sloane would have found much to interest him in this collection, even if the remedy remained elusive. The person who annotated these books seems to have been in practice in London in the 1640's-1650's, as either a physician or an apothecary, but possibly also an empiric, and had some association with the Netherlands. The majority of the notes fall into two categories; commentary on materials (chemical and botanical) described in the text, and remedies which use these materials. They generally take the form of citations from authorities, either books or persons known to have used the remedies. Notes are generally in Latin or English, but occasionally in Dutch, and extracts from authorities are in Latin, English, French, German, Dutch, Italian and Spanish. Plant names are generally given in Latin or English, translated from the original language of the text. There is a special interest in cures for gout and gonorrhea, but his main emphasis is on the preparation of remedies. He speaks frequently of his experiences in distillation, and describes in some detail the best materials to use in remedies. Many printed sources, mostly Continental authors, are mentioned. Some English sources are included, for example Thomas Moffett; the anonymous *A rich store-house or treasury for the diseased*, London, 1596; Elizabeth Grey, *A choice manual of … Physick,* 1653, and Didymus Montanus [Thomas Hill], *The gardyner's Labyrinth;* John Hall and George Starkey. The Netherlands

49 *A Catalogue of … Books … being the Library of Dr. Rugeley … will be sold by auction … on Tuesday the 19th instant … By John Bullord, etc*, [London, 1697]. BL S.C.886.

connection is emphasised by the annotator's frequent references to one of his sources, cited several times with apparent pride, a manuscript of "Abraham van Hacke Belgo Empirici: post mortem autoris apud Bibliopolam venali, et per me coempto."[50] Van Hacke may be the Abraham van Hack of Norwich, Norfolk, who was licensed on 16 August 1620 to practise medicine and surgery in the province of Canterbury,[51] and whose family later lived in London.[52]

The books acquired from Rugeley's library serve to illustrate several aspects of the descendence, or afterlife, of collections and material from several collections: the putative manuscripts of Van Hack acquired and much quoted by the unnamed annotator, referred to in texts collected by Thomas Rugeley and left to his son Luke, later selected and studied by Sloane. Although Sloane's purchases ultimately failed to provide the information he sought, his choices have ensured the survival of a significant body of material which illustrates the interests and practice of a medical professional of the mid 17 th century.

7 Afterlives

These few examples of annotated works in Sloane's library illustrate several forms of afterlife. We see the survival of parts of a library through selection by a new owner or the survival of the greatest part of a collection through its incorporation in another collection. But more than simply ensuring survival, intentionally bringing together annotated books creates new associations, new lives and new uses in new hands. None of these processes is uncommon, but they are brought into focus because of the subsequent incorporation and long-term survival of this material in a major national collection.

It is worth trying to interpret and summarise Sloane's motives in collecting this material. After all, not all collectors sought annotated copies; indeed, the survival of such material depends on many factors, including fashion, market forces, the depredations of age, and sheer chance. For Sloane, there was firstly a need for information which might be used in a medical practice. The remedies added to medical texts and pharmacopoeias could be of immediate practical use. But accompanied by case studies and accounts of the use of these

50 BL 1033.l.10, blank leaves at end of volume.

51 Lambeth Palace Library Reg. Abbot 2 f. 189v.

52 Van Hack family members are recorded in London from 1634 to 1689, and in Norwich between 1690 and 1722. An Abraham Vanhack married Ellen Derrick in London in 1634, and the will of an Abraham Vanhack was proved in 1661, National Archives PCC 1661 f. 189.

remedies, they amount to more, as the added context and evaluation promote understanding, and effect the transformation of information into knowledge.[53]

There are further reasons too, which have much more to do with the processes of collecting. Texts enhanced by previous owners, particularly those known to Sloane either in person or by reputation, offered knowledge by association, created through the accumulation of the experience of others. In any collection, the bringing together of material creates a form of identity for the collector and allows the objects collected to become part of that new identity, yet it also creates contexts which may be unknown to the collector himself, perhaps emerging only by collocation with still other collections. Sloane was both collecting the knowledge of others, and through this process creating new forms of knowledge. His desire that his collection should stay together shows that he understood the fruitfulness of such collocation, and valued the interrelated meanings that emerge from material brought together.

The afterlife of Sloane's own collections has been long but not uneventful. His desire that the collection should remain together as a whole has been mentioned earlier. Most of his books and objects are now held by the British Museum, the British Library and the Natural History Museum. There have been exoduses, notably in the sales of duplicates in the early nineteenth century. There have been losses of vulnerable natural history specimens. There was some destruction during the second World War. However, most of the material is still known and available for study, but its context is not that of Sloane's day. His books and manuscripts, once housed in close proximity to the objects to which they closely relate, have lost that connection. Books and manuscripts are separate. His correspondence survives, but there is little in the way of financial or family documentation. The collection which reached the British Museum after Sloane's death is not an archive of his life, nor is it an archive of the collections which he acquired, but it has archival qualities in that it records ways in which users interacted with its content. It has now lived alongside material from other sources for over 350 years, and during that time it has always been part of a continual process of integration into something bigger than itself. Metamorphosing from its first life in Sloane's ownership, the collection as part of the British Museum and its daughter institutions has had, and continues to have, an extended afterlife of great influence and worldwide impact.

53 As suggested earlier, the line between print and manuscript becomes fuzzy here, and it should be noted that Sloane's manuscripts also offer a wide range of case studies and remedies.