CHAPTER 5

Playing Archival Politics with Hans Sloane, Edward Lhuyd, and John Woodward

Elizabeth Yale

1 Introduction

Writing to the physician Martin Lister in December 1699, the ethnographer, linguist, antiquary, and naturalist Edward Lhuyd made himself quite clear: "I intreat you not to publish anything out of my Letters in the *Transactions*, at any time." Written while Lhuyd was on a natural historical and antiquarian progress through Wales, Ireland, Scotland, Cornwall, and Brittany, letters like this, along with his and his research assistants' notebooks, were the primary records of his journey. He was not wholly opposed to publishing them, or some version of them—but he wanted to have some control over the process. He wrote on to Lister, "But if I chance to hint at any <thing> which you may judge worthy of publique view, I shall on your Intimation therof either send you a more particular account or offer some reason why I would not have it printed."[1] He sought to block his colleagues from automatically transmitting letters of

I would like to thank Vera Keller, Anna Marie Roos, Nasser Zakariya, Sachiko Kusukawa, and the external reviewer for their feedback on earlier versions of this essay and to acknowledge the Andrew W. Mellon Fellowship of Scholars in Critical Bibliography at Rare Book School, The Huntington Library, and The Royal Society for grants that supported this research and the "Archival Afterlives" conference in June 2015.

BL = The British Library, London
Bodl. = The Bodleian Library, Oxford
EMLO = Early Modern Letters Online (emlo.bodleian.ox.ac.uk)
JBO = Journal Book Original
Notes and Records = *Notes and Records of the Royal Society of London*
RS = Royal Society

1 Lhuyd to Lister, 15 December 1699, Bodl. MS Lister 36, 242–243, trans. Brynley F. Roberts and Helen Watt, *EMLO*. On the natural philosophical process of making and collecting hints, Kate Bennett, "John Aubrey, Hint-Keeper: Life-Writing and the Encouragement of Natural Philosophy in the pre-Newtonian Seventeenth Century," *The Seventeenth Century* 22 (2007): 358–80.

 | DOI 10.1163/9789004324305_007

interest to *Philosophical Transactions*, then under Hans Sloane's editorship, as they otherwise might.

Yet, despite Lhuyd's warnings, a selection of his letters was printed in *Philosophical Transactions* without his consultation—after his death. Their publication was superintended by Hans Sloane, serving as the Society's secretary. As is well known, the physician Hans Sloane was a collector.[2] He collected naturalia: rocks, shells, fossils, plants, insects. He collected artificialia: Afro-Caribbean musical instruments, shoes, and paper samples from around the globe. He collected books, buying up libraries from the estates of deceased physicians, competing (not always successfully) with the earls of Oxford and their librarian Humfrey Wanley for medieval religious, medical, and poetic manuscripts.[3] He collected people, assembling a global network of contacts to supply his collecting habit.[4] His collections overflowed his Bloomsbury home, and he expanded to a manor house in the London suburb of Chelsea to house them.

And he collected the papers of his contemporaries. It is this collecting activity, and how it intersected with Sloane's work in the Royal Society, that I explore in this essay. Even as he began to consider the historical potential of his own correspondence, becoming more careful about preserving and cataloguing it within his broader collections, he began to collect correspondence and papers from his contemporaries.[5] Some papers came to him as a gift. Others he bought at auction, such as some papers of Robert Hooke's or those of Mayerne discussed by Vera Keller elsewhere in this volume. [6] He inherited the papers—which included correspondence, memorandum books, and annotated sheets of specimens, of his friend the apothecary James Petiver, as Arnold Hunt explores, also in this volume.[7]

With these papers, Sloane played archival politics. He collected these papers, at least in part, in order to deploy them in his day-to-day life as virtuoso,

2 Alison Walker, Arthur MacGregor, and Michael Hunter, eds., *From Books to Bezoars: Sir Hans Sloane and his Collections* (London: The British Library, 2012); James Delbourgo, *Collecting the World: Hans Sloane and the Origins of the British Museum* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2017).

3 Arnold Hunt, "Sloane as a Collector of Manuscripts," in *From Books to Bezoars*, 199.

4 James Delbourgo, "Listing People," *Isis* 103 (2012): 735–742; Delbourgo, "Collecting Hans Sloane," in *From Books to Bezoars*, 9–23.

5 Hunt, "Sloane as a Collector of Manuscripts," 203.

6 Sloane, BL Sloane MS 3972 B, 373v; Giles Mandelbrote, "Sloane's Purchases at the Sale of Robert Hooke's Library," Giles Mandelbrote and Barry Taylor (eds.) *Libraries within the Library* (London: The British Library, 2009), 110.

7 See Hunt, "Under Sloane's Shadow: the Archive of James Petiver," this volume.

naturalist, and physician. As secretary of the Royal Society, he used them as a means of accruing both personal and institutional power, of building and maintaining his position and relationships within the London natural philosophical community.[8] Sloane's use of these papers, then, offers insight into the intersection of personal collecting with the Royal Society's functioning as an institution, as well as the development of *Philosophical Transactions* as a learned journal. Through his tenure as secretary, Sloane (and others) drew on the papers of the dead, bringing them in for discussion in the Society's weekly meetings and publishing them in *Philosophical Transactions* and in independent volumes of correspondence and posthumous papers. Sloane built his archive for the sake of its afterlife, for his—and others'—continued use and transformation of these materials.

