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Throughout Victoria’s reign, Lord Lindsay and his son Ludovic, respectively twenty-fifth and twenty-sixth earls of Crawford, created one of the largest private libraries ever assembled in Britain. The Bibliotheca Lindesiana included some six thousand manuscripts, which Ludovic sold to Enriqueta Rylands in 1901 for £155,000.

The principal problematic that I address in this thesis is: Why did the earls of Crawford invest vast amounts of financial and cultural capital in this endeavour? In other words, what factors – both structural and specific – led to the formation of the library, what purposes did it serve, and what roles did its manuscript components in particular perform? Other questions include: How – and how successfully – did Lindsay and Ludovic maintain physical and intellectual control over the rapidly growing library? How did they position themselves within networks of connoisseurship and collecting in Victorian Britain? How was the formation of the Oriental manuscript collections connected with Lindsay’s interest in racial classification and with wider racial discourses? And how did the library reflect and reinforce Lindsay’s identity as a gentleman-scholar?

Previous studies of this and other manuscript collections have adhered to an antiquarian, bio-bibliographical model, focusing on the detailed matter and mechanisms of collecting, rather than exploring the socio-cultural and epistemological contexts of their development. This thesis, by contrast, constitutes the first extended application of cultural theory to a manuscript collection, or indeed to any private library, in the nineteenth century. I combine close archival work with Bourdieu’s concepts of field, capital and habitus to reveal the complex structuration and signification of the library, and to investigate the imbrication between the earls’ personal agency and wider forces operating upon the library.

My examination of the Bibliotheca Lindesiana has uncovered several key issues and themes hitherto unexplored in this or any other major private library of the nineteenth century. First, I argue that the reasons for the library’s development reside principally in various forms of classification, which preoccupied Lindsay and reflected wider societal trends and taxonomies: the classification of libraries and the ramification of knowledge; Lindsay’s deployment of the library to corroborate his and his family’s social and cultural distinction (i.e. social classification); and an interest in racial classification, which reflected Orientalist discourses associated with imperialism.

Secondly, while the dispersal of aristocratic collections in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries is a familiar trope, this study is the first to contextualize the decline of a private library within the struggle between the aristocracy and the bourgeoisie. Finally, this is the first examination of the impact of professionalization upon private as opposed to public libraries, revealing the tensions between amateur traditions and growing professionalism and specialization in the nineteenth century. I thus ‘read’ through the library some of the wider socio-economic and cultural issues operating in Victorian Britain and its empire.
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I Introduction: ‘My present discourse is to be upon Books’

1.1 Incipit

In the years coterminous with Victoria’s reign, Lord Lindsay and his son Ludovic, respectively twenty-fifth and twenty-sixth earls of Crawford, created one of the largest private libraries ever assembled in Britain. At its greatest extent, the Bibliotheca Lindesiana contained over 100,000 items, including some six thousand Western and Oriental manuscripts which were purchased by Enriqueta Rylands in 1901, to form one of the foundational collections of the recently established John Rylands Library. Yet the formation of the Bibliotheca Lindesiana has never been read through the lens of modern cultural theory. Indeed, most previous studies of manuscript collecting – in the nineteenth century and other periods – have cleaved to an antiquarian, bio-bibliographical model, narrowly focusing on the subject-matter and mechanisms of collecting, rather than exploring the socio-cultural and epistemological contexts of libraries’ development. This is the first large-scale study of a major nineteenth-century manuscript collection that positions its subject within a wider landscape, in order to explore how the library and its creators were impacted by and implicated in societal changes. I reveal the library to be a remarkable microcosm of Victorian epistemology, bibliophilic sociability, racial discourses, and aristocratic taste and distinction.

The principal question that I address in this thesis is: Why did Lindsay and Ludovic invest enormous amounts of financial and cultural capital in this endeavour? In other words, what factors – both structural and particular to father and son – led to the formation of the library, what purposes did it serve, and what roles did its manuscript components perform? Further questions arise from this central problematic, focusing upon the means by which physical and intellectual control was maintained over the library; Lindsay’s and Ludovic’s positioning within networks of connoisseurship and collecting, and within wider knowledge communities; the connections between the formation of the Oriental manuscript

collections and Lindsay’s interest in racial classification; and the ways in which Lindsay deployed the library to reflect and reinforce his identity as a gentleman-scholar.

Private libraries were of major importance in the early and mid-nineteenth century, in a period before public libraries became widespread and when the authority of the academy was not yet firmly established. The libraries of gentry and scholars (the two categories intersected) were important sites of bibliophilic sociability and knowledge formation. However, in the last quarter of the century, the cultural significance of aristocratic libraries was gradually eroded, reflecting the diminishing socio-political status and wealth of the peerage. The rise and decline of the Bibliotheca Lindesiana thus not only manifest the intellectual interests, tastes and wealth of its creators, but also instantiate wider societal trends.

In order to address the questions outlined above, I have engaged in a close, reflexive study of the rich extant archives of the earls of Crawford, and in particular Lindsay’s monumental Library Report, the most detailed exposition by any nineteenth-century bibliophile of their collecting principles and ambitions. This archival work has been informed by my own experience as an archivist and by the ‘archival turn’ in the humanities. I have also deployed cultural theory, for the first time in an extended study of manuscript collecting. In particular, I have applied Pierre Bourdieu’s concepts of field, capital and habitus to investigate the imbrication between the earls’ personal agency and wider cultural forces operating upon the library. I thus ‘read’ through the library some of the wider socio-economic and cultural issues operating in nineteenth-century Britain and its empire, such as the bourgeois challenge to the aristocracy’s hegemony, and the development of racial concepts and Orientalist discourses associated with Britain’s imperial enterprise.

1.2 The Earls of Crawford and the Bibliotheca Lindesiana

Alexander Lindsay (1812–80), known for most of his life as Lord Lindsay, and his son (James) Ludovic Lindsay (1847–1913), twenty-fifth and twenty-sixth earls of Crawford, fashioned one of the largest and most significant private libraries ever assembled in Britain. The formation of the Bibliotheca Lindesiana spanned the seventy years from the Great Reform Act of 1832 to the end of Victoria’s reign, a
period of unparalleled technological, economic, political, social and cultural transformation. At its fullest extent, the library comprised over 100,000 printed books, tens of thousands of documents and printed ephemera, and six thousand manuscript codices, scrolls and fragments.

The lives of the earls of Crawford have been amply described by Nicolas Barker and others, and brief biographical sketches will suffice to contextualize the present study. Alexander Lindsay’s early years followed aristocratic convention. He entered Eton in 1825, the year in which his father inherited Haigh Hall near Wigan and the earldom of Balcarres; thereafter he held the courtesy title of Lord Lindsay. After the customary aristocratic Grand Tour, he matriculated at Trinity College, Cambridge, in 1830. Soon after graduating in 1833, he received a substantial legacy from his cousin, Lady Mary Crawford. This unexpected fortune, together with an allowance from his father (ultimately deriving from the family’s coal-mining interests), provided the funds to indulge his twin passions for Italian art and book collecting, while he always observed the principle that ‘the great works of public religion and charity […] have the first claim on the purse of a British nobleman.’ He was also an ardent antiquary and genealogist: he made exhaustive researches into his family’s

---


3 Letter from Lindsay to Colonel James Lindsay, 22 April 1849; CPP, 94/13, fols 1739–43.
history and it was largely through Lindsay’s tireless efforts that his father’s claim to the earldom of Crawford was upheld in 1848. In 1846 he married his second cousin Margaret (‘Min’ or ‘Minnie’), daughter of Lieutenant-General James Lindsay and Anne Lindsay, both of whom had nurtured his interest in the history of art during several visits to Italy. The newly-weds took up residence at Dunecht in Aberdeenshire, on the estate that his father had purchased for them. Lindsay succeeded as twenty-fifth earl of Crawford and eighth earl of Balcarres upon his father’s death in December 1869.

Lindsay was a gentleman-scholar who abstained from public office, devoting himself instead to collecting, bibliographical pursuits and polymathic investigations into art history, comparative religion, philosophy, ethnology, linguistics and genealogy; the development of Christian thought and civilization, instantiated especially in trecento and quattrocento Italy, was a lifelong obsession. He invested huge amounts of financial capital to expand the much-depleted ancestral library into a catholic, panoptical repository of ‘the best and most valuable books, landmarks of thought and progress, in all cultivated languages, Oriental as well as European’. As a collector his watchwords were discipline and utility, liberally construed: the library was intended to service his and his family’s literary requirements, and he was determined to avoid bibliomaniacal excess, preferring textually superior editions to first editions, ‘rejecting all large-paper copies and sumptuous bindings, and only admitting the principle of rarity [...] where the rare volumes were indispensable to my scheme on merits independent of that rarity’. He claimed not to be a collector of manuscripts per se, acquiring only representative examples of illuminated manuscripts and avoiding the obvious attractions of fifteenth- and sixteenth-century Books of Hours and other bibliophilic baubles.

Non-Western manuscripts, however, were one of the library’s most noteworthy features. Lindsay assembled major collections of Middle Eastern manuscripts in Arabic, Persian, Turkish and Samaritan; South Asian manuscripts in Sanskrit and

4 LR, Introduction, p. 16.

5 Letter from Lindsay to Colonel James Lindsay, 22 April 1849; CPP, 94/13, fols 1739–43.
numerous modern Indian languages; Chinese and Japanese printed books and manuscripts; and Syriac, Armenian, Coptic and Ethiopic Christian codices. Ludovic later supplemented these collections and developed extensive holdings of South-East Asian manuscripts, collecting a pot-pourri of materials written on palm-leaf, bamboo, bone, bark and copper. Another innovation was Ludovic’s enthusiasm for fragments of ancient papyrus from Egypt. Thus when Enriqueta bought the collection for £155,000 in 1901, 3,093 Oriental printed books and manuscripts were transferred to Manchester, plus several thousand papyri, in comparison to just 475 Western manuscripts (see Appendix 5).

Lindsay’s later years were marred by ill-health, and he died at his beloved Villa Palmieri in Florence on 13 December 1880, whereupon his son inherited the earldom and responsibility for the library. Ludovic, like his father, was educated at Eton and Trinity, although he spent only a year at Cambridge before joining the Grenadier Guards. In 1869 he married Emily Florence (‘Emmie’), daughter of Hon. Edward Bootle-Wilbraham, second son of the first Baron Skelmersdale. He was a keen scientist in an era when amateurs could still make significant contributions to knowledge: he established an impressive observatory at Dunecht and was elected president of the Royal Astronomical Society in 1878 and 1879. Ludovic served as MP for Wigan from 1874 until 1880, and he held numerous public offices. He became a keen yachtsman later in life, undertaking expeditions around the world to collect scientific and natural history specimens for the British Museum, of which he was appointed a trustee in 1885; his philatelic collection became one of the foundation stones of the Museum’s holdings.

Lindsay had cultivated his son’s interest in the library from a young age, and Ludovic’s first major contribution was to secure the mathematical collection of Charles Babbage in 1873. However, as a collector he was quite unlike his father: a man of action, impulsive in his acquisitions, and eclectic in his tastes. He was fond of jewelled bindings, early manuscripts from Visigothic Spain and the empires of Charlemagne and his successors, and spectacular illuminated manuscripts. Ludovic also developed the library in new directions: in addition to South-East Asian manuscripts and papyri, he assembled a vast collection of French Revolutionary and Napoleonic décrets, proclamations, periodicals, newspapers and autograph
documents – the largest outside the Bibliothèque Nationale – building upon a nucleus formed by his father, as well as English royal proclamations and Civil War tracts. Ludovic also initiated major campaigns to catalogue the collections. Despite the disposal of the cream of the printed collections in 1887 and 1889, and the sale of the manuscripts to Enriqueta Rylands in 1901, his son could still claim in 1917 that the Bibliotheca Lindesiana was the greatest private library in the British Empire.

Ludovic’s eldest son, David (1871–1940), succeeded as twenty-seventh earl of Crawford in 1913, having previously held the courtesy title of Lord Balcarres. He was elected Conservative MP for Chorley in 1895 and held several junior government and party positions over the next thirty years. Bal’s principal contributions to public life were in the arts, as a trustee of the British Museum, National Gallery and National Portrait Gallery, chairman of the National Art Collections Fund and Royal Fine Arts Commission, president of the Society of Antiquaries and the Roxburghe Club, and chancellor of the University of Manchester. During his hegemony, he oversaw further contractions of the library, in response to the burden of taxation and the family’s declining economic fortunes. Many of the French Revolution collections joined the manuscripts at the John Rylands Library, while Quaritch disposed of fifty-three tons of books.

1.3 Previous Studies of the Bibliotheca Lindesiana and the Wider Literature

The Bibliotheca Lindesiana was the subject of a magisterial study by the eminent book historian and bibliographer, Nicolas Barker, first published in 1977. Barker successfully assimilated an astonishing quantity of information from the tens of thousands of documents in the Crawford archives, fashioning this mass of data into a coherent biographical-cum-bibliographical history, which traces the evolution of
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8 Barker, BL, p. 373.
the library from Lindsay’s schoolboy bibliomania in the 1820s through to its break-up in the early twentieth century.

*Bibliotheca Lindesiana* was commissioned by David Lindsay, twenty-eighth earl of Crawford, for presentation to fellow members of the Roxburghe Club. It is thus situated within a long tradition of bibliographical and antiquarian studies, rooted in empiricism and connoisseurship, and it conforms to the conventions of Roxburghe publications: the text is written in a discursive style, referencing is incomplete, and there is no bibliography. Barker assumes that his readers will share his encyclopaedic knowledge of book history, presenting countless allusive bibliographical references with studied ease. Likewise, he reflects his audience’s patrician view of history: while *Bibliotheca Lindesiana* is certainly no hagiography, any criticisms of his patron’s forebears and their peers are restrained. The Roxburghe context also explains Barker’s eschewal of critical theory and theories of collecting, though elsewhere he has made significant contributions to debates on methodologies of book history.9

*Bibliotheca Lindesiana* has provided essential context and steadfast guidance for my own studies of the Crawford archives. Nevertheless, I have adopted a more analytical, theorized and necessarily focused approach than Barker, contextualizing the earls’ manuscript collections within nineteenth-century book collecting, and employing the wealth of socio-cultural and collecting theories that have developed since the mid-1970s.

Other scholars have examined particular elements of the Crawford manuscripts: Frank Taylor supplemented M. R. James’s catalogue of the Latin manuscripts with updated citations and additional provenance information; J. F. Coakley has discussed the provenance and subsequent fates of the Syriac manuscripts; Stephen Emmel has analysed the Coptic collection; and Peter Kornicki is one of the few researchers who have contextualized the acquisition of elements of the library – in
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this case the Japanese books – within wider epistemological and socio-cultural landscapes.\(^\text{10}\)

The historiography of Lindsay’s collecting activities exemplifies traditional disciplinary boundaries between bibliographical and art-historical studies. The art historian Hugh Brigstocke has addressed Lindsay’s activities as an art collector in two extended articles grounded in a close reading of the archives and Lindsay’s published writings.\(^\text{11}\) Like Barker, he adopts a connoisseurial stance, concentrating on Lindsay’s taste, the mechanisms of his collecting, and the provenance and attribution of individual artworks. In fact, no study of Lindsay has successfully synthesized and reconciled his activities as a collector of art as well as of books and manuscripts. Even the catalogue of a major exhibition of paintings, applied art and manuscripts acquired by Lindsay, staged at the National Gallery of Scotland in 2000, largely treats these collections as discrete entities: introductory essays by Brigstocke and Barker discuss the art collections and library respectively, while the catalogue proper is compartmentalized into paintings, applied art, and manuscripts.\(^\text{12}\)

The wider literature on nineteenth-century manuscript collecting is disappointingly thin and under-theorized. Sandra Hindman, Michael Camille, Nina Rowe and


Rowan Watson have provided a detailed analysis of the cultural significance of manuscript illumination in eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Europe and twentieth-century America. However, while they consider the socio-cultural contexts of manuscript collecting, they adopt an art-historical approach, focusing upon illuminated codices, leaves and cuttings while overlooking textual manuscripts, and their references to the wider social and epistemological landscapes are slanted towards the visual arts. Specific aspects of manuscript collecting have also been the subject of recent articles by Roger Wieck, David Pearson, Richard Linenthal and Edward Morris.

Almost all previous studies of nineteenth-century manuscript collecting adhere to an antiquarian, bio-bibliographical model. Sir Thomas Phillipps (1792–1872), ne plus ultra of manuscript collectors, was the subject of Tim Munby’s pioneering five-volume Phillipps Studies (1951–60), later abridged by Nicolas Barker as Portrait of an Obsession. Other monograph-length studies include Christopher de Hamel’s investigation into the superlative manuscripts of the various branches of the Rothschild dynasty, and Donald Kerr’s biography of the colonial administrator and collector, Sir George Grey (1812–98). The manuscript collecting practices of
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16 Christopher de Hamel, The Rothschilds and their Collections of Illuminated Manuscripts
William Morris and John Ruskin have been studied alongside other aspects of their multi-faceted lives. Most other nineteenth-century manuscript collectors, however, have received far less critical attention. Seymour de Ricci's synoptic *English Collectors of Books & Manuscripts* (1930) furnishes brief sketches of numerous collectors. 