I focus specifically on Sloane's collection and use of Edward Lhuyd's correspondence and his use and manipulation of the Society's meeting minutes, the key record of the face-to-face business transacted in regular meetings of the fellowship and in meetings of its governing Council. Lhuyd, the second curator of the Ashmolean Museum, died in 1709, leaving behind a trove of letters and other papers in Oxford. Letters he wrote to others were, of course, scattered across the British Isles. Sloane collected some of this material and deployed it in Royal Society meetings and published it in *Philosophical Transactions*, which he personally bankrolled as secretary.[9] Sloane did so in the context of his ongoing battle with physician John Woodward for control of the society's direction and the direction of *Philosophical Transactions*, which played out during Sloane's tenure as Secretary. In life, Lhuyd and Woodward had disliked each other, a personal antipathy compounded by scientific disagreements over

8 On "archival politics," see Laurie Nussdorfer, *Brokers of Public Trust: Notaries in Early Modern Rome* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2009); Ann Laura Stoler, *Along the Archival Grain: Epistemic Anxieties and Colonial Common Sense* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009); Kathryn Burns, *Into the Archive: Writing and Power in Colonial Peru* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2010); Filippo de Vivo, "Ordering the Archive in Early Modern Venice (1400–1650)," *Archival Science,* 10 (2010), 231–48; Nicholas Popper, "From Abbey to Archive: Managing Texts and Records in Early Modern England," *Archival Science*, 10 (201): 249–266; Arndt Brendecke, "'*Arca, archivillo, archivo*': The Keeping, Use and Status of Historical Documents about the Spanish *Conquista*," *Archival Science*, 10 (2010), 267–83; Jacob Soll, *The Information Master: Jean-Baptiste Colbert's Secret State Intelligence System* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2011); Kirsten Weld, *Paper Cadavers: The Archives of Dictatorship in Guatemala* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2014).

9 Noah Moxham, "Fit for Print: Developing an Institutional Model of Scientific Periodical Publishing in England, 1665-ca. 1714," *Notes and Records* 69 (2015): 246.

the origins of fossils.[10] In collecting and publishing Lhuyd's correspondence, Sloane enrolled Lhuyd as an ally from beyond the grave—a role he would have, perhaps, been happy to play. And, as we will see, in manipulating the production and preservation of the meeting minutes of the Royal Society's Council, Sloane controlled the historical record of his own feud with Woodward.

On a deeper level, Sloane constructed an archival politics of knowledge grounded in an antiquarian logic. For Sloane, natural philosophical insights, experiments, and observations, as well as practical applications in medicine and industry, lay not only scattered on the surface of the present, but also buried in the archive, in papers gathered and accumulated over decades, if not centuries. Sloane used his archive as a source of natural philosophical learning as well as institutional and personal power, through it consolidating his position as Royal Society secretary and then president.

2 Archival Afterlives: Discussing and Publishing the Papers of the Dead at the Royal Society

When Lhuyd wrote to Lister, enjoining him not to publish his letters without first consulting him, he was on a five-year research journey around Britain and Ireland. He wrote from the village of Bathgate, along the Edinburgh-Glasgow road, after a period of some months where, traveling in the Highlands, he was unable to send or receive mail—he rambled "through countreys so retir'd, that they affoarded neither post nor carrier."[11] From 1697–1701, Edward Lhuyd left his post as curator of the Ashmolean Museum, where he presided over a collection that including antiquities, natural artifacts, as well as an extensive library of printed books, pamphlets, and contemporary manuscripts, to travel through Wales, Scotland, Ireland, Cornwall, and Brittany. He sought to reconstruct the human and natural history of Britain and Ireland. His study self-consciously excluded the English, instead searching for the common threads of history, landscape, and language linking Britain's other inhabitants. Lhuyd

10 For Lhuyd and Woodward's personal and intellectual disagreements, see Joseph Levine, *Dr Woodward's Shield: History, Science, and Satire in Augustan England* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977), 80–85; Rhoda Rappaport, *When Geologists were Historians, 1665–1750*, (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1997), 161–162; on the competing theories of fossil origins in the 1690s and early 1700s, see Rappaport, 136–172.

11 Lhuyd to Lister, 15 December 1699, Bodl. MS Lister 36, 242–243, *EMLO,* trans. Roberts and Watt.

was the first linguist, for example, to apply the word "Celtic" jointly to Welsh, Irish Gaelic, Scots Gaelic, Cornish, and Breton.[12] Using a standardized form of Welsh orthography as a phonetic alphabet, and a core list of vocabulary words derived from John Ray's *Dictionariolum Trilinguam*, a Latin-Greek-English dictionary, he systematically recorded spoken language around the British Isles and Ireland. He used this data to classify these languages into what are now known as "P-Celtic" and "Q-Celtic" based on systematic differences in their pronunciation. These family groupings still stand today.[13]

After Lhuyd's death, Sloane obtained Lhuyd's correspondence from others who knew of his interest in it. In 1713, the cleric John Morton gave him letters he had received from Lhuyd, along with stones and fossils Morton had collected, noting that they would "be a present <not un>acceptable to you, and might be of use to the publick."[14] They would certainly be of interest to Sloane: he collected them along with others Lhuyd wrote to Walter Charleton and Richard Richardson, as well as extracts from Lhuyd's correspondence with John Ray and Tancred Robinson. The latter extracts, annotated by an unknown hand, discuss competing theories of fossil formation, including John Woodward's theory that, after the Deluge, fossils had settled in layers in the earth according to their "specific Gravity." (The annotator described this notion as "a meer amusement: and a confused notion.")[15] Some of these letters also passed through the hands of Richard Waller, Sloane's co-secretary at the Royal Society, who marked them "Extracted by R. Waller," indicating they were reviewed and considered through the Royal Society's institutional channels, probably after they were given to Sloane.[16]

During Sloane's tenure as secretary (1693–1713), the letters and papers of the dead made frequent appearances at the Royal Society's weekly meetings.

12 For Lhuyd's research plan, see Lhuyd, *A Design of a British Dictionary, Historical and Geographical; With an Essay, Entituled, Archaeologia Britannica: and a Natural History of Wales* (Oxford: s.n., 1695); Elizabeth Yale, *Sociable Knowledge: Natural History and the Nation in Early Modern Britain* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2016); on his life, see Richard Ellis, "Some Incidents in the Life of Edward Lhuyd," in *Early Science in Oxford*, ed. Robert Gunther (Oxford: Printed for the Subscribers, 1945), 14:1–51; Arthur MacGregor, "Edward Lhuyd, Museum Keeper," *Welsh History Review* 25 (2010): 51–74.

13 David Cram, "Edward Lhuyd's *Archaeologia Britannica*: Method and Madness in Early Modern Comparative Philology," *Welsh Historical Review* 25 (2010): 75–96.

14 Hunt, "Sloane as a Collector of Manuscripts," 203; Morton to Sloane, 12 October 1713, BL Sloane MS 4043, 189v.

15 BL MS Sloane 4062, 278v.

16 Lhuyd to Morton, 18 October 1694, BL Sloane MS 4062, 256v; On Waller, see Sachiko Kusukawa, "Picturing Knowledge in the Early Royal Society: The Examples of Richard Waller and Henry Hunt," *Notes and Records* 65 (2011): 273–294.

Living fellows—first and foremost, though not alone among them, Sloane—brought the papers of the dead forward much as they might a contribution of their own, or a letter from a living correspondent, reading them aloud for the gathered company to discuss, evaluate, and respond to. As with contributions from living fellows and correspondents, the Society responded to these papers in a number of different ways. In some cases, they recommended that the papers of the dead be published—shorter pieces might appear in *Philosophical Transactions*, longer pieces could be published independently. On other occasions, they advised that the papers or manuscript be entered in the Society's library; that further experiments and observations be done to test and explore the author's ideas; or, most basically (and most dismissively), that the individuals who had brought forward the papers be thanked. Following Robert Hooke's death, Richard Waller regularly presented items from his papers.[17] Hooke's executors gave some of Hooke's papers directly to the Royal Society, who gave them to Waller, while others, including a set of drawings of fossils, passed through the book market into the hands of Hans Sloane.[18] Sloane regularly introduced discussion of both the general status of, as well as specific items from, the papers of John Ray, Sir Thomas and Edward Browne, and Edward Lhuyd.[19] The society was interested more broadly in the survival of scholarly papers and manuscripts (or, at least the texts they harbored), as well: over the years, topics of conversation at weekly meetings included the state of the Cottonian Library (a report was read by Humfrey Wanley); the manuscripts and papers of Tycho Brahe and Johannes Kepler; the Oriental books and papers of the Oxford professor Thomas Hyde; and the posthumous works of microscopist Marcello Malpighi.[20] In some cases, these discussions led to attempts (some successful, such as with Malpighi's

17 Felicity Henderson, "Robert Hooke's Archive," *Script and Print* 33 (2009): 92–108. Noah Moxham argues further that Waller structured his life of Hooke around the Society's archive, which Hooke participated in creating and filling. See Moxham, "An Experimental 'Life' for an experimental life: Richard Waller's biography of Robert Hooke (1705)," *British Journal for the History of Science* 49 (2016): 27–51.

18 RS JBO 11, 16–20; Michael Hunter, "Hooke's Possessions at his Death: A Hitherto Uknown Inventory," *Robert Hooke, New Studies*, ed. Michael Hunter and Simon Schaffer (Woodbridge, Suffolk: The Boydell Press, 1989), 287–294; Sachiko Kusukawa, "Drawings of Fossils by Robert Hooke and Richard Waller," *Notes and Records* 67 (2013): 123–138.

19 See repeated mentions in RS JBO 11, covering the years 1702 to 1714.

20 For Kepler's papers, see RS JBO 15, 8 November 1733, 328–330; for Brahe's papers, see JBO 11, 8 January 1706, 107; on the Cottonian library, JBO 11, 4 July 1703, 28; on Hyde, see RS JBO 11, 10 May 1704, 50.

papers) to print the papers in question or to bring them into the Royal Society Library.[21]

Hans Sloane presented Lhuyd's letters, written to the physicians Richard Richardson and Tancred Robinson, at Royal Society meetings in 1711–1713.[22] He published them in *Philosophical Transactions* in 1712 and 1713. Lhuyd's letters came to Sloane's hands as waves of interest surged around the collection of papers Lhuyd left behind at the Ashmolean at his death in 1709.[23] Lhuyd died in debt to his printer and to the university, and the university decided to sell his books and papers to cover his debts. From 1709 to 1715, as the manuscripts "lay in state," various figures, including the Harleys (via Wanley, now their secretary and librarian), the antiquary John Anstis, and Lhuyd's Welsh patron Thomas Mansel competed over their disposition.[24] Wanley was particularly interested in the *Red Book of Hergest,* one of the most important manuscript collections of medieval Welsh prose and poetry, but it turned out Lhuyd had only been borrowing it from Jesus College at the time of his death.[25] In the end, the collection went to Sir Thomas Sebright, a book and manuscript collector who had studied at Jesus College (this was not Sebright's first rodeo with the Harleys).[26]

Some collectors, Wanley and the Earl of Oxford included, were especially interested in Lhuyd's linguistic collections, the materials he had prepared towards a comparative dictionary of Welsh, Irish Gaelic, Scots Gaelic, Cornish, and Breton, which he had published as the first (and, in the event, only) volume of *Archaeologia Britannica* in 1707. (Lhuyd's own interest in the *Red Book of Hergest* had to do with tracing the historical development of Welsh.) Sloane, on the other hand, collected and published Lhuyd's natural historical and antiquarian letters, focusing in particular on his discussions of plant and animal life, fossils, and Celtic artifacts.

---

21 RS JBO 9, 22 April 1696, p. 227; JBO 9, 1 July 1696, 240; JBO 9, 22 July 1696, 241, 244; JBO 10, October 28, 1696, 3; Marcello Malpighi, *Opera Posthuma* (London: A. & J. Churchill, 1697).

22 RS JBO 11, 29 November 1711, 252–253; JBO 11, 17 January 1711/12, 265; JBO 11, 8 January 1712/3, 320–321; JBO 11, 29 January 1712/3, 327–328; JBO 11, 5 February, 1712/3, 330–331; JBO 11, 12 February 1712/13, 332–333; JBO 11, 5 March 1712/3, 337–339; JBO 11, 9 April 1713, 346–347.

23 Eiluned Rees and Gwyn Walters, "The Dispersion of the manuscripts of Edward Lhuyd," *Welsh History Review* 7 (1974): 148–178.

24 Rees and Walters, 150–151; quote on 150.

25 Humfrey Wanley, *The Diary of Humfrey Wanley*, ed. C.E. Wright and Ruth C. Wright (London: Bibliographical Society, 1966), 2 May 1715, vol. 1, 10.