Munby’s *Connoisseurs and Medieval Miniatures* (1972) includes chapters on Francis Douce (1757–1834), Robert Curzon (1810–73), Walter Sneyd (1809–88), and Bertram, fourth earl of Ashburnham (1797–1878). Elsewhere, single articles and chapters have been published on James Dennistoun (1803–55),
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27 Bennett’s role in the dispersal of Morris’s library is discussed by Needham. The published catalogues of the Holford, Brooke, Tyssen-Amherst and McClean collections reveal little about their owners.
An important aspect of my research is to contextualize the earls of Crawford in relation to other collectors, and this secondary literature has yielded valuable data on the tastes and techniques of fellow bibliophiles. However, the emphasis of these works – and of studies of elite libraries more generally – is frequently upon the detailed content of the collections (especially the 'high spots'), while the collectors themselves remain shadowy figures, their backgrounds and motivations elided. Moreover, the socio-cultural contexts of manuscript collecting are routinely ignored: scholars rarely address the social, cultural and epistemological functions of manuscripts in the modern era, or investigate the place of manuscripts within larger libraries.

Failure to embrace cultural theory has arguably led to the neglect and marginalisation of manuscript studies within the academy, in comparison with other forms of material culture. The field is under-theorized and tainted with connotations of antiquarianism and connoisseurship, scholarship focusing predominantly upon the provenance, attribution, materiality, and textual and visual elements of specific manuscripts. The problem has been compounded by the hybridity of manuscripts themselves: they are situated at the confluence of art-historical and textual (literary and historical) studies, and do not neatly conform to modern disciplinary structures and boundaries.

Nevertheless, more theoretically-informed approaches to bibliographical studies have emerged in recent years, particularly centred upon reading practices and the networks of sociability enfolding individual books and collections. Robert Darnton was one of the first scholars to advocate more theorized, expansive and socially sensitive methods of book history. His communications circuit, ‘a general model for analyzing the way books come into being and spread through society’, was subsequently refined by Thomas Adams and Nicolas Barker, both to include within the circuit the survival of books and explicitly to recognize the ‘whole socio-economic conjuncture’ within which books are situated. More recently, Mark
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Towsey has undertaken a detailed investigation of Scottish libraries as foci of reading practices and sociability during the Scottish Enlightenment. Similarly Edward Potten has drawn attention to the scholarly neglect of private libraries in the post-bibliomaniac era, advocating 'a concerted effort to identify and research libraries associated with a wider social and economic demographic'. These studies have confirmed my determination to pursue a more theorized approach in my own research, blending a close reading of the archives and manuscripts with the adoption of socio-cultural theory.

Very few studies of nineteenth-century book collecting hitherto have adopted the theoretical methodologies advocated by the preceding critics. Kevin Dettmar employs a Bourdieusian approach in his study of Victorian gentlemen’s libraries, arguing for the petit-bourgeois commodification of literary culture in the nineteenth century. Meghan Hughes introduces her MA thesis on book collecting in New Zealand with a detailed review of Bourdieu’s concepts, although she is not reading, see The History of Reading: A Reader, ed. Shafquat Towheed, Rosalind Crone and Katie Halsey (London: Routledge, 2011).


entirely successful in synthesizing the theoretical framework with her subsequent empirica
al analysis. Despite their limitations, these Bourdieu-inspired texts demonstrate the
benefits of applying socio-cultural theories to studies of book and manuscript collecting; they have informed my own research methodology (outlined presently), while warning against the superficial application of Bourdiesuan concepts and terminology.

1.4 Research Problematics and their Importance

The principal question that this thesis addresses is: why did Lindsay, and later his son, invest immense amounts of financial and cultural capital to create one of the greatest private libraries in Britain, which eclipsed all but the largest institutional libraries? More specifically, why did they assemble one of the most significant collections of manuscripts in Britain? The Bibliotheca Lindesiana was not the product of historical accident, whim or unthinking, habitual collecting behaviours: its development involved expenditure of £135,000 between 1851 and 1900, an outlay of incalculable intellectual effort and time by Lindsay, and the employment of a cohort of professional librarians by the turn of the century. This colossal investment, sustained over seventy years, demands explanations located not only in the characters, motivations and personal circumstances of the earls of Crawford but also within wider socio-cultural and epistemological contexts. In particular, I shall investigate both the role that the library performed in reinforcing the Lindsay family’s distinction, at a time when the hegemony of the aristocracy was threatened by a burgeoning bourgeoisie, and the position of the library within wider communities and networks of knowledge.


34 Expenditure estimated by Bal, 17 January 1904, in Vincent, p. 69.

35 On knowledge communities, see William C. Lubenow, ‘Only Connect’: Learned Societies in
A series of further enquiries arises from this central research question. What specific functions did the manuscripts perform and how closely assimilated were they with the rest of the library, which predominantly comprised printed material? How – and how successfully – did Lindsay and Ludovic maintain physical and intellectual control over this rapidly growing library? How did father and son position themselves within networks (both formal and informal) of connoisseurship and collecting in Victorian Britain? What role did booksellers such as Bernard Quaritch play in the development of the library, potentially problematizing assumptions over the earls’ principal agency in this enterprise? How was the formation of the Oriental manuscript collections connected with Lindsay’s interest in racial classification and with wider racial discourses? How did the library reflect and reinforce Lindsay’s identity as a gentleman-scholar? And how did Ludovic differ from Lindsay in his motivations for and mechanisms of collecting and in his engagement with bibliophilic networks?

These questions have not previously been asked of the earls of Crawford and their library, or indeed of any other nineteenth-century manuscript collectors. The originality of this thesis thus lies in its situating the Bibliotheca Lindesiana within the wider socio-cultural and epistemological topography, interrogating it through the prism of modern cultural theory to reveal its broader significance in Victorian society and knowledge communities. This innovative methodology has major implications for wider manuscript studies and for the study of private libraries, to which I shall return in the Conclusion.

Traditional manuscript studies have tended to overlook the after-life of manuscripts, concentrating instead on the circumstances of their production and originary purpose, with detailed analyses of their texts and of their codicological, paratextual and decorative elements.36 However, the Crawford manuscripts, like other manuscript collections, are the product of a deliberate and repeated process

36 A recent exception is Christopher de Hamel, Meetings with Remarkable Manuscripts (London: Allen Lane, 2016), which does include information on the subsequent histories of manuscripts.
of selection and fashioning; they are not transparent windows onto the past, but are inflected by the tastes, interests, wealth and status of successive owners. I contend that our appreciation of any manuscript’s significance is deepened by an understanding of the circumstances of its later survival and custody, its after-life. This requires more than the compilation of a roll-call of owners: we need to understand how and why the manuscript was successively acquired, and its signification for and use by each owner. The present thesis contributes to this endeavour, enriching our understanding of the Crawford manuscripts.

Moreover, as I noted in the preceding section, previous studies of this and other elite libraries in the nineteenth century have focused on the mechanisms of collecting and on the contents of the libraries, to the extent of providing detailed enumerations of their components. Such bibliographical studies provide valuable data for investigations into the reception of a particular text or corpus, as well as the life-histories of specific copies of books and manuscripts, but they frequently fail to examine why such libraries were developed or what roles they enacted.

Private libraries performed important socio-cultural and epistemological functions in the early and middle decades of the nineteenth century, in a period before public libraries became firmly developed and when the authority of the academy was not yet entrenched. In the last quarter of the century, the influence of aristocratic libraries began gradually to diminish, as public and academic libraries expanded, mirroring the erosion of the aristocracy’s socio-cultural and economic influence in the face of an increasingly powerful bourgeoisie and the concomitant growth of the academy, especially in provincial cities such as Birmingham, Manchester, Liverpool and Leeds. New collectors – bankers and industrialists – entered the market for
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rare books, manuscripts and works of art, converting economic into cultural
capital. Combining cultural theory with close reading of the archive has enabled
me to examine this socio-cultural context of the Bibliotheca Lindesiana, as well as
the rich complexity of its internal structuration and signification.

1.5 My Response: Reflexivity and Methodologies

My interest in the Bibliotheca Lindesiana developed from a professional
responsibility for managing the former Crawford manuscripts, which are now
located at the John Rylands Library. Curiosity about their provenance developed
into a determination to comprehend their life-histories and, in particular, the
circumstances of their acquisition and stewardship by the earls of Crawford, in
order more effectively to support researchers and fulfil my curatorial duties.

This thesis is doubly self-serving. First, while the professional and academic benefits
that accrue from a doctorate are not a major motivation for me, it would be
disingenuous to deny their existence. Secondly, in investigating collections for
which I have curatorial responsibility, I am susceptible to accusations of a conflict
of interest and lack of objectivity: there is a clear incentive to overestimate the
collections and thereby corroborate my own position and the standing of my
institution, just as Lindsay deployed the library to confirm and enhance his
distinction.

I have therefore generally eschewed potentially self-interested assessments of the
significance of the material, addressing instead the earls’ motivations for developing
the library, its internal organization, and the external influences acting upon it.
However, I question whether Arnoldian disinterestedness and detachment are
either achievable or desirable. The paradigm of objectivity was long ago

Nicholson, 2004); Samuel J. M. M. Alberti, ‘Civil Cultures and Civic Colleges in Victorian
England’, in The Organisation of Knowledge in Victorian Britain, ed. Martin Daunton

38 Dianne Sachko Macleod, Art and the Victorian Middle Class: Money and the Making of

39 On Arnoldian disinterestedness, see Amanda Anderson, The Powers of Distance:
dethroned, as Hayden White has explicated in the field of historiography.40 Bourdieu advocates instead a reflexive sociology, in which researchers recognize their own objective positions both in relation to the subject under investigation and within the intellectual and academic field.41 It therefore behoves me, as a first step towards reflexivity, to declare myself as a white, middle-aged, middle-class, male archivist/manager working in an academic library and professionally responsible for the subject matter of investigation, and as a newly-minted researcher situated (like Lindsay) on the periphery of the academic field, and indeed crossing disciplinary boundaries. While my background is the antithesis of Lindsay’s – my Victorian ancestors laboured in the collieries and cotton mills of Lancashire – I can identify with his collecting instincts, his bibliophilia and dedication to the ameliorative function of libraries, and his catholic intellectual interests founded upon a classical education.

As a Lancastrian, I also have a parochial interest in the Bibliotheca Lindesiana, whose development was funded by the earls’ income from the Wigan Coal and Iron Company, and which was later translated to Manchester, courtesy of the vast wealth generated by the Rylands cotton enterprise. The history of the collection bears witness to the industrial might, wealth and confidence of Victorian Lancashire, as well as to socio-geographic tensions between the growth of an urban mercantile-industrial bourgeoisie, an aristocracy whose traditional economic and social bases were predominantly rural (albeit Haigh Hall was subject to encroachment from industries sponsored by the earls of Crawford themselves), and increasingly dominant metropolitan influences. The collection’s twenty-mile journey from
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Wigan to Manchester in 1901 thus instantiates a major cultural and societal reconfiguration from the landed aristocracy to new civic elites.

As noted earlier, I have adopted a methodological approach quite different from previous studies of the Bibliotheca Lindesiana and of the wider field of book and manuscript collecting in the nineteenth century. This study is based upon a close, reflexive reading of the extant archives, combined with selective deployment of modern cultural theories, notably Bourdieu’s interconnected concepts of field, capital (especially cultural capital) and habitus.

The evidence for this investigation lies principally in the now-dispersed collections of the Bibliotheca Lindesiana and in their archival traces: the extensive Crawford Library Papers, now housed at the National Library of Scotland in Edinburgh, and Lindsay’s Library Report, which remains in the family’s possession at Balcarres House in Fife. A detailed assessment of these remarkable sources is provided below. Other material relating to the Wigan Coal & Iron Company and to the Haigh Hall estate is located at Wigan Archives Service in Leigh, and at Lancashire Archives in Preston. Previous studies based upon the Crawford archives have not taken into consideration their partiality and silences, nor have they been informed by the ‘archival turn’ in the humanities and recent cultural theory. For comparative purposes, I have mined the archives of other manuscript collectors such as William Tyssen-Amherst, Thomas Brooke and William Bragge; these investigations have inevitably been conditioned by my own training and experience as a professional archivist.

Bourdieu’s manifold contributions to philosophy, anthropology, sociology and cultural studies across several decades have been extensively discussed by numerous critics, and it is neither necessary nor feasible to summarize his work here.42 It is, however, imperative to establish the relevance and benefits of Bourdieu’s methods for my research.

42 The best summaries are Pierre Bourdieu: Key Concepts, ed. Michael Grenfell (Durham: Acumen, 2008); Pierre Bourdieu: Fieldwork in Culture, ed. Nicholas Brown and Imre Szeman (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2000); Derek Robbins, Bourdieu and Culture (London:
Bourdieu has proved essential in two key respects. First, through the concept of habitus (which he variously defines as ‘a system of lasting, transposable dispositions which, integrating past experiences, functions at every moment as a matrix of perceptions, appreciations, and actions’, or ‘the feel for the game […] the social game embodied and turned into a second nature’), he seeks to transcend the dichotomies between individual agency and social structure, and between objectivist (structuralist) and subjectivist (phenomenological) methodologies. Habitus is shaped by one’s education, upbringing and class background, but not in a deterministic manner; it disposes one to behave in particular ways within particular fields or social circumstances – to occupy certain positions within a field where one’s habitus is finely attuned to the rules of the game, to be a ‘fish in water’ – but it does not mechanistically determine behaviour. People do not act like structuralist automata, hostages to their class, upbringing and environment. Habitus thus mediates between agency and environment. In the case of the Bibliotheca Lindesiana, the personal agency of Lindsay and Ludovic was of course extremely important, as this thesis will demonstrate, but the formation of the library was not an inevitable consequence of the earls’ class and upbringing. Instead, the reasons for the development of the library must be sought in the confluence of both the earls’ characters and interests and wider socio-cultural circumstances. Bourdieu argues that the ‘subject’ of the production of an artwork (or, in this case, a library) is not the maker who physically creates it, but the entire

\[\text{Sage, 2000};\text{ and, more critically, Richard Jenkins, Pierre Bourdieu, revised edn (London: Routledge, 2002).}\]


44 Jenkins argues, unconvincingly, that Bourdieu fails to bridge the gap between individual agency and social structure: ‘he remains trapped within an objectivist point of view’. Jenkins, p. 91.

45 Bourdieu, *In Other Words*, pp. 90, 108.
set of agents engaged in the field. It is thus vital to acknowledge others’ agency in
the library’s development – the role of fellow collectors, booksellers and scholars –
and to locate the library within the wider social, cultural, epistemological and
economic contexts in which it functioned. I shall show how fellow collectors and
bibliophiles, librarians, booksellers and others helped to shape the library.

The second, and related, way in which my research has benefited from Bourdieu’s
methodologies is through his intensive investigations of the mutually reinforcing
associations between the acquisition of cultural goods, taste, classification and
distinction. Bourdieu argues that taste, far from being intrinsic and natural, is an
arbitrary signifier inculcated through family background and education, and that it
serves to reinforce and reproduce social inequalities. ‘Social subjects, classified by
their classifications, distinguish themselves by the distinctions they make.’ Tastes
for fine wines, classical music, Old Master paintings, or indeed rare books and
manuscripts, cannot be acquired easily or cheaply: major investments of time and
money are required. These ‘refined’ tastes, and the associated accumulation of
luxury or cultural goods, function to mark out the possessor as a person of
distinction, someone with superior cultural capital, whereas they are denied to
subordinates. In the case of the earls of Crawford, I shall argue that the library was
intentionally constructed to reinforce their social and cultural distinction, in a
period when the aristocracy was being challenged by an emergent bourgeoisie, and
that it exemplified their elevated taste.

46 Pierre Bourdieu, The Field of Cultural Production: Essays on Art and Literature, ed. Randal
48 Bourdieu identifies three types of cultural capital: embodied, in other words, persistent
dispositions of the mind and body; objectified, in the form of cultural goods such as works of
art; and (less relevant to this study) institutionalized, such as educational qualifications.
Although Bourdieusian methods have been central to my research, it must be admitted that nineteenth-century manuscript collecting did not constitute an autonomous field according to Bourdieu’s definition of the term: ‘a separate social universe having its own laws of functioning independent of those of politics and the economy’.\(^{49}\) Rather, manuscript collecting was situated at the conjunction of the wider literary and artistic fields (themselves components of the field of cultural production), and the agents, commodities, mechanisms and ‘laws’ of manuscript collecting were subsets of these larger fields. Manuscripts were traded and collected as part of a larger market for antiquarian books; I am not aware of any dealer or collector who specialised exclusively in manuscripts. Consequently, it is not possible to undertake a classic Bourdieusian field analysis, mapping the relative locations of positions and players within the field. Nonetheless, it is clear that the earls of Crawford were dominant players, alongside the likes of the earl of Ashburnham and William Tyssen-Amherst, whereas minor collectors such as Thomas Joyce (encountered in Chapter 5) were relatively subordinate. In fact, I shall contend that Bourdieu’s binary division of fields into dominant and dominated classes, or class fractions, risks oversimplifying complex, fluid positions within the (loosely defined) field of manuscript collecting. For example, an elite dealer such as Quaritch could be dominant in certain contexts, such as auctions, yet he was inferior to his aristocratic clients in others. I shall also suggest, *contra* Bourdieu, that some elite collectors such as the Rothschilds were dominant because their social and political capital was relatively weak; they used deluxe manuscripts and rare books to reinforce their precarious social standing. Nevertheless, Bourdieu’s concepts of habitus, capital and field are powerful tools for analysing the terrain of manuscript collecting and the networks of collectors, dealers and experts with which the earls of Crawford engaged.