26 Rees and Walters, 152.

At about the same time, Sloane also began sharing with the Society extracts from the correspondence and papers of the physician Sir Thomas Browne.[27] Sloane's use of these materials coincided with the auction of the library of Sir Thomas's son Edward Browne which incorporated his father's, suggesting a possible channel for Sloane's access to these papers.[28] The material Sloane presented largely consisted of letters to Browne rather than by him. These papers conveyed a range of antiquarian and natural historical particulars, and included images, as well. Presented to the Society in February 1711/12, correspondence with the Bishop of Iceland related information on "the Country, its Productions, its Migratory Birds, its Animals … not mentioned by any Writer."[29] Letters from William Dugdale discussed the draining of the Lincolnshire fens, and in particular, evidence, both material and textual, that the marshy fens had once been solid, dry, land, and that the Romans "had formerly been concerned in the same Works."[30] In May, Sloane presented from Sir Thomas Browne's papers a drawing of a Hungarian tomb, along with copies of the Latin inscriptions found there. The letters and extracts that Sloane chose to present covered roughly the same range of topics as those he presented from Lhuyd's correspondence, yet they dated from half a century earlier—roughly, the 1650s and 1660s.

The papers of Robert Hooke proved uniquely productive, inspiring further discussion and experimentation for over ten years after Hooke's death. Though Richard Waller took primary responsibility for editing these materials and presenting them at Royal Society meetings, Sloane took an interest in them, as well. Waller was surprised when he was unable to find a set of drawings of figured stones and petrified shells amongst Hooke's papers. But they turned up in Sloane's library, and "by the Favour of Dr Sloane, into whose Hands they happily fell," Waller was able to include engravings of these drawings in the *Posthumous Works*.[31] But these were not the only papers of Hooke's to fall happily into Sloane's hands: Sloane's personal library catalog lists three volumes of maps from Hooke's collection; "Dr Hooks letters, loose papers &c … gathered & bound up together"; some "Miscellaneous Collections of Mathematicks," partly in Hooke's hand; a manuscript on using magnetic variation to determine longitude taken "out of the library of Mr Robert Hooke"; and, finally, one

27 RS JBO 11, 7 February 1711/12, 268; 14 February 1711/12, 270; 21 February 1711/12, 272; 22 May 1712, 293.

28 Mandelbrote, 102.

29 RS JBO 11, 7 February 1711/12, 268.

30 RS JBO 11, 21 February 1711/12, 272.

31 Waller, *Posthumous Works*, 281. On Sloane and Hooke's books and manuscripts, see Mandelbrote, 98–145.

of the manuscripts of Hooke's diary.[32] That Waller was surprised to find the drawings missing suggests that he believed he had received all of the "personal" papers from Hooke's executors. However, there was some slippage in the process of transfer. It was not as neat, or as complete, as Waller would have hoped. Although Sloane probably acquired some manuscript material through his purchases at the auction of Hooke's library (sheets and slips tucked in to the books escaped the notice of Hooke's executors), this was not his only route to Hooke's papers. He collected other materials privately soon after Hooke's death, and he continued to purchase Hooke's papers through other library sales through the first half of the eighteenth century. "Dr Hooks letters, loose papers &c", for example, were "apparently acquired about three years" after Hooke's death, while the "Miscellaneous Collections of Mathematicks" were purchased at a library auction in 1739.[33]

3 Lhuyd's Letters as Visual and Textual Resources for Antiquarian Studies and Natural History

In the letters of his that Sloane presented and published in *Philosophical Transactions*, Lhuyd highlighted things he collected in his Celtic travels, as well as the social and natural contexts in which he found them. Lhuyd used visually descriptive language; he and his research team made drawings of individual specimens and artifacts, while also including textual information describing a specimen's color and size. He identified specimens by pointing readers to images resembling them in other books. His techniques here jibe with a number of approaches identified in recent studies of the visual culture of early modern natural history and antiquities, such as those by Alexander Wragge-Morley, Stephanie Moser, and Dániel Margócsy: the use of visually descriptive language, the categorization of "small finds" across sites, and the use of reference books to identify specimens when the physical specimen or a drawing could not be transported.[34]

32 Sloane, *Catalogues of his MSS*, BL Sloane MS 3972 B, 48v, 59r, 373v, 381v; Mandelbrote, 110.

33 Sloane, BL Sloane MS 3972 B, 373v; Mandelbrote, 110.

34 Alexander Wragge-Morley, "The Work of Verbal Picturing for John Ray and Some of His Contemporaries," *Intellectual History Review* 20 (2010): 165–79; Stephanie Moser, "Making Expert Knowledge Through the Image: Connections between Antiquarian and Early Modern Scientific Illustration," *Isis* 105 (2014): 58–99; Dániel Margócsy. "Refer to Folio and Number: Encyclopedias, the Exchange of Curiosities, and Practices of Identification before Linnaeus," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 71 (2010): 63–89.

What many of these techniques had in common was the isolation of the individual specimen, and comparison of that specimen to others that were similar to it: creating classes of specimens, abstracted from their local contexts, across space and time. So, for example, in a letter written from Monmouthshire in June 1697 (extracted in the *Philosophical Transactions* in the spring of 1712, fifteen years later), Lhuyd described a visit to a coalworks in Brecknockshire, where the mines were cut horizontally into the mountain, rather than dug vertically. Lhuyd found there a stone, a "valuable Curiosity." He offered a detailed visual description—the stone was made of a "substance like those they make Lime of; of a compress'd Cylinder Form; and as it were cut off even at each End: About 8 Inches long, and 3 in breadth: Its *Superficies* adorn'd with equidistant Dimples … and in each Dimple a small Circle; and in the Center of each Circle a little Stud like a Pins head"—and a reference comparing it to "Dr Plot's *Lepidotes*," a specimen engraved in Plot's *Natural History of Oxfordshire*, also taken from a coal mine, though in Cornwall. The stone Lhuyd had found was remarkable, he thought, in that it was "not referable to any thing I can think of, either in the Animal or Vegetable Kingdom," except to stones collected by other naturalists.[35]

Yet, Lhuyd's letters also offer a broader visual description of the places in which he wandered, situating the individual specimens in the sites in which he found them and giving his correspondents a fuller picture of the geological and human landscape of Wales. He described the high lonely lakes, deep in the Welsh mountains, where he found previously undescribed plants, and the coal mines where he found fossils. He meditated on the appearance of the rocks at the tops of Welsh mountains: "There is no Brimstone or Pumice-stones on the Tops of our Mountains, nor any thing else that I suspect to have been the Effects of Vulcano's. What seemed to me most strange, were waste confus'd Stones, and (to appearance) fragments of Rocks, standing on the Surface of the Earth, not only in wide Plains, but on the Summits also of the highest Mountains."[36] Lhuyd described the dry wells that stood at the tops of some of those mountains: they could be found on mountains on which "stood anciently Castles or Forts." [37]

35 Lhuyd, "Some farther Observations relating to the Natural History of Wales. In a Letter from Mr. Edw. Lhuyd to Dr Tancred Robinson, F.R.S.," *Philosophical Transactions* 27 (1712): 468.

36 Lhuyd, "A Letter from the Late Mr. Edward Lhuyd, Keeper of the Ashmolean Museum in Oxford, to Dr Tancred Robinson, F.R.S.," *Philosophical Transactions* 27 (1712): 465.

37 Lhuyd, "A Letter from the Late Mr. Edward Lhwyd, Keeper of the Ashmolean Museum in Oxford, to Dr Tancred Robinson, F.R.S.," *Philosophical Transactions* 27 (1712): 465.

As natural specimens were described in natural and human contexts (the high lake, the coal mine), so Lhuyd set antiquities within cultural contexts, allowing readers not only to visualize individual objects, but the human milieu in which they were found. Lhuyd did this in a description of a series of small stone finds in Scotland, in a letter written from Linlithgow (a town about 20 miles west of Edinburgh) in December 1699. The letter was printed in *Philosophical Transactions* in 1713, the last of a series printed together, tracking his travels from 1696 through 1699. In this letter, he described a series of small finds, stones and glass beads of particular forms, unto which the people he met with in his travels ascribed various kinds of magical powers. There were small glass beads, known as "snake-buttons" in the Scottish Highlands and "Adder-beads" in Wales. In both places, locals told a story that the beads were made by snakes, as Lhuyd wrote in his 1695 additions to William Camden's *Britannia*:

> "About Midsummer-Eve …'tis usual for snakes to meet in companies, and that by joyning heads together and hissing, a kind of Bubble is form'd like a ring about the head of one of them, which the rest by continual hissing blow on till it comes off at the tail, and then it immediately hardens, and resembles a glass ring; which whoever finds (as some old women and children are perswaded) shall prosper in all his undertakings."[38]

Lhuyd believed these objects were of human manufacture, but in Scotland, he wrote, "not only the Vulgar, but even Gentlemen of good Education throughout all *Scotland*, are fully perswaded the Snakes make them."[39] Flint arrowheads, which Lhuyd compared to those found among the Indians of New England, were believed to fall out of the air, shot by Fairies.[40] As with natural objects, while he situated objects in their cultural and natural contexts, Lhuyd also assimilated stone tools to a larger class of similar objects. The arrowheads showed similarities not only to those found elsewhere in Britain, but in North America, as well. Lhuyd was not alone in drawing links between Native American and British material cultures. His fellow antiquaries made speculative connections between observed Native American practices and historical features of the British landscape. John Aubrey, for example, noted that natives in Virginia burned the forests to clear land "to cultivate the soile with Maiz,

38 Lhuyd, in "Additions to Denbighshire," in William Camden, *Britannia* (London: F. Collins, for A. Swalle and A. & J. Churchill, 1695), 683.

39 Lhuyd to Richardson, 17 December 1699, *Philosophical Transactions* 28 (1713): 98; Lhuyd, "Additions to Denbighshire," in Camden, *Britannia* (1695), 683–684.

40 Lhuyd to Richardson, 17 December 1699, *Philosophical Transactions* 28 (1713): 99.

and Potato-rootes.... Who knows, but Salibsury plaines, etc: might be made long time ago, after this manner and for the same reason?"[41] Perhaps the high downs of Britain and the open meadows and plains of North America developed through similar processes of human cultivation.

4 Editorial Transactions: From Personal Correspondence to Printed Philosophical Letter

What did it take to transform personal correspondence into a printed philosophical letter? Sloane (or possibly Waller, who extracted at least some of Lhuyd's letters for the Society) edited out Lhuyd's pleasantries, as well as his day-to-day accounting of his movements. In the published version of his letter to Tancred Robinson, dated 14 September 1696 and published in volume 27 of *Philosophical Transactions*, these opening lines are dropped: "Since my coming to Wales I have been generally upon the ramble in the day time and in company at night; so that I have had but little leasure for correspondence."[42] Not only pleasantries were edited out; the mundane work of managing as extensive a research project as Lhuyd's—crowd-funded and crowd-sourced through his correspondents—went missing, too. In his 22 December 1696 letter to Robinson, written during a brief rest in Oxford, he thanked Robinson for his assistance with gaining contacts among the Cornish gentry, and asked for his further help in distributing his natural historical and antiquarian questionnaire, a key research instrument, amongst them. Lhuyd distributed roughly 4,000 copies of his questionnaire. It allowed him to pinpoint artifacts, sites, and manuscripts that he wished to seek out, as well as knowledgeable people who might further assist him as he traveled.[43] Lhuyd typically distributed the questionnaire through his correspondents, as he did here, asking them to spread the sheets out among their contacts.[44] In the published version, all that remained of this letter were a few notes about a flock of scarlet birds observed in a hemp field in Pembrokeshire.[45]

41 John Aubrey, *Naturall Historie of Wiltshire*, Bodl. MS Aubrey 1, 18v. See also M. Goodrum, "Recovering the Vestiges of Primeval Europe: Archaeology and the Significance of Stone Implements, 1750–1800," *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 72 (2011): 51–74, 54.

42 Lhuyd to Robinson, Swansea, Glamorgan, 14 September 1696, RS LBO 14, 285–288.

43 Yale, *Sociable Knowledge*, 193–201.

44 Lhuyd to [Tancred Robinson?], Oxford, 22 December 1696, RS LBO 14, 289–290.

45 Lhuyd to Robinson, Oxford, 22 December 1696, *Philosophical Transactions* 27 (1710–1712), 466.

Some changes were more thorough-going. Before publication, Lhuyd's letters were edited so as to emphasize their visual, descriptive character. Causal speculation was reduced or removed. In the unpublished version of Lhuyd's September 1696 letter to Robinson, he ventured an opinion as to what the rough, rocky fields at the tops of the Welsh mountains might support in terms of geological theory. He thought it argued against a dissolution that covered the surface of the earth: how could such a dissolution "create solitary Rocks on the surface of the Earth, without a Mould to cast it into for supporting of the sides"?[46] This was dropped from the print version. In another case, Lhuyd's speculated that an "Ear of Rye" found in the side of an infant in Merionythshire could be supporting evidence for his theory that fossils germinated in the earth from seeds. This, too, was edited out. [47]