I have made selective use of other theorists throughout my research. Jacques Derrida’s *Archive Fever* has been especially enlightening on the power inscribed in archives such as the Crawford Papers, problematizing their impartiality and truth-claims.\(^{50}\) Michael Foucault provides valuable insights into the relationship between

\(^{49}\) Bourdieu, *Field*, p. 162.

\(^{50}\) Jacques Derrida, *Archive Fever: A Freudian Impression*, trans. by Eric Prenowitz (Chicago:
knowledge, classification and power, which are particularly relevant to the Bibliotheca Lindesiana, given Lindsay’s abiding interest in the classification of knowledge, and his overt intention that the library should reinforce his family’s and the aristocracy’s social and political influence. Foucault’s exploration of the panopticon also affords a useful metaphor for considering Lindsay’s project to create a universal library encompassing ‘the best that is known and thought in the world’.

Walter Benjamin’s short essay ‘Unpacking my Library’ has particular relevance for this study of the earls of Crawford as collectors: he offers a remarkably sensitive analysis of collectors’ intellectual and emotional investment in their libraries, and explores issues such as the mechanics of collecting and the polarities of order and chaos. It is also a text which has influenced later theorists such as Jean Baudrillard and Susan Stewart. Baudrillard’s *For a Critique of the Political Economy of the Sign* provides one of the most perceptive analyses of auctions ever written, and is particularly pertinent to Lindsay’s and Ludovic’s activities in the salerooms.
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Since the study of nineteenth-century book and manuscript collecting remains under-theorized, I have borrowed methodologies from the more conceptually advanced field of collecting studies, whose gaze has predominantly fixed upon the collection of artworks, applied art, anthropological artefacts and other ‘collectibles’. The writings of Susan Stewart and Susan Pearce have been particularly enlightening on the psychological aspects of collecting.\(^{55}\) The former’s profound reflections on objects of desire, particularly souvenirs, afford insights into Ludovic’s collecting of exotic manuscripts. Pearce explores the social and psychological functions of collecting and gift-exchange, arguing for the active role of objects in perpetuating ideological structures and shaping identities. Her distinction between three modes of collecting – souvenir, fetishistic and systematic – is apposite to Lindsay’s (predominantly systematic) and Ludovic’s (principally souvenir) collecting practices. Likewise, Arjun Appadurai reveals how objects operate within social contexts; in particular, he explores the role that luxury goods, such as illuminated manuscripts, perform as ‘incarnated signs’.\(^{56}\)

Studies of individual collectors have often been influenced by Freudian psychoanalysis, in which collecting is treated as aberrant behaviour practised to alleviate collectors’ anxiety, self-doubt and depression, which are often rooted in traumatic childhood experiences. Freud himself referred to the collector ‘who directs his surplus libido onto the inanimate objective: love of things’.\(^{57}\) Many collectors are stimulated by the tension between the order they impose on their collection and the chaos of the outside world, which continually threatens to intrude: whenever they admit new objects into the structured domain of the
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collection, they risk importing some of that external anarchy and casting the collection into disarray; but, by successfully incorporating this new material, putting it ‘in its place’, and restoring orderliness to the collection, they reassert control over their material possessions and, through this *fort-da* (‘gone... there’) game, they (temporarily) satisfy their need for self-affirmation.58 Werner Muensterberger offers perceptive insights into the motivations of living collectors, but his and others’ retrospective psychoanalytical studies of earlier figures are vitiated by lack of evidence and by their elision of the specific historical contexts of collecting practices.59 In the case of the earls of Crawford, there is insufficient evidence with which to develop a retrospective psychoanalytical study of their collecting and organization of books and manuscripts, although we know that Lindsay was cruelly bullied at Eton.60 Nevertheless, Muensterberger offers incisive observations on the competitive arena of auction-rooms; combined with Appadurai’s concept of ‘tournaments of value’ and Baudrillard’s ‘crucible of the interchange of values’, they help to explain the role of auctions in the development of the Bibliotheca Lindesiana.

Chapter 2 has been informed by recent studies of the organization of knowledge and disciplinarity by Amanda Anderson and Joseph Valente, Peter Burke, Martin Daunton and Thomas Heyck, who have identified trends during the second half of
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the century of increasing specialization and bureaucratization in the natural sciences, other intellectual disciplines and the professions, in response to the explosion of knowledge and the increasing complexity of capitalist society. 61

Bourdieu has been criticized for disregarding the embodied mechanisms by which networks are formed and sustained; he was concerned with objective relations, rather than concrete intersubjective relations. 62 My analysis in Chapter 3 of the cultural networks in which the earls of Crawford operated seeks to reconcile an empirical, microanalytical approach, rooted in a close reading of the archives, with Bourdieu’s concept of structured, hierarchical fields. I have been particularly inspired by Alison Rukavina’s recent study of the international book trade in the late nineteenth century. She combines Deleuze and Guattari’s ‘rhizomatic’ (‘acentered, nonhierarchical, non-signifying’) model of cultural development with Werner and Zimmermann’s concept of histoire croisée, or ‘entangled history’, to produce a complex and fluid social network model, in which ‘every node is potentially a centre; in other words, there is no periphery in a network’. 63 Rukavina


argues that this ‘allows for the complexity of interactions between agents to play out without prescribing the nature of the relations between agents and predetermining the direction of a book’s movement’. Of course, the present study focuses on one aristocratic collection and thus differs markedly from Rukavina’s expansive survey of the international book trade, and I am fully aware that the field of manuscript collecting was highly stratified, with relatively dominant and dominated players. Nonetheless, I contend that a social network model, which mitigates the effects of subjectivist and comparativist approaches, is germane to an analysis of Lindsay’s position within the wider literary-artistic fields, and to studies of book collecting more generally. It facilitates (and requires) a de-centred, panoramic perspective of Lindsay’s situation within multiple, imbricated networks and reduces the risk of merely reinforcing his inherently privileged position.

In Chapter 4 I have made extensive use of postcolonial theory. Edward Said’s model of the mutually reinforcing association of academic Orientalism and imperialism (defined by him as ‘the practice, the theory, and the attitudes of a dominating metropolitan centre ruling a distant territory’) remains enormously influential and has particular relevance for this thesis. However, in the decades since the publication of Orientalism, Benedict Anderson, Homi Bhabha, John Ganim, John McLeod, Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak and many others have developed more nuanced approaches, questioning the coherence of the Orientalist project, exploring the complex interactions within the colonial ‘contact zone’ and exposing indigenous resistances to – and complicities with – Western engagements with the East.
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64 Rukavina, p. 23.


66 Benedict Anderson, Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism, revised edn (London: Verso, 2006); Homi K. Bhabha, The Location of Culture
This investigation of the Bibliotheca Lindesiana is necessarily circumscribed by the strict parameters of a PhD thesis. I have therefore adopted a selective approach, choosing four key themes, which function metonymically in lieu of a more comprehensive study of the library. First, I reveal how the library’s internal organization and classification were informed by Lindsay’s interest in the classification of knowledge and the history of libraries, and how the ordering of the library was influenced by contemporary concerns over information overload. Secondly, I examine Lindsay’s and Ludovic’s formal and informal relationships with fellow collectors and others who informed the development of the library; in other words, their classification of themselves as collectors. Thirdly, I investigate the degree to which Lindsay’s collecting of oriental materials reflected his interest in racial classification. Finally, I explore Lindsay’s use of the library to construct his identity and distinction as a gentleman of taste and erudition, and his explicit objective to deploy the library to educate his family and support the role of the aristocracy as a bastion of society; that is, the library’s role in social classification. In short, I contend that explanations for the development of the library lie substantially in these various forms of classification.

As well as revealing the fecund intrications and significations of the library and Lindsay’s thickly connected interests in classification, I explore the imbrication between the earls’ personal agency and wider forces operating upon the library. I thus employ the library as a lens through which to examine some of the wider socio-economic and cultural issues operating in nineteenth-century Britain and its empire, notably: the ramification and professionalization of knowledge and attendant anxieties over ‘information overload’; the contestation of gentlemanly status and erosion of the aristocracy’s economic, social and cultural influence in the face of an increasingly confident and powerful bourgeoisie; and the development of racial concepts and Orientalist discourses associated with British imperialism.

I have excluded from my research certain aspects of the library and of Lindsay’s activities as a collector, in order to maintain a suitably tight delineation to this thesis. Lindsay’s profound faith was a formative influence upon the development of the library. I have not addressed this issue directly, but it is implicit throughout the thesis, as the numerous references to Lindsay’s interest in the development of Christian thought and civilization, the emphasis on religion and theology in the Library Report (as well as in his published writings), and his self-representation as a Christian gentleman, all bear witness. As with so many other aspects of Victorian society, the building of the library was deep-dyed in Christianity, and further investigation of Lindsay’s theology would facilitate a fuller comprehension of the library.

Lindsay devoted scarcely less energy to collecting art than he did to books and manuscripts. His activities in this sphere have been extensively considered by Brigstocke, and I have therefore disregarded them. However, it should be noted that Lindsay’s interest in classification extended into the history of art, as the classification of the various schools in Sketches of the History of Christian Art witnesses. This is a subject that warrants further investigation and, as I noted above, a wider study synthesizing all Lindsay’s collecting activities is long overdue.

I have also largely ignored the economic context of the library’s development. The Lindsay family’s principal source of income in the nineteenth century was the Wigan Coal and Iron Company, in the running of which Lindsay was actively involved. In future I hope to determine whether there was any correlation between
the Lindsay family’s expenditure on the library and their income from dividends and mining royalties, as well as to investigate further their ambivalent attitude to trade.

Finally, I do not discuss here Ludovic’s later enthusiasms for collecting autographs, broadsides and French Revolutionary material, nor have I explored in detail the motives and context for his sale of the manuscripts to Enriqueta Rylands in 1901. I shall consider potential avenues for further research in the Conclusion.

1.6 Thesis Outline

The thesis is organized into four substantive chapters, each of which addresses a key aspect of the library and its problematics. Chapter 2 investigates how Lindsay confronted the challenges of establishing and maintaining control over a rapidly expanding library, contextualizing his endeavours within the wider epistemological and organizational landscapes of the nineteenth century. He had an abiding interest in the classification of libraries, which he articulated through the Library Report and other projects. I examine the principles and practices by which he organized a vast library that constantly threatened to overwhelm him, situating them within a genealogy – or meta-classification – of classification schemes and the organization of knowledge from the sixteenth century onwards. I also explore the extent to which Lindsay’s library classification reflected and indeed corroborated his preoccupations with social and racial distinctions. Likewise, Ludovic’s endeavours to reorganize the library and his appointment of a full-time librarian are positioned within the context of the professionalization of libraries in the late nineteenth century. I also investigate the physical and intellectual positioning of manuscripts within the library, revealing that their ambiguous status and Lindsay’s ambivalent attitude towards them led to their occupying a liminal position within the impermanent ‘Museum’ department of the library. However, as the manuscript collections grew, they eventually precipitated out from the printed books to form discrete sections of the library.

The Bibliotheca Lindesiana was a site of knowledge formation and Foucault reminds us that knowledge is socially constructed. Chapter 3 locates the library within the wider horizon of knowledge communities and communities of
connoisseurship and collecting. I examine the nexuses of collectors, bibliophiles, scholars, librarians and dealers, who engaged with Lindsay and informed the development and use of the library, considering how he classified and positioned himself within the field of cultural production, especially in the locale of manuscript collecting, and how his identity and distinction as an elite collector were fashioned through these relationships. Agents such as Bernard Quaritch played a crucial role in the development of the library and I investigate the nature of their relationships with the earls. Lindsay’s networks are contrasted with those in which his son and grandson participated towards the end of the century, a diachronic approach revealing wider trends in bibliophilic networks and the field of cultural production.

The next two chapters focus more closely on the formation of the library, and its manuscript components specifically, to develop the argument that the library was constructed both to reinforce Lindsay’s social and cultural distinction and to further his studies of racial classification. He assembled one of the most significant collections of Oriental books and manuscripts in Britain, spanning the period when Britain’s empire approached maturation. Through the lens of postcolonial studies, Chapter 4 examines Lindsay’s motives and mechanisms for collecting Oriental materials and his engagement with Orientalist discourses, and investigates how the collections supported his researches into racial classification, ethnology and comparative religion. It also reveals how Lindsay’s Orientalist interests were imbricated with his concern for social and cultural distinction. Ludovic’s motives for collecting Oriental materials are more opaque, and his collecting practices are contrasted with those of his father.

Chapter 5 contends that Lindsay deployed the library – and his medieval and Renaissance manuscripts especially – both to fashion his own social and cultural identity as a gentleman of refined taste, discrimination and erudition, and to serve as a bastion against the challenges which he perceived to be confronting his family and the aristocracy as a whole during a period of unprecedented change. The library was a construction of social class, taste and distinction, which positioned Lindsay within ancient traditions of elite collecting, exemplified by the Florentine Medici dynasty, upon whom he overtly (if problematically) modelled himself.
The Conclusion restates the principal research questions and arguments of the thesis, emphasizing the original contributions to knowledge and elucidating connections between the themes of the preceding chapters. I also outline proposals for developing my research beyond the present thesis.

1.7 The Crawford Library Papers: Subject and Source

The Crawford Library Papers offer remarkable insights into the formation, evolution and eventual dismemberment of the Bibliotheca Lindesiana. The archive comprises 117 volumes of ‘Crawford Library Letters’, dating from 1850 until 1909 and containing over 50,000 items of correspondence, together with thirty volumes of receipts and invoices, and much miscellaneous correspondence and accounts. Notwithstanding the archive’s limitations and problematics, it forms an extraordinarily detailed record of a major private library and constitutes one of the most important primary sources for studies of manuscript collecting in Victorian Britain, richly illustrating the processes by which the earls acquired material and their relationships with fellow collectors, bibliophiles, scholars and dealers.

Lindsay’s monumental Library Report, or ‘Report on the present state and future prospects of the Crawford and Balcarres or Lindesian Library’, composed between 1861 and 1865 and extending to almost 190,000 words, is unique in the annals of nineteenth-century book collecting (Figs 5.1 & 5.2). It provides a detailed exposition and vindication of the collecting principles and practices upon which the library was built; it contains an exhaustive account of the contents of the library as it was constituted in the early 1860s; and it represents a manifesto of intent, a ‘blueprint’ to guide Lindsay and Ludovic in the ongoing development of the library. No other nineteenth-century collector of books and manuscripts has left such a comprehensive account or justification of his collecting activities.67

Derrida, Caroline Steedman, Antoinette Burton and other contributors to the recent ‘archival turn’ have problematized traditional notions of archives as passive,

impartial repositories of truth; they have exposed archives to the invigorating
influences of cultural and literary theories. The ‘archival turn’ has also politicized
archives: politics are inscribed in their constituent documents, in their exclusions
and silences, and in the systems and conventions governing access to them. An
accurate assessment of the research significance – and limitations – of the Crawford
Library Papers therefore requires us to reconstruct the complex history of the
archive, to interrogate its truth-claims, and to explore its silences, biases and degree
of constructedness. The following discussion is framed by John Randolph’s
suggestion that biography rather than institutional history is an appropriate
framework for reflecting upon the history of an archive. Biography encourages us to
consider the life-history of the archive, from its creation and active administrative
life, through phases of stasis and reorganization, accretion and loss, care and
neglect, to the present day.

Lindsay apparently preserved all incoming letters from booksellers and others, from
the early 1850s onwards. Copies of out-letters were recorded as drafts or summaries,
written in his minute, barely legible hand, on scraps of paper or in empty spaces of
in-letters. This material was presumably kept in packets or bundles, arranged
chronologically perhaps. Upon his succession, Ludovic asked Quaritch and other
booksellers to return all his father’s letters. Quaritch duly despatched a case of
correspondence, covering the years 1852–80, to Haigh in February 1881. When J. P.
Edmond was appointed librarian in 1891, Ludovic instructed him ‘to keep all letters
& copies of answers Press or manifold in [a] way that they can be got at easily – as it
is a great advantage’. The returned out-letters were painstakingly interfiled with

---

68 Derrida; Carolyn Steedman, Dust (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2001);
Archive Stories: Facts, Fictions, and the Writing of History, ed. Antoinette Burton (Durham,

69 John Randolph, ‘On the Biography of the Bakunin Family Archive’, in Archive Stories:

70 Letters from Quaritch to Ludovic, 20 January and 5 February 1881; CLL, 1881–82, fols 10, 17.

71 Letter from Ludovic to Edmond, 25 September 1891; CLL, 1891, fol. 101.
the in-letters and Lindsay’s drafts and notes, and Edmond arranged for them to be pasted onto guard-sheets and bound by John Fazakerley of Liverpool, thus forming the chronological volumes of Library Letters.

The binding of the Library Letters, and the associated series of receipts and invoices, served a practical purpose: to create a readily accessible reference source in order to augment Ludovic’s knowledge of the library. As the library outgrew the capacity of a single intellect to comprehend it, the archive assumed greater importance as a means of (re)imposing order; it functioned as a panoptical instrument of control and surveillance, just as the entire library operated as a panopticon, offering Lindsay (and later Ludovic) a commanding vision of the world represented in it. Ultimately, the archive would serve as a surrogate for the library, following the twentieth-century dispersal of most of the collections.

The establishment of a formalized, comprehensive archive documenting the library’s formation also reveals Ludovic’s strong sense of the historical importance of the library: the archive would reinforce the library’s significance, then and in the future. The chronological arrangement evinced the library’s development over many decades, validating the library not only by confirming the context and provenance of many of the individual works and constituent collections found within it, but also by documenting the earls’ sustained financial, intellectual and emotional investment in it. This was in marked contrast to the ‘instant’ collections acquired by Enriqueta Rylands, or by Lord Ashburnham earlier in the century, which were not true collections at all, according to Pearce: ‘in order to be honourable and genuine, collections must have been acquired over the years, and piece or group at a time.’ When Enriqueta acquired the Crawford manuscripts, she did not obtain the Library Papers which documented their pedigree and provenance. The archive, or the lack of it, mirrored the social positions of the respective owners. The Library Papers are a component of the vast Crawford family muniments, which span many centuries. Such collections uphold patriarchal hegemony etymologically, ontologically and structurally: ‘muniment’ derives from the Latin munire, ‘to defend’; the term denotes records preserved as evidence of

72 Pearce, On Collecting, p. 235.
entitlement to rights and privileges; and archives reflect hegemony in their hierarchical structure, which diagrammatically resembles a family pedigree. Thus the Library Papers not only document the manuscripts, but also affirm their pre-eminence. Enriqueta, by contrast, was an *arriviste*, a middle-class product of nineteenth-century entrepreneurialism, without a distinguished pedigree, who died childless leaving instructions for her personal papers to be destroyed. \(^7\) While she was able to purchase the Crawford manuscripts as tangible goods, she was unable to acquire their intangible connotations – their saturated history and Lindsay’s overarching intellectual project for which they had been assembled – although the aristocratic associations of the Spencer and Crawford collections were arguably a major attraction to her. \(^7\)

Following Edmond’s appointment in 1891, the volume of correspondence increased dramatically, reflecting both his obligation to account to his (frequently absent) employer for his every action and item of expenditure, and the professionalization of the library’s management, itself exemplifying wider systematizing trends. He was assisted by the introduction of a wet copying press, which produced copies of his outbound letters on tissue-paper, to form a complete record of all outward as well as incoming communications.

Although the Library Letters are particularly valuable in containing both sides of the correspondence, they are an artificial construct rather than an organic archive, in that Ludovic recalled his father’s letters to Quaritch and other booksellers, thereby compromising the archive’s integrity and its status as an impartial record of events. The ‘constructedness’ of the archive is most obviously expressed in its outward appearance: the bundles of papers accumulated by Lindsay and Quaritch were transformed into row upon row of volumes uniformly bound in burgundy morocco, lettered in gilt on the spines. The archive, refashioned in the guise of a


\(^7\) John Hodgson, ‘Lancashire Hodge-Podge: Reading the John Rylands Library through the Concept of Hybridity’, *BJRL*, 91.1 (2015), 81–96 (pp. 82–4).
library collection, thus forms a tangible monument to the earls of Crawford and their extraordinary endeavour in building the library.

No archive is comprehensive or neutral, and the researcher must be alive to the archive’s partiality (in both senses) and to attempts – deliberate or inadvertent – to manipulate it. Pregnant silences may arise from deliberate censorship and suppression of evidence; accidental losses over time cause the archive to speak sotto voce; while informal, spoken communications are unlikely to be inscribed in the archive in the first place. In this case, while there is no evidence of deliberate expurgation, the Library Papers are largely mute on certain issues, such as visitors to the library (in the absence of surviving visitors’ books) and the informal bibliographical discussions which undoubtedly took place within the family circle, around the dinner table or within the library itself. Occasionally these ephemeral discourses leave faint archival traces; when, for example, Bal mentions to Edmond his conversations at the Carlton and Burlington Fine Arts clubs with the likes of Sydney Cockerell and Henry Yates Thompson.

The effort and expense Ludovic devoted to the archive suggest that it served to celebrate and corroborate the importance of the library and that therefore there was at least an unconscious process of positive figuration. Indeed, within the archive one occasionally glimpses a knowingness amongst its creators, an awareness of the archive’s historical significance. For example, Bal wrote to his father in 1900, enclosing a letter from Barkentin & Krall, who admitted that a Byzantine book-cover they had tried to sell to the library was a forgery: ‘Please keep it for the Library Correspondence as shewing that the honest broker still exists.’75

More insidious forms of bias arise from imbalances in the power relationships between different groups who have a stake in the archive. Derrida asserts that power is inscribed in the archive, which etymologically derives from the Greek arkheion, the residence of the superior magistrates. ‘There is no political power without control of the archive, if not of memory.’76 Individuals and groups occupying positions of authority and high social status, those possessing superior

75 Letter from Bal to Ludovic, 29 July 1900; CLL, July-Sep 1900, fol. 702.

76 Derrida, pp. 2–4.
economic, cultural and social capital, are more likely to be represented in archives, and on more favourable terms, than those who do not possess such advantages – subalterns – since archives are typically created by and on behalf of elites, the archons.

The Crawford Library Papers are deeply implicated in the asymmetrical power dynamics of the library. Lindsay’s correspondence with booksellers and other suppliers exemplifies the unequal relationship of aristocrat and petit-bourgeois tradesmen. His letters are often hastily written, casual missives, with numerous corrections and the briefest of appellations, whereas booksellers observed due deference in the formality of their epistles. The very presence in the archive of Lindsay’s letters to booksellers demonstrates their subaltern status, since they readily acquiesced in Ludovic’s request for their surrender. Furthermore, the archive not only represents these hierarchized relationships; it was also a potent device to reinforce them. Ludovic and his librarian used the archive as a check against suppliers repeatedly offering the same material, for instance.

Edmond occupied an intermediary position between Ludovic and external suppliers, acting as gatekeeper to the library and to his employer. He was invested with authority by virtue of his position, but his powers were circumscribed, and major decisions were referred to Ludovic. The archive reflects this (at times uncomfortable) ambivalence. Edmond was peremptory with suppliers, berating bookbinders for poor workmanship, criticizing booksellers for failing to supply issues of periodicals, and rebuffing or simply ignoring offers of books that he considered inappropriate or overpriced. On the other hand, he was suitably deferential towards his employer and other members of the family. Edmond was sedulous in keeping Ludovic informed of the minutiae of library business, yet his regular reports testify to, and were necessitated by, the latter’s prolonged absences from Wigan. The archive served to demonstrate his prudent stewardship of the library, but it also functioned as an instrument of surveillance upon Edmond himself, a substitute for Ludovic’s personal supervision.

These considerations do not diminish the significance of the Library Papers, but one must be alive to the full richness of the archive’s layered history and manifold contexts, its silences and partiality, in order to evaluate accurately its evidential
value. The Library Papers have been shaped both physically and epistemologically by their creators and by the wider social, cultural and political forces that have intruded upon them, just as these shaped the library itself. The archive is therefore as much the subject as the source of my investigation. Indeed, the themes I have discussed in this section – the archive’s classification and hierarchical structure, its role in corroborating the earls’ social distinction, and the unequal relationships of dominant and dominated players inscribed within it – will recur in subsequent chapters.
Fig. 1.1. Photographic portrait of Lord Lindsay, probably by Thomas Rodger, salt print, c.1855. University of St Andrews Photographic Collection, ALB-6-149. Courtesy of the University of St Andrews Library.
Fig. 1.2. Photographic portrait of Lord Lindsay and his son Ludovic, by Camille Silvy, albumen print, 17 February 1863. Copyright National Portrait Gallery, London.
Fig. 1.3. Photographic portrait of Ludovic inspecting the twelfth-century Dinant Gospels (Latin MS 11), which he purchased in March 1884. Reproduced courtesy of the Earl of Crawford and Balcarres.
Fig. 1.4. Opening of Luke, from the Dinant Gospels; Latin MS 11, fol. 88r. Copyright The University of Manchester.
Fig. 1.5. Photograph of Haigh Hall, 1872. Wigan Archives & Local Studies, image no. PC2010.1736. Copyright Wigan Archives & Local Studies.

Fig. 1.6. Ludovic at his desk in the Long Library at Haigh Hall, c.1899. Top left is the framed 'Ravenna Papyrus' (Latin MS 1). From Henry Folkard, A Lindsay Record (Wigan: printed by Strowger and Son for the author, 1899). Copyright The University of Manchester.
Fig. 1.7. The Long Library at Haigh Hall, c.1899. Far left is Ludovic’s apparatus for photographing bindings and other materials; in the foreground is a cabinet housing French Revolutionary proclamations. From Henry Folkard, A Lindsay Record (1899). Copyright The University of Manchester.
2 Organizations of Knowledge: Structure and Classification of the Bibliotheca Lindesiana

2.1 Introduction

Collecting and classification are intensely intricated. Collecting implies categorization – the conscious or subliminal determination of what is collectable – while the practicalities of accumulation demand some form of ordering if chaos is to be averted. John Elsner and Roger Cardinal assert that ‘the plenitude of taxonomy opens up the space for collectables to be identified, but at the same time the plenitude of that which is to be collected hastens the need to classify.’¹ Within libraries, there is a constant tension between endeavours to impose ‘standards of coherence’ – by means of catalogues, classification schemes, and systems of shelving and retrieval – and the centrifugal forces that threaten disintegration.² The latter are particularly potent in large and diverse libraries, but are intrinsic to any collection; in Walter Benjamin’s words, ‘there is in the life of a collector a dialectical tension between the poles of disorder and order.’³

This chapter explores how the dynamic of collecting and classification operated within the Bibliotheca Lindesiana. Using concepts such as the panorama, Benjamin’s polarity of order/disorder, and widespread nineteenth-century anxieties over ‘information overload’, I examine the principles and practices by which Lindsay and Ludovic organized a vast and rapidly expanding panoptical library that constantly threatened to overwhelm them. The library offered itself as fertile ground for innovative ordering schemes, yet it continually resisted their efforts to establish and maintain physical and intellectual control. I contextualize these


³ Benjamin, p. 62.
endeavours within nineteenth-century epistemological and organizational landscapes, and specifically discourses concerning taxonomies, disciplinarity, and the ramification and professionalization of knowledge.

Lindsay’s abiding interest in the classification of libraries was articulated through the Library Report and other projects. My investigation therefore focuses upon the Report which, standing in a metonymic relationship to the library, offers a conspectus across the broad sweep of the collections and exemplifies their organization, to the extent that it serves as a surrogate for the actual, now largely dispersed library. I also examine the extent to which Lindsay’s theories of classification translated into the actual arrangement of the library, and the degree to which they were compromised by practical considerations.

Of course, such classifications were not drawn up and implemented in isolation. They must be located within a genealogy – or meta-classification – of classification schemes and the organization of knowledge from the sixteenth century onwards. They also reflect to varying degrees the religious, socio-cultural and intellectual biases of their creators, and I explore the extent to which Lindsay’s concerns with the theory and practice of library classification mirrored and indeed corroborated his preoccupations with social and racial distinctions.

A further question arises from the foregoing issues: to what extent were the manuscripts physically integrated with the rest of the library, or were they treated as a discrete category of material, and if so, did this reflect a conceptual distinction on Lindsay’s part? Finally, this chapter examines how Ludovic’s practices differed from Lindsay’s, situating his endeavours to reorganize the library and his appointment of a full-time librarian within the context of the professionalization of libraries in the late nineteenth century.
Concerns over ‘information overload’ have been manifest in many cultures and eras, but anxieties were particularly acute in nineteenth-century Britain. A matrix of factors generated significant (if variable) increases in monograph and serial publications: advances in printing and paper-making technologies reduced production costs; improvements in communication networks facilitated the gathering and distribution of information; the increasing reach and complexity of government were contingent upon and generated a growing mass of statistical data and official publications; the ramification of academic, professional, scientific and technical disciplines created new source material and markets for specialist publications; and increasing literacy and expansion of the middle classes encouraged the development of leisure reading and reading for self-improvement. This is not to imply a direct relationship between the expansion of print and the growth of the Bibliotheca Lindesiana; as a private collection, rather than a public copyright library, its growth was determined by the wealth, interests and ambitions of its owners. Nevertheless, it is important to contextualize the library’s development within these wider anxieties and the measures that were taken to


address them, such as the gradual professionalization of librarianship, the formulation of new cataloguing technologies and procedures, and the burgeoning of literary reviews and specialist bibliographies, to guide readers and collectors through the proliferation of print and enable them to select suitable literature according to canons of taste.

Lindsay did not share Sir Thomas Phillipps's unrealizable desire to possess 'one copy of every book in the world'. His ambition was to create a panoptical library containing 'the best that is known and thought in the world', in order to serve the present and future needs of the Lindsay family and of a wider circle of associates and scholars. His interests were encyclopaedic and the library in turn afforded him a comprehensive perspective across several continents, epochs of time and many cultures. It was a product of the same impulse that, Bernard Comment argues, lay behind the phenomenon of the scenic panorama: 'The invention of the panorama was a response to a particularly strong nineteenth-century need – for absolute dominance. It gave individuals the happy feeling that the world was organized around and by them, yet this was a world from which they were also separated and protected, for they were seeing it from a distance.' Thus the vast scale and ambition of the library simultaneously furnished Lindsay with the information and commanding perspective that his studies demanded, and exacerbated the problem of 'information overload'. In 1834, the year in which Lindsay began to collect books seriously, he counted 6,636 volumes in the Haigh library. By 1870 the number had risen to 24,080, and a further five thousand had been added by 1872.

---


7 Bernard Comment, *The Panorama*, trans. by Anne-Marie Glasheen, revised and expanded edn (London: Reaktion, 1999), p. 19. Lindsay was familiar with panoramas and may have visited Robert Burford's panorama of the Battle of Alma in 1855; his mother-in-law reported: 'Lindsay says there is a model to be seen, of the whole ground upon which the camp stands, and the hills round it.' Letter from Anne Lindsay to General James Lindsay, 6 February 1855; CPP, 86/1.

8 Barker, *BL*, pp. 79, 267; William Younger Fletcher, *English Book Collectors* (London: Kegan
Like Middle Hill, Haigh Hall was under constant threat of being overwhelmed by books, requiring periodic physical adjustments to accommodate continual accruals. Ludovic later recalled: ‘books came pouring in, on all subjects from all parts of the world, far quicker indeed than it was possible to shelve them: room after room had its walls covered.’9 His sister Alice concurred: their father’s library ‘was the apple of his eye, and though he loved pictures and art, books were the passion of his life, and walls, tables, shelves, rooms, passages, and finally floors were covered with them at Haigh’.10 She described one clearance campaign in February 1870: ‘the floor of the Long Room is gradually being cleared of its stupendous mass of books, they have hitherto lain in heaps covered with white sheets looking like corpses. The chicks [younger children] are indefatigable carrying them away in a wheelbarrow of Annie’s and putting them up on the shelves in the passages.'11 As well as evoking the materiality of the library, her striking simile suggests that not everyone in the family subscribed to Milton’s contention that books contain ‘a potencie of life’. Anne Lindsay certainly perceived an abundance of life in the library, but only when mediated through her son-in-law: ‘I am enjoying Lindsay’s books and every day become acquainted with some new ones [...] the Library apart from Lindsay is so large as to be like a wilderness. But with him it is full of the most beautiful flowers and the sweetest fruit.’12 Her metaphor was inspired by Lindsay’s acquisition of

Paul, Trench, Trübner, 1902), p. 403; de Ricci, p. 162. Fletcher’s and de Ricci’s estimates are confirmed by Bal in his diary entry for 19 May 1917, in Vincent, p. 379. In comparison, Phillipps estimated in 1856 that he owned 20,000 manuscripts and 30,000 printed books. By the time of his death in 1872 numbers had increased to perhaps 60,000 and 50,000 respectively. A. N. L. Munby, The Formation of the Phillipps Library from 1841 to 1872, Phillipps Studies, 4 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1956), pp. 86, 166.
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12 Letter from Anne Lindsay to her daughter May Holford, 19 May 1859; CPP, 94/19.
Sowerby’s English Botany, but recalls the familiar topos of the book or library as a garden.\textsuperscript{13}

Lindsay was indeed the key to the library, its gardener and its arkon.\textsuperscript{14} The library was the extrinsic manifestation of Lindsay’s interests and thought processes; it was, literally, his brain-child. Arguably only one other library has manifested such congruity between its content and organization and the thought patterns of its creator: the Warburg Library, where ‘the books remain a body of living thought as Warburg had planned.’\textsuperscript{15} Lindsay never employed a librarian, fearful perhaps that such assistance might compromise the close, personal control that he could exert over the library. Instead, with the (often unremarked) support of his wife and mother-in-law, he shouldered the entire responsibility for its management, purchasing books and manuscripts, recording accessions, physically arranging the collections, coordinating specialist cataloguing and binding through Quaritch, and answering enquiries from fellow collectors and scholars, as well as studying the collections for his own research. At times the burden seemed to overwhelm him: he regularly complained of headaches and eye-strain.