In the process of editing out the business of natural history, Sloane, working with Waller, edited out controversy and personal animus, removing Lhuyd's comments against the natural philosopher John Woodward. In a letter of 24 November 1696, written to Richard Richardson and published in 1713, Lhuyd made reference to a book, Thomas Robinson's *New Observations on the Natural History of This World of Matter* that "dealt very freely" with Woodward's theories of the formation of the earth.[48] More direct criticism of Woodward—reaching beyond his scholarship to his personal conduct—was dropped from a letter to Richard Richardson, dated 18 April 1699. Lhuyd's *Lithophylacium Britannicum*, his pocket guide to British fossils, was then in press. Since Lhuyd was absent from London, Tancred Robinson superintended publication for him. Lhuyd and Richardson had agreed to print some letters of Richardson's, compressed into one letter and translated into Latin, in Lhuyd's book.[49] In preparing the text for the press, Tancred Robinson inserted Woodward's name into what had been a veiled criticism of his theories: Richardson challenged Woodward to find fossil shells in the quarries in Richardson's North Yorkshire neighborhood—they should have been there, according to Woodward's theory that fossils had settled in sedimentary layers during the Noachian deluge, but

46 Lhuyd to Robinson, Swansea, Glamorgan, 14 September 1696, RS LBO 14, 285–288, trans. by Watt and Roberts, *EMLO*.

47 Lhuyd to Richard Richardson, 19 June 1698, RS LBO 14, 349–353, trans. Watt and Roberts, *EMLO*.

48 Lhuyd to Richardson, 24 November 1696, RS LBO 14, 337–338, trans. Watt and Roberts, *EMLO*.

49 Transcribers' note, Richard Richardson to Edward Lhuyd, 16 June 1698, trans. Watt and Roberts, *EMLO*; Lhuyd, *Lithophylacii Britannici Ichnographia* (London: ex officina M.C., 1699), 106–111.

Richardson was unable to find any. The section dropped from Lhuyd's 18 April 1699 letter to Richardson was Lhuyd's apology to Richardson for the inclusion of Woodward's name: "I was likewise concernd at the inserting any person's name in your Letter: but truly that Gentlmans carriage has been such, towards Mr Ray, Dr Lister, Dr Robinson & others, that no Gentlman of worth need scruple the public contradicting him in a plain matters of Fact wherin any persons of a Thousand may be Arbitrators: and I find that notwithstanding his \<great choler &/> Indignation few Naturalists spare him when he comes in their way."[50] According to Lhuyd, Woodward's private conduct excused public criticism of his theories, attached to his name. Sloane, in preparing Lhuyd's correspondence for publication, didn't necessarily disagree with this point; however, he thought it best not to air in print the personal animus that accompanied Lhuyd's reasoned scientific critique.

5 Sloane's Archival Politics

Sloane published Lhuyd's letters in *Philosophical Transactions* following the resolution of his own longstanding feud with John Woodward. Woodward and Sloane had different visions of the Royal Society. In Woodward's uncharitable view, Sloane focused too much on irrelevant minutiae, filling *Philosophical Transactions* with descriptive accounts of unphilosophical phenomena—an approach parodied, beyond the bounds of the Royal Society, in William King's 1700 *Transactioneer*, which attacked Sloane and the apothecary James Petiver.[51] Rumor, perhaps advanced by Sloane and Petiver, said that Woodward and his Royal Society ally John Harris had assisted King in his satire. Woodward denied it, but, on the other hand, he did believe Sloane's editorship was a scandal to the Royal Society's reputation. He sought to focus the Royal Society more tightly on the search for causal knowledge.[52]

Their dispute played out in person, at meetings of the Royal Society and its governing council, and in print. In May 1706, Council reprimanded Woodward and reminded him of the rules of right conduct: "unjust reflections" spoken against the Society or any of its members during meetings would be considered,

50 Lhuyd to Richardson, 18 April 1699, BL Sloane MS 4062, 300, trans. Watt and Roberts, *EMLO; Philosophical Transactions* 28 (1713): 275–276.

51 See Barbara M. Benedict, "From Benefactor to Entrepreneur: Sloane's Literary Reputation 1685–1800," in *From Books to Bezoars*, 34–37.

52 Levine, 85–86; Moxham, "Fit for Print," 243–244. For the outlines of the feud between Woodward and Sloane, see Levine, 85–92.

according to the Society's statutes, as grounds for ejection.[53] The reprimand suggests Woodward's "reflections" could be construed as violating gentlemanly norms, whether they were against Sloane or others. Just before Lhuyd's death, Sloane solicited from him a review of Johann Jacob Scheuchzer's *Itinera Alpina*, a survey of Alpine natural history, and published it in *Philosophical Transactions* in the form of a letter to Richardson. In this review, Lhuyd took a gratuitous swipe at Woodward's fossil theories, noting that Sheuchzer seemed to support Woodward's idea "of an Atomical Dissolution of all Things" at the Deluge, though this theory had been "sufficiently exploded" by Lhuyd and others.[54] Whatever Woodward may have said in person about fellows, including Sloane, this reflected publicly against Woodward's theories. Things came to a head in 1710. At a meeting of the full fellowship, Sloane read an account in which he discussed bezoar stones as gallstones and "a cause of colic"—a theory with which Woodward strongly disagreed.[55] They exchanged hard words—Sloane grimaced and laughed at Woodward, and Woodward accused Sloane of being ignorant of anatomy.