In order to assimilate the plethora of books and manuscripts continually entering the library, Lindsay developed a distinctive accessioning and cataloguing system, which Ludovic later outlined:

\begin{quote}
In order to assimilate the plethora of books and manuscripts continually entering the library, Lindsay developed a distinctive accessioning and cataloguing system, which Ludovic later outlined:
\end{quote}

\begin{itemize}
\item\textsuperscript{14} On archons, see Derrida, pp. 2, 4.
\item\textsuperscript{15} E. H. Gombrich, Aby Warburg: An Intellectual Biography, 2nd edn (Oxford: Phaidon, 1986), p. 331. See also Barbara Maria Stafford, ‘Reconceiving the Warburg Library as a Working Museum of the Mind’, Common Knowledge, 18.1 (2012), 180–7. The Warburg Library was institutionalized – and thus to an extent ossified – after its owner’s death, whereas the Bibliotheca Lindesiana passed to its founder’s son and was therefore liable to reinterpretation, reconstruction and ultimately dispersal.
\end{itemize}
For many years he was satisfied to mark off a purchase on his ideal desiderata list, and then to enter it on a folio sheet, author, short title, place and date, in fact a title-a-line accession list – and the next purchase would follow irrespective of order. I think it must have been about the years 1862–65 that these folio sheets of accessions were cut up and the slips pasted down on sheets, this time in order of the alphabet, and my impression remains of the pile of sheets, being nearly a foot and a half thick. Then as more books came in they were entered as accessions which after a time were in turn cut up and formed into another alphabet, and another, and another, and yet, so clear was his memory and his sense of locality, that he was not dependent on this pile of folio sheets of catalogue; if any one were to ask him, Is such a book in the Library? he would always answer without hesitation No, or Yes, you will find it on such a shelf in such a room.

While this seemingly haphazard arrangement of piles of paper may have been an inadequate guide to the library for others, for whom it remained a ‘wilderness’, terra incognita, it satisfactorily served Lindsay’s requirements, despite Ludovic’s assertion that his father had intended to amalgamate the sheets into a single sequence but dreaded the labour involved. For they combined two representations of the library, materially manifesting its chronological development in the succession of stacks, while affording ready access to its contents in the form of several alphabetical indices. Lindsay was able to navigate his way around the Haigh library

16 Lindsay compiled the desiderata list on loose sheets, one author or work per sheet; these were arranged alphabetically and later bound. Now Edinburgh, National Library of Scotland, ACC 9769, Crawford Volumes Series, 232: Lord Lindsay’s Desiderata and Collations, 1859. See Fig. 2.1.

17 Lindsay, I, Introduction, col. x. Thomas Phillipps operated a similar system: ‘As accessions arrived they were briefly listed, numbered and incorporated in additional sheets’ of the Phillipps catalogue. Munby, Phillipps Studies 1, p. 4, who notes that the stamping, numbering and arrangement of manuscripts during the 1830s was largely the work of Phillipps’s daughters. A. N. L. Munby, The Family Affairs of Sir Thomas Phillipps, Phillipps Studies, 2 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1952), p. 27.

18 Lindsay, I, Introduction, col. xi.
physically and conceptually – both through his intellectual mastery of these towers of paper and by long familiarity with the library’s topography, its arrangement of rooms, corridors, bookcases, shelves and the disposition of the volumes upon them, with items of furniture and pictures serving as supplementary visual cues. In a move that recalls Bachelard’s topoanalysis (‘the systematic psychological study of the sites of our intimate lives’), Annette Carruthers offers an insight into the relationship between thought processes and the spaces in which they occur: ‘Buildings become enfolded in people’s thinking habits. The remembered familiarity of a building’s plan [...] seems actually to channel and “carry” the movements of one’s thinking. The mind is entirely freed to make its thoughts when it also has entirely familiar habitations and its familiar routes, a principle well understood in meditative practice.’ Of course, for Lindsay the Haigh library was especially redolent with such mental catenae, having been generated out of his interests and intellect in the first place. Indeed, one reason why he never enacted his ambition of transferring the library from Haigh to Dunecht, his house in rural Aberdeenshire (apart from lengthy delays in the construction work) may have been the realization that his intimate familiarity with the library, his intellectual and somatic mastery of it, and the manifold connections between its physical disposition and organization and his own thought processes, might have been disturbed by its relocation. Notwithstanding occasional lapses, Lindsay’s prodigious memory was interwoven with the topography of the library.

2.3 A ‘structured and structuring structure’: The Library Report and Library Classification

While developing this system of accession sheets, Lindsay was concurrently compiling the Library Report, which offered a more discursive account of the present state of the library and served as a manifesto and blueprint for its future development. Bourdieu’s famously laconic definition of habitus as a ‘structured and

Gaston Bachelard, *The Poetics of Space*, trans. by Maria Jolas (Boston, MA: Beacon Press, 1994), p. 8; Carruthers, p. 257. Lindsay’s daughter recalled: ‘Till the later years of his life he could put his hand on any book without fail, and without a catalogue or list’ (Meynell, p. 28).
structuring structure’ is a useful formulation with which to consider the Report.\textsuperscript{20} It is a ‘structured structure’ in that it is arranged in a highly organized manner, according to established taxonomies of knowledge whose origins lay in the medieval period and were refined by later generations of philosophers, bibliographers and encyclopaedists, as I shall discuss shortly. It is also a ‘structuring structure’, which seeks to impose order upon, and establish intellectual control over, a vast and rapidly expanding library that constantly threatened to engulf its owner and the household in a torrent of books. Furthermore, while the Report instantiates and reinforces the internal structure of the Bibliotheca Lindesiana, it also overtly positions the library within a wider tradition of great libraries ranging from the ancient civilizations, through China and the Islamic world, to modern Europe.

The Report is situated within two long-established practices: one describing actual libraries, the other outlining idealized libraries containing all possible works within their ambit of collecting (Chartier’s ‘libraries without walls’).\textsuperscript{21} Both conventions (accommodated by the dual meanings of ‘bibliotheca’/‘bibliothèque’) confronted the challenge of describing the contents in a structured, comprehensible fashion. At this point a brief outline of the history of library classification will help to contextualize Lindsay’s endeavours.\textsuperscript{22} Alain Besson cautions against simplistic

\textsuperscript{20} Bourdieu, \textit{Distinction}, p. 167.


equivalences between bibliographical classifications and wider epistemological
taxonomies. However, in the early modern period (Foucault’s Classical *episteme*)
the development of library classification was unquestionably allied to other systems
for the organization of knowledge: the curricula of university teaching, rooted in
the medieval programmes of the *trivium* and *quadrivium*; the arrangement of
encyclopaedias; and the taxonomic projects which sought to comprehend and
control the natural world. These knowledge systems were indeed thickly
connected. Links between the curriculum and the order of books in university and
college libraries are obvious, but there were also correlations between taxonomies
and library classifications; the latter were influenced by the development of
increasingly sophisticated proto-scientific taxonomies, which were in turn shaped
by the organization of the libraries within whose walls natural philosophers studied.
There was also coincidence in the personnel involved in these enterprises: obvious
examples include Konrad Gesner (1516–65), author of the *Bibliotheca universalis* and
pioneer of the study of plants and animals, and the polymath Leibniz, who served as
librarian at Hannover and Wolfenbüttel and formulated his *Idea Leibnitiana
Bibliothecae ordinandae contractior*. Mazarin’s librarian, Gabriel Naudé (1600–53),
recommended organizing a library under the faculties of *théologie, médecine,*

---

Catherine J. Minter, ‘The Classification of Libraries and the Image of the Librarian in
Nineteenth and Early Twentieth-Century Germany’, *Library & Information History*, 25.1
(2009), 3–19. Earlier résumés are provided by J. W. Lubbock, *Remarks on the Classification
of the Different Branches of Human Knowledge* (London: Charles Knight, 1838); and Edward
Edwards, *Notes on the Classification of Human Knowledge, with Especial Reference to the
Methods Which Have Been Adopted, or Proposed, for the Arrangement or Cataloguing of
Libraries* (Liverpool: T. Brakell, 1858). See also Burke, pp. 81–115. On the duality of
*bibliotheca/bibliothèque*, see Eric Garberson, ‘Libraries, Memory and the Space of

23 Besson, pp. 176–90.

24 Burke, pp. 82–94; Garberson.

Classification’, *Journal of Library History*, 6.2 (1971), 133–52; Burke, pp. 105–6. See also Carlo
Ginzburg, ‘Réponse à Ulrich Johannes Schneider’, *Matériaux pour l’histoire de notre temps,
jurisprudence, histoire, philosophie, mathématiques and humanitez, each of which he further particularized. In the Encyclopédie, Diderot and d’Alembert grafted their humanist tree of knowledge upon the trifurcated root-stock planted by ‘le Chancelier Bacon’: from the three faculties of memory, reason and imagination sprang respectively history, philosophy and poetry (liberally interpreted); reason was privileged over imagination and memory, while theology was notoriously subordinated to philosophy. Jacques-Charles Brunet (1780–1867) restored theology’s primacy, refining Naudé’s scheme and those of subsequent bibliographers in his celebrated Manuel du libraire et de l’amateur de livres, which went through five editions between 1810 and 1860–65. Brunet’s classification comprised five principal divisions (théologie, jurisprudence, sciences et arts, belles-lettres and histoire) each with several further subdivisions. The complexity and sophistication of his scheme reflected not only the increasing specialization and fragmentation of knowledge but also the urgent need to exercise control over the rapid multiplication of books in the nineteenth century: 11,229 titles are listed in the first edition, 31,872 in the fifth. Indeed, the Manuel served as a vade mecum, guiding collectors like Lindsay in their choice of which works to acquire, both directing and affirming their taste and discrimination.

Lindsay had a life-long interest in the classification of knowledge and libraries, which appears to have pre-dated the precipitous expansion of the Bibliotheca


Lindesiana and the practical requirements of organizing his own library. In the Library Report he asserts: ‘I have for years been occupied at intervals in methodising and completing a system of classification which I think will be found to be more scientific and more practically useful than any hitherto proposed.’

Reflecting this interest were the many works on classification that found a place in the library, including several editions of Brunet and works by Naudé, Garnier, Horne and Pourcelet. Lindsay explains in the Report that he acquired such books with two objects in mind: ‘one, the collection of the library itself, the other, the formation [...] of a new System of Classification, more scientific and more convenient, founded in great measure upon my peculiar views of philosophy as expressed in “Progression by Antagonism”’.

Lindsay’s earliest extant classification scheme appears in *Progression by Antagonism* (1846). Here, employing a Hegelian dialectic, he modifies Bacon’s tripartite classification of the human faculties – memory, reason and imagination – into reason, imagination and a synthesis of the two. He omits memory and

---

29 LR, p. 1.


31 LR, Historical Paralipomena, p. 22.

understanding on the grounds that they ‘do not induce difference of pursuit or purpose’ and are ‘subsidiary to Imagination and Reason’; in actuality their exclusion is necessary to preserve the symmetry of his progressive dualism. At the end of the essay, Lindsay presents a ‘Classification of Human Thought’ in the form of a dichotomous or bifurcated diagram, a format whose own family tree can be traced back through the Encyclopédie and the taxonomies of Linnaeus to Bacon and Ramus. In this visualization of knowledge superficially resembling the schema in the preface to Chambers’s Cyclopædia, he proceeds from the general faculties on the left-hand side of the diagram, through a series of bifurcations or antagonisms, to a set of forty specific subjects on the right, some of which are further subdivided to produce fifty discrete categories (Fig. 2.2). In a footnote Lindsay claims that ‘By associating several of the Sciences and Arts here separated in analysis [...] this might be made the basis and skeleton of an extended Classification for a Library’, in which case he proposes that a ‘supplementary class’ should be added, comprising miscellaneous collected works, encyclopaedias, reviews, general literary history and general bibliography. However, because the classification is founded upon his theory of antagonism, Lindsay is induced to create artificial oppositions between categories, resulting in a fragmented taxonomy wholly unsuitable for library classification – whether hierarchical or encyclopaedic – unless, as he suggests, it

33 Ibid., p. 2. Hugh Brigstocke discusses Lindsay’s Hegelianism in ‘Sketches’, 54, noting that there is no evidence that he had read Hegel or A. W. Schlegel by 1846. However, Hegel is cited several times in Progression and his influence seems strong. On Bacon’s classification, see Sachiko Kusukawa, ‘Bacon’s Classification of Knowledge’, in The Cambridge Companion to Bacon, ed. Markku Peltonen (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), pp. 47–74.


35 Ephraim Chambers, Cyclopædia: or, an Universal Dictionary of Arts and Sciences, 2nd edn, 2 vols (London: printed for James and John Knapton [and others], 1728), i, p. ii.
were entirely reordered. Thus ethics derives from SCIENCE > SPECULATIVE OR PURE >
PHYSICAL OR NATURAL > MATTER; whereas moral philosophy (treated by Dewey as
synonymous with ethics) stems quite differently: SCIENCE > PRACTICAL OR APPLIED >
METAPHYSICAL > GOVERNMENT OF MATTER AND MIND BY SPIRIT. It is unsurprising that

_Progression by Antagonism_ elicited derision from Ruskin in his anonymous review:
'It is generally easier to plan what is beyond the reach of others than to execute
what is within our own; and it had been well if the range of this introductory essay
had been something less extensive, and its reasoning more careful.'

In _Progression by Antagonism_, Lindsay attempted unsuccessfully to reconcile the
analytical, fissile approach intrinsic to classification with his natural preference for
Baconian synthesis and balance. The latter was instantiated in his belief in the
reconciliation of reason and imagination within the Church of England and Britain’s
balanced constitution; in his multifarious literary output of prose and poetry; and in
his career as an amateur gentleman-scholar whose studies ranged expansively
across diverse fields, including art history, literature, theology, philosophy, history,
anthropology and ethnology, in a period when disciplinary boundaries remained
porous and the authority of the academy was not yet well established. Allied to
Lindsay’s polymathy was his ambition – discussed later in this chapter – to create a
wide-ranging, panoptical library.

Tensions between classification and catholicity – between microscopic and
macroscopic – remained largely unresolved in Lindsay’s career, and point to wider
nineteenth-century debates over the relative merits of generalism and

36 John Ruskin, (anon.), review of Lord Lindsay, ‘Progression by Antagonism’, and ‘Sketches

37 Heyck; Philippa Levine, _The Amateur and the Professional: Antiquarians, Historians and
Archaeologists in Victorian England, 1838–1886_ (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press,
1986). Significantly, Lindsay’s most important and lasting contribution to knowledge –
_Sketches of the History of Christian Art_ – was in the field of art history, where amateurism
specialization. During the 1860s he essayed a more functional classification, which could serve the practical needs of a library. According to his son, Lindsay ‘wrote a long memorandum on the subject [of classification] some twenty or thirty years before his death (I think) but, though it is complete he never wrote it out for the press, but laid it aside.’ This document seemingly survives as a substantial bound volume containing disjointed drafts of a detailed classification scheme (Fig. 2.3). That Lindsay intended the scheme to be applicable to libraries, rather than being a purely theoretical construct, is indicated by the arrangement of Belles Lettres, for example:

1. Introduction to Belles Lettres
2. Dictionaries
3. Rhetoric
4. Poetry
5. Romance
6. Collections, Miscellanies, Belles Lettres
7. General Hist[ory] Belles Lettres
8. Philosophy of Belles Lettres
9. Miscellanies
10. Bibliography of Belles Lettres

In fact, this project was never completed: certain sections, such as Belles Lettres, Theology and Language are highly developed, each running to scores of pages and containing up to fifteen levels of subdivision; others, such as Poesy and Logic, are merely inchoate sketches. Nor is there any indication of how Lindsay intended to link these broad subjects into an overarching intellectual framework, similar to the scheme in Progression by Antagonism. Perhaps he found it impossible to reconcile

39 Lindsay, I, Introduction, col. x.
40 Edinburgh, National Library of Scotland, ACC 9769, Crawford Library Papers, 296: Lord Lindsay’s System of Classification, n.d. [c.1860–65].
his propensities towards synthesis and abstraction with the contrary, centrifugal
tendencies towards complication and atomization. The extraordinary degree of
subdivision in certain sections of the scheme suggests a febrile, hyper-analytical
mind; the scope for limitless regression meant that Lindsay could never complete
the scheme to his satisfaction. It also fatally compromised the practicability of the
scheme for the organization of libraries.

Such difficulties may explain Lindsay’s decision not to implement his idiosyncratic
classification scheme in the Report, which was intended as a functional document,
guiding Lindsay and his successors in the library’s continuing development.
Practical considerations dictated that it should instead adopt the structure of
Brunet’s *Manuel*, the most widely consulted guide to rare and antiquarian books in
this period. Indeed, the Report adheres with remarkable fidelity to the arrangement
of the fourth edition of the *Manuel* (1842–44): see Appendix 2.41 Throughout the
Report Lindsay repeatedly cites Brunet as an authority on bibliographical issues,
and employs him as a benchmark against which to measure the rarity of his own
books, both positively – quoting the French bibliographer’s approbation of certain
editions – and negatively, noting rare works in the library that had escaped his
attention: ‘unknown to Brunet’ is a recurrent boast.42 Lindsay identifies other
shortcomings of Brunet, criticizing in particular the Roman Catholic bias that he
perceives in French classification schemes:

---

41 Jacques-Charles Brunet, *Manuel du libraire et de l’amateur de livres*, 4me edn, 5 vols (Paris:
chez Silvestre, 1842–44). The Report was compiled contemporaneously with the fifth edition
of the *Manuel* (1860–65). Mérimée claimed that ‘les bouquinistes savent par coeur le *Manuel
de Brunet*’. Prosper Mérimée, ‘Le procès de M. Libri’, *Revue des deux mondes*, 1re série, 14
(1852), 306–36 (p. 331). Quoted in translation by P. Alessandra Maccioni Ruju and Marco
Mostert, *The Life and Times of Guglielmo Libri (1802–1869), Scientist, Patriot, Scholar,

42 E.g., ‘a valuable work, of which, according to Brunet, “fort peu d’exemplaires sont
parvenues en Europe.”’ *LR*, Historical Paralipomena, p. 22. Less frequently Lindsay cites
other authorities such as De Bure, Camus, Chalmers, Dibdin, Ebert, Foppens, Lowndes and
Panzer.
French classification, I should here premise, being the work of Roman Catholics, does not recognise the coequal dignity of the Greek with the Latin Church subsequently to the schism of the East and West, and still less the position of the Church of England as a branch of the Church Catholic. But this is of little consequence. Although following the general outline of Brunet’s System, I acknowledge no slavery to it, and shall deviate from it when I see sufficient cause.  

In fact, while some sections of Brunet’s Manuel may betray Roman Catholic bias, it was noted earlier that French classification was also influenced by trees of knowledge compiled by Protestants such as Bacon and Chambers. Indeed, Lindsay vehemently condemns the humanist ‘irreligion’ of Diderot and d’Alembert, describing the Encyclopédie as a ‘pest-house of moral contagion [...] by which the Freethinkers of the last century endeavoured to sap the foundations and ramparts of Christianity’. However, he fails to comment upon the broader Western perspective from which almost all classifications of knowledge developed and which relegated non-European cultures (as well as subalterns within Europe) to subordinate, marginal roles. I shall consider shortly the degree of association between Lindsay’s own classificatory theories and practices, and his preoccupations with racial and social distinctions.

Of course, there is a significant difference between the theoretical organization of a library, as represented in a catalogue or classification scheme, and its physical instantiation – the actual arrangement of books on shelves. Practical issues – space limitations, variations in the size of volumes, non-standard formats such as rolls and portfolios, the need to protect precious items from the curious and light-fingered, convenience of access to frequently consulted material, and the requirement to accommodate continual accruals – intrude upon idealized notions of how a library ought to be arranged to reflect the organization of knowledge and

---

43 LR, Theology, p. 2.

the interests of the collector. In the case of the Bibliotheca Lindesiana, evidence of how the library was materially organized is scant. If, as seems plausible, the books were arranged into broad subject categories, such as the scheme outlined in the Report, this arrangement was compromised by other considerations, such as Lindsay’s concern to safeguard the most valuable items, which he kept in his own room. In 1864 he told his wife that ‘I have been hard at work ever since breakfast till lunch removing and arranging books for packing, with the view of having the more valuable ones packed together so as to be easily and at once saved from fire, if necessary.’ A volume compiled by Lindsay in the mid-1860s records the books and manuscripts housed in sixteen drawers under a large table in his room. Whereas one might have expected the contents to be organized in an obviously meaningful order, perhaps thematically, there is no apparent commonality between the contents of most drawers, besides their generally special nature. For example, drawer eight contained one volume of the 42-line (Gutenberg) Bible, various literary and liturgical works such as the 1502 Aldine edition of Dante and a Mozarabic Breviary, the Henry of Chichester Missal manuscript, and David Lindsay’s Godly Mans Iourney (1625). Similarly, while drawer fifteen held predominantly religious works, its contents also included the Shakespeare First Folio and a 1496 edition of Marco Polo.

Despite Lindsay’s abiding interest in the principles of classification and his quest for the ideal system of arrangement, the practicalities of managing the ever-expanding library sometimes defeated even his impressive organizational powers. In 1867 he apologized to David Laing for his inability to locate a sixteenth-century armorial compiled by Sir David Lindsay:


46 Letter from Lindsay to Lady Lindsay (Min), 3 August 1864; CPP, 94/20.

I have mislaid it within the last two years, and in spite of every search have not as yet been able to find it [...]. I do not think it is lost; but about the time referred to a large number of our most valuable books were packed up & put away for security, in anticipation of some alterations being made at Haigh, & I have not yet discovered the locality where the Armorial found refuge.  

In 1872 the books and manuscripts were divided between no less than six locations at Haigh Hall: the 'Passage' (9,400 volumes), Billiard Room (4,800), East Library (3,900), Lindsay's Room (5,980), South Library (3,799) and Boudoir (1,185). The visit of the Prince and Princess of Wales to Haigh in 1873 necessitated ‘a general clearance of the house, as just then books were everywhere awaiting new shelving’, exacerbating problems caused by Lindsay’s declining health and extended periods abroad. Ludovic described how a volume of Tudor and Stuart proclamations, put away in 1873, was only rediscovered ten years later, together with ‘many other scarce works which had for long been mourned as lost’. Lindsay himself was clearly dissatisfied with the haphazard disposition of the collections, as he intimates in the Report:

> At present, as you are aware, at Haigh, our books and pictures are as it were intermingled with each other, and scattered over the house. Half of the ground floor is occupied by the books and half with by pictures; and it is the same on the first story, [sic] upstairs. The general effect is, that neither collection possesses the character of homogeneity and unity which ought to belong to it; and that the impression produced in either case is that of

---

48 Letter from Lindsay to Laing, 13 August 1867. Edinburgh University Library, Papers of David Laing, La.IV/18/146‒7. Lindsay rediscovered the armorial in c.1870. Letter from Lindsay to Laing, undated. La.IV/18/157–8.

49 Transcript of a note in Min’s diary, 1872; CPP, 94/21.

50 James Ludovic Lindsay, Bibliotheca Lindesiana: A Bibliography of Royal Proclamations of the Tudor and Stuart Sovereigns and of Others Published under Authority 1485–1714, with an Historical Essay on their Origin and Use by Robert Steele, 2 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1910), 1, p. iii.
“disjecta membra,” dissevered limbs, rather than of a symmetrical, consistent, and living body corporate.\textsuperscript{51}

However, his plans for wholesale reorganization of the collections along more systematic lines were constrained by his elderly father’s aversion to disturbance of his domestic arrangements. For this reason, and because of the threat from the polluted atmosphere of Wigan, he proposed the more radical solution of transposing the Bibliotheca Lindesiana to Dunecht, where he intended to construct a vast library room, a double cube one hundred feet long by fifty wide and fifty high, capable of housing the entire collection.\textsuperscript{52} Had this ambition been realized, it would have enabled him to fulfil his desire to organize the library along scientific lines. However, although a magnificent library was eventually constructed at Dunecht, to designs by George Edmund Street which adhered closely to the specification set out in the Library Report (Figs 2.4 & 2.5), the books were never transferred from Lancashire, for reasons discussed above. The Report is thus situated within a long tradition of unrealized or unrealizable utopian libraries that, in Chartier’s words, ‘would bring together all accumulated knowledge and all the books ever written. […] Bringing together the entire written patrimony of humanity in one place proves an impossible task, though.’\textsuperscript{53}

\textsuperscript{51} LR, Epilogue, p. 14.

\textsuperscript{52} Ibid., p. 15. In 1849 Lindsay outlined a similarly unfulfilled ambition to create a ‘quadrangular gallery’ at Haigh to accommodate his art collection. Letter from Lindsay to Colonel James Lindsay, 22 April 1849; CPP, 94/13. Quoted in Brigstocke, ‘Collector’, 299.

2.4 ‘Classified by their classifications’: Connections between Library Classification and Cultural and Racial Distinctions

The formulation and implementation of library classification schemes do not operate in an ideological vacuum. Far from being disinterested, ‘natural’ representations of the world, classifications import, refract and corroborate the epistemological, social, cultural, religious, racial and gendered outlooks of their creators and practitioners.54 As Bourdieu expresses it, ‘Social subjects, classified by their classifications, distinguish themselves by the distinctions they make.’55 The Bibliotheca Lindesiana was not immune from these biases and in this section I shall explore how Lindsay’s interest in the classification of libraries intersected with, and offers itself as a lens through which to view, his preoccupations with socio-cultural and racial distinctions.

At a superficial level, one observes the striking visual correspondences between the genealogical pedigrees which demonstrate Lindsay’s aristocratic lineage in Lives of the Lindsays, the ramified tables he employs to expound his classification of civilizations in Progression by Antagonism, and the dichotomous diagram illuminating his ‘Classification of Human Thought’ in the latter work (Figs 2.2 & 4.1).56 In each case the diagrams are rhetorical devices, connoting transparency, certainty and impartiality, and eliding the ambiguities, contingency and polemicism of Lindsay’s arguments. They also manifest his concern for hierarchy and order,


55 Bourdieu, Distinction, p. xxix. John Budd, applying Bourdieu’s model to the field of libraries, argues that ‘Classification, or classifying, is not a simple idea. It is rooted in “class,” which has been politically charged for many years.’ John M. Budd, ‘The Library, Praxis, and Symbolic Power’, Library Quarterly, 73.1 (2003), 19–32 (p. 28).

56 Pearce notes the correspondence between family trees and other pictorial representations of systematic relationships. Pearce, On Collecting, p. 270.
whether social, racial or epistemological. The connections between these classificatory schemes must now be investigated more deeply.

In the Library Report, Lindsay makes explicit the connections between taste and classification, and between the proper ordering of a library and its function in consolidating social and cultural capital: ‘a choice and well ordered ^private^ Library exercises a most ennobling influence upon the family which possesses it, and through such families upon society.’

In order to confer distinction, both the selection and organization of a library's contents must be governed by taste and discrimination; a well-ordered library engenders a well-ordered society. The Phillipps library, by contrast, incorporated countless choice items but was notoriously disorganized and cannot be said to have exerted an ennobling influence upon its owner.

The Report's representation of the library and the relative weighting of the several departments within it reflect conventional notions of the hierarchy of knowledge (such as the privileged position of theology), the traditional French classification schemes, and Lindsay’s own elite tastes and intellectual interests. Thus primacy is awarded to theology, to which some fifty pages of the Report are devoted and where Lindsay boasts that the library is ‘decidedly rich in many subdivisions of that department’, whereas jurisprudence ‘is but meagrely represented in our Library.’

Unsurprisingly, Lindsay does give special attention to one branch of jurisprudence: to the 'law of probation in genealogy, to the law of nobility generally on the Continent, and to the peerage law of Britain at home'. He admits that his interest in this field has been piqued by his own genealogical research and endeavours to prove his father’s entitlement to the earldom of Crawford and the dukedom of Montrose.

Lindsay’s aristocratic outlook is also apparent in the lengthy supplement appended to the historical section of the Report. ‘Historical Paralipomena’ comprise ‘the

58 LR, Theology, p. 43; LR, Jurisprudence, pp. 1–2.
59 Ibid., p. 2.
History of Chivalry and Noblesse, or, as I would rather term it, Genealogical History, or even, still more simply and comprehensively, Genealogy’. This was matter of ‘unspeakable practical and political importance’ for Lindsay, not only for his own studies, but because of his belief in the aristocracy’s pivotal, moderating influence upon society:

I have sought to assemble together most important works on the subject of Genealogy, Heraldry, and Chivalry, – and if you still think that the Library is too redundant in this department, I must retreat on the excuse I have pleaded on more than one previous occasion, that the class has attained a special development through the necessities of my own studies. After all, the doer of a great deed is as important as the deed he does; and Genealogy, worthily written, would, as the biography of the ruling races of the world, have a claim to rank and prominence equal at least to that of ordinary history.60

At a time when the position of the aristocracy was being challenged and when the romantic medievalism that flourished in the early decades of the century was waning, Lindsay makes a case for the continued relevance of works on chivalry and noblesse.61

A large section of the Report is devoted to belles-lettres or ‘polite literature’. Lindsay, like Horne before him, adopted the French bibliographers’ expansive interpretation of belles-lettres, encompassing the ‘science of language and comparative grammar’, rhetoric, poetry, prose fiction, and philology or criticism.62

60 LR, Historical Paralipomena, pp. 1–2. Lindsay follows the model of Brunet, who terms this section ‘Paralipomènes historiques’.


62 Horne used the English term ‘polite literature’, whereas Lindsay retained the French
Belles-lettres was, John Guillory asserts, ‘a discourse of judgment or taste, designed to cultivate a faculty of discrimination, the ability to distinguish good writing (“fine letters”) from bad’. Although the term was not imported into England until the early eighteenth century, ‘polite literature’ or *literae humaniores* had been an essential component of a gentleman’s library since the early modern period. In fact, Lindsay’s catholic definition conceals the tensions between the philological/linguistic elements of belles-lettres and its more subjective, cultured aspects. These strains would eventually cause the bellettristic discipline to break apart. Belles-lettres infiltrated the academy for the first time in the eighteenth century and briefly flourished there, thanks to the efforts of Hugh Blair (1718–1800) and other exponents of the Scottish Enlightenment, but Guillory maintains that it was ‘always in danger of sinking to a merely effusive discourse of appreciation’, and it remained underdeveloped as a discipline. While philology would split off and flourish in the nineteenth century, belles-lettres’ lack of rigour and scientificity led to its marginalization within the increasingly research-orientated universities.

---


64 Besson, pp. 209–11.


Lindsay’s emphasis on belles-lettres and its edifying function thus both positions him outside the academy and aligns him with a nostalgic, elitist view of literature. This is emphasized in the importance he attaches to the *editiones principes* of the classics, which ‘have a peculiar and graceful value in point of bibliographical rarity and interest’ which has never as yet diminished, and which can only become extinguished with the total decay of polite learning and refined feeling in the educated ranks of society’. Thus the fortunes of the classics and the enlightened elite are inextricably interwoven. In summary, there is considerable evidence that Lindsay’s construction of cultural distinction and the organization of the Bibliotheca Lindesiana were mutually reinforcing. The privileging of (Protestant) theology, genealogical works and belles-lettres both reflected and corroborated Lindsay’s elite habitus and his dominant position in the field of cultural production.

Having considered the correlations between, on the one hand, Lindsay’s interests in organizations of knowledge and of libraries and, on the other, his preoccupations with social distinction, I now address the question of whether and to what extent the former were imbricated with his fascination with Eastern cultures and racial classification. In a general sense Orientalism and the organization of libraries were densely connected. Benedict Anderson’s ‘totalizing classificatory grid’, which features in Chapter 4, could equally be applied to libraries and the books and manuscripts contained within them, both as objects to be controlled and as instruments of colonial oppression. New knowledges acquired from European exploration and conquest challenged traditional taxonomies and stimulated the development of novel systems of classification, which were themselves mechanisms of occidental domination. Tim Fulford, for example, argues that ‘Botanical classification [...] was one of the new enlightenment discourses by which Europe

---

67 On the development of philology, see Haruko Momma, *From Philology to English Studies: Language and Culture in the Nineteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013); Turner.

68 LR, Belles-Lettres, p. 10.
took command of a world that, simultaneously, it was bringing under its colonial control. There are also striking visual symmetries between Lindsay’s classification of knowledge and his racial taxonomies.