What words, precisely, did Sloane and Woodward exchange? What faces were made? What insults lobbed? It might seem that the answers to these questions were relatively straightforward, but it took further council meetings to pin them down. This process was recorded in the pages of the rough minute book, the paper book in which minutes were taken during Council meetings. The final judgment, both of what was said and the actions that were taken in response, is recorded in the clean copy of the Council minutes. On March 29, Council took up the business of Sloane and Woodward's contré-temps. Woodward attempted to manipulate the Council process in his favour; he requested that the matter be put off until his ally John Harris, a member of Council in 1709–1710, could be present. However, he was unsuccessful in delaying the proceedings. According to the minute book, "The Words spoken of Dr Sloane by Dr Woodward were; Speak sense or English and we shall understand you. If you understood Anatomy you would know better: or to that purpose." It was affirmed, as well, "that Dr Sloane made Grimaces, with a Laughter, and holding up his hands at Dr Woodward, before the reflecting Words above-mentioned were spoken." But did Sloane's grimaces provoke or excuse Woodward's reflecting words? With Sloane and Woodward out of the room, Council voted that Woodward's words were "reflecting" but that Sloane's grimaces were not "sufficient provocation for

53 RS, Council Minutes, vol. II, 1682–1727, 132.

54 Lhuyd, "A letter from Mr. Edward Lhuyd," *Philosophical Transactions,* 26 (1709), 157.

55 Levine, *Dr Woodward's Shield*, 91.

the above-mentioned Reflections."[56] On May 3, the Council retroactively laid in place statutes outlining the procedure for ejecting a fellow from Council and banning him from regular meetings of the full fellowship for speaking "words reflecting upon any other Member."[57] They then proceeded to reinforce the archival recording of these statues by requiring that "new Statutes" should be "reported to the Society in a convenient time" and a full copy of the statues should be recorded on vellum and deposited in the library for the fellows' consultation.[58] The use of vellum suggests the permanence and formality invested in this process. On May 24, Council performed a formal attempt at reconciliation as a final prelude to kicking Woodward out. Sloane "declared that he meant no Affront to Dr Woodward" by his grimaces, laughter, and gestures. The assembled company judged that this should be sufficient apology to Woodward, and asked whether he meant to accept the apology and offer his own to Sloane in return. Woodward, refusing "to beg [Sloane's] pardon for the reflecting words he spoke" was ejected. The episode was closed by a motion of Council, carried in the affirmative, to thank "Dr Sloane for his pains and fidelity in serving the Society as Secretary."[59]

In the clean copy of the minute book, all of this is recorded in a smooth, even italic hand. The story plays out sequentially and neatly. Even in the clean copy of the minute book, though, the entire process, with its additions to the statutes and the formal thanks to Sloane for his pains, appears rigged against Woodward. His agitated, angry comments disrupted the smooth, gentlemanly surface of the Royal Society's scientific waters, and many had felt him to be disruptive for some fifteen years. The institutional archive recorded a history of his disruptions, in the form of the reprimand against "unjust reflections" issued in 1706. The dominant forces on the Council, backing Sloane, manipulated institutional procedure against Woodward.

More of that agitation comes through in the rough minute book, the notes taken as Council worked out what Woodward had said, what Sloane had done, and what actions were to be taken in response. These minutes are preserved as Sloane Manuscript 3342, "Minutes of the Royal Society, 1699–1712," having passed in to the British Library's Sloane manuscripts collection from Sloane's library. The minutes are bound out of order, with the notes for the meetings of May 3, 10, and 17th preceeding those for March 29th, at which Council initially discussed Sloane and Woodward's altercation and settled on the precise

56 RS, Council Minutes, vol. II, 1682–1727, 166.

57 RS, Council Minutes, vol. II, 1682–1727, 167.

58 RS, Council Minutes, vol. II, 1682–1727, 168.

59 RS, Council Minutes, vol. II, 1682–1727, 169–170.

wording of Woodward's "reflecting words".[60] Council discussed two alternate wordings. The first was, "That nobody who understood anatomy would say so." The clerk—likely John Thorpe, a physician ally of Sloane's—crossed this out in favor of "If you understood Anatomy you would know better; or to that purpose", the wording used in the clean minute book.[61] In the course of recording, Woodward's statement was generalized; Council refused to pin the words down exactly, adding the phrase "or to that purpose." In the rough minutes, the motion asking whether Sloane's actions were "sufficient provocation" for Woodward's "reflecting words," described those actions as "such a grimace." Here, the clerk (or the assembled Council members) appeared to get ahead of themselves, referring to Sloane's actions as "such a grimace" before the grimace had been described fully in writing. The clerk crossed this out, expanded his description of Sloane's response to Woodward, and attributed it to a particular witness: "Mr Clavel affirmed that Dr Sloan made grimaces with a laughter & holding up his hands ~~before~~ at Dr Woodward before the reflecting words above mentioned were spoken." In this sentence, the clerk began to write "before the reflecting words," but then crossed out the initial "before" in order to note that Sloane held his hands up at Woodward. The wording here suggests the importance of specifying the details of Sloane's gestures, laughter, and grimaces, as well as of clearly identifying Woodward as the target of those gestures. We also see the importance of sourcing the recorded version of Sloane's grimace and laughter to a specific witness who was not Sloane himself. These details worked out, the clerk then recopied the text of the motion asking whether Sloane had provoked Woodward.[62] The clerk recopied this rough version into an intermediate copy, minus the crossings-out, in the rough minute book: from this he copied the final version for the clean minute book.[63] This may have happened in the Royal Society's rooms in Gresham College. By statutes adopted by Council in 1686, Thorpe, as clerk, was required to remain unmarried and live in Gresham College, where he was supposed to carry out his work.[64] Given his closeness to Sloane, however, and the fact that the rough minute book ended up in Sloane's archive, it is also possible Thorpe copied the minutes at Sloane's Bloomsbury home. Society

60 BL Sloane MS 3342, 68–78.

61 BL Sloane MS 3342, 76r; Henry Lyons, *The Royal Society 1660–1940: A History of its Administration under its Charters* (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1944), 143–144.

62 BL Sloane MS 3342, 76r.

63 BL Sloane MS 3342, 77r-v.

64 Thomas Birch, *The History of the Royal Society of London* (London: Printed for A. Millar in the Strand, 1757), vol. 4, 453–454.

records—such as journal books and correspondence—had been known to wander before.[65]

The olive branch that Sloane offered to Woodward was perhaps most carefully worded of all, as the rough minute book reveals. Sloane formally attempted to reconcile with Woodward before Council on May 24. After hearing Sloane's declaration that he "did not intend by any Grimaces to affront Dr Woodward," Council voted on whether that statement should be sufficient satisfaction to Woodward. Should Sloane also be required to express an apology? According to the minute book, they debated "whether the words ~~[& he is sorry that his gestures were so interpreted] shall be added after the words~~ [affront Dr Woodward]."[66] The language of apology is crossed through in the rough minutes, housed at the British Library, and does not appear in the fair copy of the minutes, housed at the Royal Society Library. Officially, Sloane offered only the minimal statement that he had meant no affront to Woodward.