However, while Lindsay collected Oriental books and manuscripts ostensibly to facilitate his studies of comparative religion and ethnology, there is no evidence that the actual organization of the library was either influenced by or supported his interest in ethnic classifications. Indeed, as Chapter 4 explicates, two striking aspects of the Library Report are Lindsay’s generally liberal approach towards non-Western cultures, and the considerable attention he devotes to Oriental books and manuscripts. In almost every department of the library, Lindsay enumerates his extensive holdings of Orientalia, as well as his desiderata, and he generously acknowledges the contributions to human knowledge made by non-European cultures, as when he asserts that ‘Oriental Medicine is, in fact, an important branch of science, and both the Chinese and Arabs – the teachers of medical Christendom through the Saracens and Jews – have contributed to the building up of the temple of Esculapius.’ The following passage, in which he defends the ‘literary catholicity’ of the library, exemplifies his enlightened attitude:

I am half afraid that you will grudge the space upon our shelves (although not so very great after all) devoted to these Oriental literatures, but any such prejudice will soon dissipate itself in the purer air of liberal appreciation for which I plead. We of the Western world sin grievously against modesty in asserting ^assuming^, as we commonly do, like the Greeks but without their excuse, that all science, art, and literature not European must needs be inferior and uninteresting, in a word, barbarous. This is very far from being the case.\footnote{LR, Introduction, pp. 17–18.}


\footnote{LR, Arts and Sciences, p. 7.}
Thus there is considerable evidence that during Lindsay’s hegemony Western and Oriental materials were neither physically nor intellectually segregated. While the latter were never accorded full parity, they were generally integrated with the European collections. Later in the century, in a move that paralleled the hardening of racial and colonial attitudes in the European empires, the Oriental collections were subject to increasing discipline/disciplinarity and separation; they were exposed to Anderson’s ‘totalizing classificatory grid’. During the 1890s Ludovic’s librarian, J. P. Edmond, arranged the manuscripts by language, protecting the more valuable ones in glass-fronted bookcases and physically segregating the Oriental and Western manuscripts:

I propose arranging these Oriental MSS. in 20 shelves on one side of the glass case. The other side can be filled up with such European MSS. as you have not room for downstairs [...]. A further advance has been made in arranging the gallery; the Japanese Library is shelved immediately succeeding the Chinese Books; and after the Japs comes the lithographed Oriental literature, and the Armenian printed books.72

A divergence is also apparent in Ludovic’s endeavours to improve the cataloguing of the library. The Arabic, Persian, Turkish and Chinese items were described in summary ‘hand-lists’, whereas it was his ( unrealized) intention to commission detailed catalogues of the Latin and other European manuscripts, ‘a division in the eyes of many by far the most important’.73 A similar differentiation operated when the cream of the manuscripts was exhibited at the Grafton Galleries in 1898: the eighty-six Western manuscripts and bindings were treated to detailed individual descriptions in the catalogue, while a selection of 156 Oriental items was grouped into a single twelve-line entry.74 Thus one can observe growing physical and

72 On the organization of the manuscripts, see letters from Edmond to Ludovic, 5 March and 2 April 1892; CLL, Jan–June 1892, fols 110–11, 141; the latter is quoted above.


74 Bibliotheca Lindesiana, List of Manuscripts and Examples of Metal and Ivory Bindings Exhibited to the Bibliographical Society at the Grafton Galleries 13th June 1898 by the
conceptual separation between Oriental books and manuscripts and the remainder of the library. There are obvious parallels with the increasingly rigid segregation and stratification operating within the bureaucratized ‘new imperialism’ of the late nineteenth century; both were motivated by anxieties of control and differentiation. Likewise, Louise Tythacott has highlighted the increasing systematization and segregation of ethnographic materials within nineteenth-century museums, in response to new forms of knowledge.

On the other hand, it would be wrong to exaggerate the degree of separation between the Oriental and Western sections of the library. It is possible to discern ‘transgressions’ or ‘border crossings’ between Oriental and Western manuscripts, most obviously in Ludovic’s preference for classical and Christian texts amongst the papyri he acquired in Egypt – reminders that the Graeco-Roman and ancient Christian worlds did not respect modern geo-political boundaries – but also, more subtly, in the Arabic texts which preserved ancient Greek science and philosophy, in the Islamic influences perceptible in medieval Spanish manuscripts, and in the famous ‘Egyptian’ page of the Colonna Missal. By bringing together such a diversity of books and manuscripts from many cultures and geographical regions, the earls of Crawford exposed latent connections between these materials – their mutual influences and accidental correspondences – as well as their obvious differences. Thus both the content of the manuscripts and the earls’ approaches to


77 Islamic influences are evident in Rylands Latin MS 89. The Colonna Missal is now Rylands Latin MS 32.
their collections problematize rigid East-West distinctions and imply a more fluid figuration of the Orient in the context of the Bibliotheca Lindesiana.

2.5 ‘The Museum or curiosity department’: The Organization of Manuscripts within the Bibliotheca Lindesiana

Manuscripts occupy a liminal position in many libraries, corporeally and conceptually. Codices outwardly resemble their printed cousins, and it may be convenient and practicable to collocate them on the same shelves. But manuscripts also comprise an array of non-book formats, such as scrolls, parchment deeds and single-sheet documents, which demand separate, specialized accommodation (although collectors have often attempted to ‘discipline’ such heterodox material and make it physically conform to the codex archetype, for instance through the practices of binding loose-leaf items and dressing Oriental manuscripts in European covers). In conceptual terms manuscripts may be collected and valued for their informational content, in a manner similar to printed books; alternatively their art-historical significance may be paramount, illumination translating them from the field of bibliography to that of fine art; or they may function as historical curiosities, conversation pieces, and fetishized relics of great men and women.78 In these cases, collectors may choose to locate their manuscripts (materially and/or noetically) in the context of a picture gallery or cabinet of curiosities, rather than a library proper.79 In fact, I shall show that Lindsay adopted a hybrid approach, situating his manuscripts within the body of the library, but displaying them from time to time in the contingent, mutable space of his ‘Museum’.

---


79 On manuscript collecting in the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, see Munby, Connoisseurs; Hindman and Rowe.
There is a paucity of evidence for the physical and intellectual positioning of manuscripts within private libraries in the nineteenth century. Auctioneers’ catalogues and other published descriptions of such collections (often compiled in anticipation of or subsequent to a collection’s dispersion or transfer of ownership) tended both to treat manuscripts and printed books promiscuously (especially when manuscripts constituted a small proportion of a collection), and to impose an extrinsic order, disregarding any arrangement applied by the owners. In any case, manuscripts themselves resist unambiguous categorization and classification, because of the fluidity of their content and structure. Thus it was often expedient for catalogues to be arranged alphabetically (such as the collections of William Bragge, Thomas Corser and Henry Huth), or according to Brunet’s divisions or similar categorizations (exemplified by the collections of William Tyssen-Amherst and Frank McClean).\textsuperscript{80} A further complication is that some collectors (notably John Ruskin and Henry Yates Thompson) were continually acquiring and disposing of manuscripts, and their collections were therefore inherently unstable.\textsuperscript{81} Lord Ashburnham’s outstanding collection of manuscripts is one of the few whose arrangement is well documented. The four major sections of the collection – the Libri, Barrois, Stowe and Appendix manuscripts – were distinguished by different coloured spine labels. The Libri, Barrois and Appendix manuscripts were interfiled in two sequences, arranged roughly by subject, while the Stowe collection was shelved separately, as were the printed books.\textsuperscript{82}

The Bibliotheca Lindesiana constitutes an interesting case-study of a hybrid print-manuscript collection in which the organization and status of the manuscripts

\textsuperscript{80} The Tyssen-Amherst catalogue records: ‘It was first proposed to make a separate section for the manuscripts; but the specimens under description being nearly all closely connected with printed books also in the library, it has seemed more advisable to place them at the beginning of each section.’ Seymour de Ricci, \textit{A Hand-List of a Collection of Books and Manuscripts Belonging to the Right Hon. Lord Amherst of Hackney} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1906), p. 61.

\textsuperscript{81} On Yates Thompson, see de Hamel, ‘Yates Thompson’. On Ruskin’s manuscripts, see Dearden.

\textsuperscript{82} Gehl, p. 17.
shifted over time. Lindsay claimed not to be a collector of manuscripts per se. As I explain later, he was obliged to acquire Oriental manuscripts in order to document the cultures of the East, because of their late adoption of printing. By contrast, he averred that his Western manuscripts were limited to ‘a few valuable specimens illustrative of the calligraphy of different ages and countries’. Lindsay distinguished himself from other nineteenth-century manuscript collectors, such as his brother-in-law Robert Holford, by eschewing the obvious attractions of illuminated manuscripts. He thus conformed with Naudé’s advice that one should not collect manuscripts of works already printed, and that ‘il faut neâger [sic] tous ces livres & Manuscrits qui ne sont prisez que pour le respect de leur antiquité, figures, peintures, relieures, & autres foibles considerations [sic].’ Lindsay professed that his ambitions in this field were strictly limited:

I may perhaps buy a few other MSS. on the score of beauty in writing or illumination, but the above constitute the series which I have proposed to myself to procure as specimens of the principal styles and epochs of calligraphy. A Manuscript library, such as that of Sir Thomas Phillipps or Lord Ashburnham, has a value and a charm inexpressibly attractive; but I have never directed ^bent^ my thoughts in that direction, and in so far as I may have the means of collecting, over and above the range of our typographical library, it will be in the direction of Art [...]

Those individual manuscripts that Lindsay did acquire were generally assigned to the ‘Museum or curiosity’ department of the library, which comprised ‘monuments in the history, not so much of thought and literature as of bibliography’. Lindsay enumerates those ‘few valuable specimens illustrative of the calligraphy of different ages and countries’ that constitute the Museum. In the Wunderkammer tradition, the list is striking for its eclecticism: thirty-three Oriental manuscripts, including

83 LR, Epilogue, p. 3.
85 LR, Epilogue, p. 7.
86 LR, p. 1.
Hieroglyphic, Ethiopic, Persian, Sanskrit, Javanese, Chinese and Tibetan manuscripts, and fifteen Western codices, ranging from the eighth century to the fifteenth. His desiderata are likewise modest, including ‘A fine Papyrus’ (‘two or three that I brought from Egypt having fallen to pieces’), ‘a good Coptic MS.’, ‘an Arabic MS. in the old Cufic character’, and ‘a good Anglo-Saxon MS.’. He also intends the Museum to contain a selection of autograph letters and charters, specimens of Chinese xylography, European blockbooks, a selection of incunabula and later printed works chosen ‘to illustrate the progress of printing down to the present time’, and ‘a few fine specimens of the Bibliopegistic Art’. However, he is adamant that the Museum, unlike a cabinet of curiosities, should not constitute a physically distinct department:

I do not, let me add, intend by the word ‘Museum’ to imply a collection to be kept separate and distinct from the Library; but simply such a series of volumes, chosen rather for their bibliographical curiosity than their usefulness for purposes of study, as may on special occasions be brought out and so arranged as to constitute a ‘Museum’, of pro tempore extemporisation, full of interest and instruction.

---


88 LR, Epilogue, pp. 10, 13. Lindsay wrote of autographs: ‘To gaze upon words of immortality in the actual handwriting of those who penned them, or peruse the friendly correspondence of such men in the unpremeditated ease of their daily life and humanity, is one of the purest and most exquisite sources of gratification of which the mind is capable.’ Ibid., pp. 7–8.

89 LR, Epilogue, p. 2.
In sketching proposals for his idealized library at Dunecht, Lindsay rehearses how he envisages the Museum functioning:

I should propose that some cases, glazed and with lock and key, should be constructed for the purpose of exhibiting on particular occasions the more interesting of our books and manuscripts, in the manner which has been adopted in the British Museum and elsewhere. These might be kept in some separate quarter except when wanted, and should then be ranged at intervals along the sides of the room, filled with books or other objects selected for their interest or importance. [...] The effect of this would be to form, from time to time, a portion of the Library, selected for the occasion, into the ‘Museum’ which I have so often spoken of.90

The impermanence of the Museum, I argue, reflects not only the ambivalence of the material that it was intended to house, but also the contradictions in Lindsay’s own attitude towards these special items. As I have observed, manuscripts and other ‘valuable specimens’ defied unproblematic classification as bibliographical items: analogous to but distinguishable from printed books. Thus they could neither be fully incorporated within the library, nor entirely divorced from it. Lindsay claimed to value manuscripts less as textual witnesses than as representative examples of the various scriptoria and schools of illumination. He also privileged later, more authoritative printed editions over incunabula, treating the latter rather as landmarks of typography: ‘when mere and simple rarity is the sole characteristic of a book – when it is not the first edition, nor the best, nor in any way distinguishable for merit or beauty – then, although not insensible to the charms of the bibliomaniacal Circe, I have withstood her spell, and rejected it.’91 However, there is arguably an element of special pleading here. On the one hand, Lindsay deprecated the ‘cabinet’ style of collecting, and claimed that the library was founded upon utility. Yet, when it suited, he was able to justify to himself acquiring a 42-line Bible, a First Folio, and a number of outstanding illuminated manuscripts.92 This elasticity

90 Ibid., p. 16.


92 Lindsay admitted: ‘my view of utility has been a broader and more generous one than that
of policy and practice could be accommodated by the temporality of the Museum, which was untrammelled by rigid categorization and physical demarcation. Furthermore, the extemporization and asynchrony of Lindsay’s museum are features of the amateurism which I touched upon earlier; as Carolyn Dinshaw argues, ‘[a]mateur temporality starts and stops at will [...] amateurs can enjoy the chance irruptions that occur when all is not synched up’, in contrast to the linearity and regularity of professionalism.93

In the decade after he compiled the Library Report, Lindsay purchased a significant number of important manuscripts, both Western and Oriental, including Nicolas de Lyra’s *Postilla*, the Colonna Missal, the Joan of Navarre Psalter, the Prüm Lectionary, the Forme of Cury, and an outstanding Haggadah, as well as the hundreds of Arabic, Persian, Turkish, Coptic, Ethiopic and Samaritan manuscripts from the collections of Nathaniel Bland, Duncan Forbes, George Hamilton and Henry Tattam. While he continued to assert that he did not collect manuscripts *qua* manuscripts, he certainly adopted a more catholic approach towards their acquisition.

When Ludovic assumed control of the library, he initially adhered to his father’s cautious policy with regard to manuscripts, no doubt to Quaritch’s disappointment: ‘I have not in any sense a MS library, nor do I wish greatly to extend my field in that direction at the present time, excepting perhaps on specimens of really remote antiquity and equal beauty of illumination and execution.’94 However, he was more susceptible to the allure of spectacular items, such as the folio copy of Lydgate’s *Troy Book*, which Quaritch had repeatedly tried to persuade his father to buy, and he soon fell under the spell of manuscripts, especially early codices.95 During the decade from 1884 he acquired many important manuscripts in the glittering series of the mere utilitarian.’ LR, Epilogue, p. 1.

93 Dinshaw, p. 22. She defines asynchrony as ‘different time frames or temporal systems colliding in a single moment of now’ (p. 5).

94 Letter from Ludovic to Quaritch, 20 March 1882; London, Bernard Quaritch Ltd Archives.

of sales that marked this era: those of François Vergauwen, the earl of Jersey (Osterley Park), Bateman of Youlgrave, Andrew Fountaine, Howel Wills and Stuart of Aldenham. As the manuscript collections grew, they gradually sedimented out from the printed books, forming discrete sections of the library, arranged by language. While Ludovic continued to exhibit the manuscripts regularly, both at Haigh Hall and elsewhere, Lindsay’s concept of an extempore ‘Museum’ was no longer discussed: the manuscripts’ position within the Bibliotheca Lindesiana, although remaining distinct, was now firmly consolidated. They were also subject to an increasingly professionalized management, as I shall explore in the next section.

2.6 Professionalization and Distancing: Reorganization of the Library under Ludovic

While library classification schemes cannot be said to have preoccupied Ludovic in the way that they absorbed his father’s attention, they did appeal to his scientific mind. Indeed, he was responsible for one of the earliest applications in Britain of the decimal classification system devised by Melvil Dewey at Amherst College: only three years after Dewey published his scheme in 1876, and years before its widespread acceptance in Britain, Ludovic adopted and expanded it in order to classify the astronomical library at Dunecht Observatory.96 Alert to the innovation of this modified Dewey scheme and its potential application in other scientific libraries, Ludovic printed and circulated a limited edition of his classification and index. In the introduction he explains his adaptations to Dewey’s basic scheme:

---

On examining the classes devoted to my special subjects in Mr. Dewey’s arrangement, I found several points upon which I differed from him, notably in his arrangement of Astronomy. These I have altered without scruple, and, I venture to hope, without detriment. The original form of Mr. Dewey’s Classing extends to three figures of decimals. My case being that of a Specialist, I have added a figure, thereby increasing the field for work tenfold.97

It is as though Ludovic has inverted his giant telescope to focus on the microscopic gradations of classification.