6 Conclusion

For Sloane, paper was power. Sloane and Woodward's feud, worked out through letters passed from person to person and edited for publication as *Philosophical Transactions* articles, through their face-to-face maneuverings, and on the archival page, illustrates this principle concretely. Sloane not only sought to control archival records and manuscripts as sources of medical and natural philosophical knowledge, as with his collection and publication of Lhuyd's letters. He also sought such records as sources of institutional power. When Sloane was elected President of the Royal Society in 1727, following the death of Isaac Newton, his second official act, after settling a point of order about the use of the ceremonial mace during the Society's meetings, was to take in hand the Society's record keeping. According to the fair copy of Council minutes,

> The President observed that some years since a Copy of the Journals and other Books was ordered to be made out, but was never yet finished. The chief design of which was to have had two Copies, that one might be lodged in some different place for a Security to preserve Copies of the

65 Mordechai Feingold, "Of Records and Grandeur: the Archive of the Royal Society," in Michael Hunter, ed., *The Archives of the Scientific Revolution: The Formation and Exchange of Ideas in Seventeenth-century Europe* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1998), 175.

66 BL Sloane MS 3342, 72r.

> Books against any accident of fire or otherwise, whereby they might be destroyed were there but one Copy of them. therefore He judged it might be fit to renew this Order. whereupon it was Ordered
>
> That the Copies of the Journals and other Books which were begun to be made be continued to the present time and when they shall be finished, That the said Copies be for the future lodged in the hands of the President, the President at the same time giving an Obligation under his hand to oblige himself, his Executors and Administrators to deliver the same to the Society at the Expiration of his Office.[67]

In this order, Sloane's concern is for the survival of the Royal Society's records: he orders off-site backups of the records to protect against the possibility that "any accident of fire or otherwise" might destroy them. Yet it is also about control: the copies are to be lodged in his house in Chelsea, built expressly to hold his collections. During his presidency, Sloane further required that Cromwell Mortimer, secretary and editor of *Philosophical Transactions* from 1728 to 1750, move to Chelsea to be closer to him.[68] Letters published in *Philosophical Transactions* from Sloane's secretaryship forward, including Lhuyd's letters, can be found in both Sloane's archive and in the Royal Society's.[69] In fact, the rough minute book in which Council recorded the process of working out precisely what Woodward had said to Sloane, whether Sloane provoked Woodward, and whether Woodward should be ejected survives only amongst Sloane's manuscripts. It is the only volume of rough minutes not housed in the Royal Society Library. Sloane allowed only the official, polished version of their dispute to survive in the institutional archives. *Philosophical Transactions* was officially Sloane's project as editor, bankrolled by him, though the Society had input into its contents, but the Council minutes more properly belonged to the Society. Whereas the distribution of letters published in *Philosophical Transactions* in Sloane's archive reflects Sloane's control over the journal, his capture of the rough minutes represents a more serious breach of the Society's archive. Perhaps preferring that the messy business of working out the details—the crossings-out and rephrasings that occurred as Council wrote, revised, and polished its communal voice—be less visible, he assimilated the rough minute book into his own collection. Sloane was concerned not only with manipulating the verbal, face to face processes in which Council determined his and Woodward's fate; he was also keen to

67 RS, Council Minutes, vol. II, 1682–1727, 303.

68 Moxham, "Fit for Print," 253.

69 Moxham, "Fit for Print," 253 and 260, n. 71.

secure the written record, leaving in the institutional archive only the gleaming surfaces of decisions made. In his editing of *Philosophical Transactions*, as well as in his daily interactions with the Royal Society record-keeping apparatus, Sloane manipulated the boundary between private and public archive, and deployed his collections strategically as a means of reinforcing his position within the Royal Society.

In this, Sloane's editing of the archive is not entirely unlike the editing of Lhuyd's letters from his Celtic travels, in which the logic of surfaces also asserted itself. Observations remain intact; but the business of doing natural history, of sorting out the books and tracking the progress of the distribution of research questionnaires, was deleted. No evidence of Lhuyd's personal grudge against Woodward remained. It's not surprising that Sloane deleted references to these kinds of business and personal matters, especially when they were upwards of fifteen years out of date. What's remarkable is that Sloane edited the archive as one might edit letters for publication, preferring to leave in the public archive only the polished official record.

With Woodward effectively vanquished, Sloane deleted any reference to Woodward from Lhuyd's letters, though he had happily published Lhuyd's review of Scheuchzer's *Iter Alpina*, with its side swipe at Woodward, in 1709. The dispute finished, there was no need to attack Woodward by name. Whether or not direct criticism appeared in the letters, those who needed to know would know that, given Lhuyd and Woodward's personal and intellectual disagreements—and that, in life, Lhuyd had been on Sloane's side—in publishing these letters, Sloane attacked Woodward.

Sloane collected for posterity, yes; one sees this in the moment he began writing his own correspondence into his library catalogues in the 1730s.[70] But he also collected to build institutional and personal power in the present. James Delbourgo has articulated the notion that, for Sloane and his suppliers, "collecting things meant collecting people."[71] Sloane collected his suppliers, the contacts who brought him things, and the suppliers collected Sloane, building a relationship with him that allowed them to then build contacts with other collectors to whom they could sell or give materials.

For Sloane, collecting the papers of his contemporaries was perhaps the purest form of this sort of collection of people. As Alison Walker argues in this volume, Sloane applied a similar logic in his purchases of printed books, seeking out the libraries of physicians who annotated their books. In doing so, Sloane

70 Hunt, "Sloane as a Collector of Manuscripts," 203.

71 Delbourgo, "Collecting Hans Sloane," 17.

brought his contacts, and their relationship with him, into his archive. There, those papers and the relationships that they carried could be further deployed as matter for Royal Society meetings, in print in *Philosophical Transactions*, and in his own publications.[72] Sloane could maintain his network of allies, marshaling them on his behalf, even from beyond the grave.

72 As in his later publication of physician Luke Rugeley's remedy for sore eyes, sourced from papers he had purchased from Rugeley's associates. Discussed by Arnold Hunt, "Sloane as a Collector of Manuscripts," 202–203; and Alison Walker, in this volume.