The Bibliotheca Lindesiana was the creature of Lindsay and earlier I noted the closeness with which it mapped onto his mind. It was perhaps inevitable that Ludovic could not attain his father’s intellectual mastery over the library nor match his degree of self-identification with it. In 1884 he embarked upon an ambitious project to write a history of the library. Like his father’s Report, it was to be structured upon ‘the familiar classification of Brunet and the French Bibliographers’. However, he abandoned it after seventy-four pages, part-way through the first section; it was essentially a reworking of the Report, with passages repeated verbatim, a disappointing postscript to Lindsay’s magnum opus.98

Ludovic did institute improvements to the organization of the library, which appears to have been neglected during Lindsay’s final years. While his father was still alive, Ludovic had purchased several thousand catalogue cards, some ‘American revolving bookcases’ and several works on the organization and management of libraries.99 He cut up the folio sheets upon which his father had pasted the accession slips, to create a single alphabetical sequence instead of five. ‘I never regretted the labour this reducing work caused me, as thereby I learnt whether a

97 Lindsay, Dun Echt Classification Scheme, pp. [3]–4.


99 Invoice from Trübner & Co., 19 December 1879; CLI, 1877–82, fol. 110. 7,000 more cards were purchased in 1881; invoice from Trübner & Co., 30 June 1881; ibid., fol. 1151.
book already existed and to a very great extent the whereabouts in the house to look for it.’

However, Ludovic was unable or unwilling to devote sufficient attention to the management of the library and eventually recognized the need for professional assistance: to impose order on a collection grown unwieldy through rapid expansion; to tackle the backlogs of cataloguing and binding; to pursue dilatory suppliers of journals and serial publications; to respond to the almost daily offers of material from British and overseas booksellers; and to handle the frequent enquiries he received from scholars, fellow collectors and the plain curious. The decision to appoint John Philip Edmond (1850–1906) as full-time librarian in 1891 placed the library on a more professional footing, but it also had the (presumably intended) consequence of distancing Ludovic from its day-to-day operations, freeing him to pursue other interests, in contrast to his father, for whom the library was his chief avocation. Edmond had made his reputation at Sion College, where he reorganized the library according to the classification schemes of Brunet and Dewey, an initiative which no doubt recommended him to Ludovic. From 1888 Edmond had also assisted on a part-time basis with the publication of Ludovic’s Catalogue of English Ballads and Handlist of Proclamations.

While there were particular circumstances which motivated Ludovic to appoint Edmond, the decision must be located within the context of the professionalization of libraries – among many other spheres of activity – during the late nineteenth

100 Lindsay, Catalogue of Printed Books, 1, Introduction, col. xii.

101 Barker, BL, pp. 289–90, 304–5. On Edmond, see John Webb, John Philip Edmond: Bookbinder, Librarian and Bibliographer of Aberdeen 1850–1906: A Short Biography (Aberdeen: Aberdeen & North-East Scotland Family History Society, 2011); Henry Guppy, ‘Obituary: Edmond (John Philip)’, Library Association Record, 18 (1906), 199–201. The latter deserves quotation: ‘Immediately upon his removal to Haigh, he [Edmond] set to work to put the library into working order, by reclassifying it upon the shelves in accordance with Dewey’s system. When this had been accomplished, he commenced what may be termed his magnum opus, in the shape of the general catalogue of the printed books and broadsides in the library, arranged upon the modified dictionary principle. At the time of his death the work was nearing completion, the slips were in type, the end was in view [...].’
century. W. J. Reader and other scholars have identified trends during the second
half of the century of increasing specialization and bureaucratization in the natural
sciences, other intellectual disciplines and the professions, in response to the
explosion of knowledge and the increasing complexity of capitalist society. 102
Intellectual authority became institutionalized within the academy, marginalizing
lone scholars; by the 1890s, the era of gentlemen-savants such as Lindsay was
over. 103

The defining characteristics of professionalization are control of entry into the
profession, by means of widely recognized qualifications and membership of a body
representing the interests of the profession and its members; the establishment and
enforcement of standards of conduct and expertise; the formulation of a specialized
vocabulary with which to conduct professional discourse; and a shared sense of
identity and common interest among the members of the profession, vis-à-vis
themselves and in contradistinction to outsiders. In the case of libraries, nascent
professionalism developed in the last quarter of the century: the Library Association
was founded in 1877, examinations were introduced in 1885, it obtained a Royal
Charter in 1898 (when Ludovic was president), and the Library Association Record
was first published in the following year, edited by Henry Guppy. However, one
should exaggerate neither the influence of the Association nor the speed and extent
of the professionalization of libraries in this period. In 1891 membership of the
Association stood at 454, of whom only 187 were librarians; it would be another two
decades before librarians comprised the majority of members; professional
examinations were poorly attended; pay was generally low; and the first full-time
training course for librarians was not established in Britain until 1919. The
boundaries of the profession remained permeable and its status and self-confidence
depressed well into the twentieth century. 104 It may therefore be argued that when

102 W. J. Reader, Professional Men: The Rise of the Professional Classes in Nineteenth-Century
England (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1966); Heyck; Anderson and Valente; Daunton.

103 Ian Small, Conditions for Criticism: Authority, Knowledge, and Literature in the Late

104 See Black, New History, pp. 193–224; David McKitterick, ‘Libraries, Knowledge and Public
Identity’, in The Organisation of Knowledge in Victorian Britain, ed. Martin Daunton
Ludovic appointed Edmond in 1891, he was in the vanguard of the professionalization of libraries.

Edmond immediately set about imposing Benjamin’s ‘mild boredom of order’ upon the library. He embarked upon a reclassification programme according to the Dewey system and, as I noted earlier, he arranged the manuscripts by language, protecting the more valuable ones in glass-fronted bookcases. Edmond simultaneously addressed the backlog of uncatalogued material. He tackled the early printed books himself, but his expertise did not encompass all the languages represented in the library and he found it necessary to continue the practice of entrusting manuscripts to experts in Britain and abroad for identification and cataloguing. Soon after Ludovic took charge of the library, he conceived a plan to publish the various hand-lists of the manuscript collections as a single catalogue. Quaritch deputed his senior assistant, Michael Kerney, to edit it, and proposed a tripartite structure – Biblical manuscripts, Oriental manuscripts and European manuscripts – which reflected the traditional privileging of Christian texts. They went so far as to print trial pages, but it became apparent that revision would be required to impose consistency upon the work of the several cataloguers. There the matter lay until Edmond could take in hand Kerney’s catalogue of Arabic, Persian and Turkish manuscripts. He impressed upon Ludovic the significance of the Oriental manuscripts, telling him that they exceeded in number the combined

(Oxford: Oxford University Press for the British Academy, 2005), pp. 287–312; William Arthur Munford, *A History of the Library Association, 1877–1977* (London: Library Association, 1996). Munford (p. 43) and Black (pp. 195–6) note that in 1885, the first year in which the Library Association held examinations, only two second-class certificates were awarded, and in some subsequent years there were no entrants at all.

105 Edmond wrote: ‘I am immersed in the joys of cataloguing *incunabula*. It is a most bewitching study.’ Letter from Edmond to Bal, 17 January 1893; CLL, Jan–April 1893, fol. 18.

106 Letter from Quaritch to Ludovic, 9 October 1883; CLL, 1883, fol. 192.

107 Bernard Quaritch Ltd Archives: Letter from Ludovic to Quaritch, 1 October 1884. I am grateful to Alice Ford-Smith of Quaritch for supplying me with a copy of this letter, which is quoted in Barker, *BL*, pp. 287–8.
holdings of all the principal American libraries. In April 1893 Edmond reported
that he would soon be ready to start printing. Unfortunately, when the proofs came
back from Aberdeen University Press they were found to be full of errors, and
Kerney’s Hand-list of Oriental Manuscripts was not published until 1898.

While imposing intellectual order upon the library, Edmond simultaneously
addressed the concomitant and imperative need to improve its housing and
preservation. He bombarded bookbinders with a stream of instructions for binding
periodical parts, making phase boxes and portfolios for proclamations and other
single-sheet documents, and undertaking general repairs and rebinding. He began
his career in his father’s Aberdeen bindery and had an insider’s knowledge of the
trade; bookbinders quickly learned that they could not hoodwink him with inflated
charges or second-rate work. Quaritch’s and Lindsay’s preferred binder, Francis
Bedford, had died in 1883. Subsequently the West-End bindery of Zaehnsdorf
received the majority of orders from Haigh, but Edmond became dissatisfied with
the standard of their workmanship. He increasingly relied upon the Liverpool firm
of John Fazakerley, conveniently close to Haigh, for the routine business of binding
periodicals and making boxes. ‘Faz.’s lassies’, as Edmond dubbed the women
sewers, were also employed to bind up Bal’s private correspondence and his
collection of autographs; presumably they could be trusted with confidential
material because they were semi-literate.

Despite Edmond’s best endeavours, controlling the ever-growing library proved an
enormous challenge. In 1894 Bal quipped to his father:

    The Shelf problem, like the Poor, is ever with us. Edmond & I went down to
    the Billiard Room & shook our heads gravely. There is a perfect constipation
    among the art Books, a mass of French Revolution stuff will shortly return

109 Letter from Edmond to Ludovic, 25 April 1893; CLL, Jan–April 1893, fol. 334. On the
errors, see Barker, BL, p. 326.
110 Correspondence between Edmond and Bal, 9 September 1897, 24 and 28 December 1899;
CLL, Sep–Oct 1897, fol. 266; CLL, Oct–Dec 1899, fol. 1400, 1403.
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from the binders, which will necessarily involve the removal of books appertaining to the new and vulgar world called America. The folio tracts are still lying in Edmond’s room, some scores of hundreds. If however you value your domestic peace, do not suggest the annexation of the morning room in the presence of your countess.¹¹¹

Ludovic therefore acceded to Edmond’s requests for the appointment of assistants, and by 1900 half a dozen members of staff were engaged in accessioning, organizing, cataloguing and indexing vast quantities of books and other material.¹¹² This professionalization further distanced Ludovic from the quotidian life of the library, and exposed the tensions latent within a family collection that in its scale and modes of operation emulated the largest academic libraries in Britain.¹¹³ Thus when Ludovic died in 1913 and his son was compelled to institute economies, he felt no compunction in dismissing the librarians. Bal confided in his diary:

One thing is necessary, namely a dispersal of the Library staff. I confess my decision has caused no regrets in the family, because bibliography was carried to a point so close to the professional that sometimes it appeared as though Haigh existed for the Librarians and that nurses, children, perambulators etc. were interlopers […]. The administrative cost apart from purchases and binding has amounted to something like £1,500 a year and the

¹¹¹ Letter from Bal to Ludovic, 22 June 1894; CLL, April–June 1894, fol. 198.


¹¹³ The Bibliotheca Lindesiana contained approximately 100,000 books in 1900; in comparison, Owens College Library, Manchester, employed just five members of staff (including two boys) and held some 70,000 volumes, while the John Rylands Library opened in 1900 with a similarly-sized stock. Fletcher, p. 403; *The Owens College, Manchester: (Founded 1851): A Brief History of the College and Description of its Various Departments*, ed. P. J. Hartog (Manchester: J. E. Cornish, 1900), p. 117; Henry Guppy, ‘The John Rylands Library: A Record of Twenty-One Years’ Work’, *BJRL*, 6.1–2 (1921), 11–68 (p. 11).
very fact of having from four to six men in the house is an infallible incentive to buying – I can’t afford to buy [...].

This passage reveals the paradox of a family library organized along professional lines. Moreover, the professionalization of libraries, which Ludovic had promoted, both in his own collection and more widely as president of the Library Association, collided with the economic and social decline of the aristocracy in the twentieth century. It was impossible for the Lindsays to compete with the larger municipal and university libraries in Britain, as well as the private libraries of American magnates such as Morgan and Huntington, which were now in the forefront of the development of libraries and of library science. The days of the great private libraries were numbered, at least in Britain. Through financial necessity rather than natural inclination, Bal was obliged to revert to his grandfather’s practice of managing the library himself.

2.7 Conclusion

In response to the threat of ‘information overload’, both Lindsay and Ludovic demonstrated an active interest in the theory and principles of library classification, to a degree perhaps unequalled amongst private collectors in the nineteenth century. Lindsay made extensive studies of the history of classification and developed his own organizational systems, which reveal the tensions between idealized taxonomies, grounded in theories of the organization of knowledge, and practical library schemes that can be applied to actual collections in order to facilitate the retrieval of information. Lindsay’s first endeavours were founded upon his philosophical and historical theorems (in particular the concept of ‘progression by antagonism’), and consequently were wholly impractical. Later he synthesized the work of French bibliographers to produce a more serviceable scheme in the Library Report. Lindsay’s competing impulses towards classification and catholicity illuminate wider contemporary debates over the relative merits of specialization and generalism. He epitomized the gentleman-scholar, who was gradually marginalized as disciplines were institutionalized within the academy.

---

114 Bal’s diary entry for 9 March 1913, in Vincent, p. 311.

115 On American collectors, see Hindman and Rowe, pp. 215–74; Linenthal.
I have demonstrated that the formation of Lindsay’s social and cultural distinction was closely allied to his interest in the classification of libraries and to the organization of the Bibliotheca Lindesiana in particular. On the other hand, while Orientalism was generally implicated in the organization of libraries, Lindsay’s enlightened attitude towards non-Western cultures resulted in a high degree of physical and intellectual integration between European and Oriental materials. Manuscripts occupied an uncertain, liminal position within the library, assigned to the impermanent ‘Museum or curiosity’ department, reflecting their ambiguous status and Lindsay’s ambivalent attitude towards them. However, as the manuscript collections grew, especially under Ludovic’s hegemony, they gradually precipitated out from the printed books to form discrete sections of the library.

Lindsay’s direct control of the library and his reliance on memory as the primary ideational device hark back to the early modern library, which Garberson has shown to be grounded in the classical memorative tradition and ‘was conceived and functioned as a memory aid’.116 Following Ludovic’s succession, several developments in the management of the library reflected wider socio-economic trends towards greater scientificity, bureaucratization and specialization. The Oriental collections were subjected to more intensive classification and segregation, analogous to Anderson’s ‘totalizing classificatory grid’ within the colonial contact zone. Ludovic relinquished day-to-day management of the library in favour of a cohort of professional staff, and exercised control vicariously, via documentary systems and administrative procedures, rather than through personal memory and direct, haptic experience. Thus the Bibliotheca Lindesiana exemplified (indeed pioneered) the development of the modern, scientifically organized and professional library, to an extent that was ultimately unsustainable in the context of the aristocracy’s economic and social decline in the twentieth century, an issue that I address in Chapters 3 and 5 below.

116 Garberson, 120.
Fig. 2.1. Lord Lindsay’s Desiderata and Collations, 1859. National Library of Scotland, ACC 9769, Crawford Library Papers, 232, fol. 32. Copyright National Library of Scotland.
Fig. 2.2. ‘Classification of Human Thought’, from Lord Lindsay’s Progression by Antagonism (London: John Murray, 1846). Copyright The University of Manchester.
Fig. 2.3. Lord Lindsay’s System of Classification, n.d. [c.1860–65]. National Library of Scotland, ACC 9769, Crawford Library Papers, 296, fol. 227. Copyright National Library of Scotland.
Fig. 2.4. Dunecht House, Aberdeenshire, c.1886, showing the recently completed chapel (far left) and library (left-centre, with spiral tower). Reproduced in the catalogue for the sale of Dunecht House (London: Watson Lyall, 1886). Historic Environment Scotland.

Fig. 2.5. Interior of the library at Dunecht House, 1991. It was Lindsay's unrealized ambition to transfer the Bibliotheca Lindesiana here. The space was later used as a ballroom. Country Life Picture Library, image no. 962580. Copyright Country Life.
3  *Et amicorum*: Situating the Bibliotheca Lindesiana within the Field of Cultural Production

3.1  Introduction

The Bibliotheca Lindesiana was a site of knowledge formation. Knowledge was created through the assemblage of rare books and manuscripts, through their study by Lindsay and others, and, as the preceding chapter demonstrated, through their organization and classification. However, Foucault has shown that knowledge is socially constructed, and it is thus essential to locate the library within the wider landscape of knowledge communities and communities of connoisseurship and collecting. As a major collector of books and manuscripts, Lindsay established and maintained relationships with fellow collectors and bibliophiles, scholars, librarians and dealers, who engaged with him and informed the development and use of the library, as collaborators and competitors, expert advisers and researchers, cataloguers and suppliers. I shall now examine these nexuses, considering how Lindsay classified and positioned himself within the field of cultural production, especially in the locale of manuscript collecting, and how his identity and distinction as an elite collector were fashioned through these relationships. It is also illuminating to contrast Lindsay’s networks with those in which his son and grandson, Ludovic and Bal, participated towards the end of the century; a diachronic approach will reveal wider trends in bibliophilic networks and the field of cultural production.

The questions that this chapter addresses are: How was bibliophilic sociability instantiated in formal and informal networks of collectors during the mid-nineteenth century, and how and to what extent was Lindsay implicated in these networks? How successful was he in reconciling his innate shyness with his professed commitment to making the library accessible to his *amicis* in the aristocratic tradition of Jean Grolier? Where was he positioned between the poles of manly homosociality and its counterpoint, effeminacy, of which a scholar-collector was prone to suspicion? And how did Ludovic and Bal differ from Lindsay in their integration into bibliophilic and wider cultural networks?
I also investigate the important role of dealers, notably Bernard Quaritch, in the development of the library. The earls’ relationships with them were markedly unequal in terms of their respective financial, cultural and social capitals: booksellers were irredeemably classed as ‘trade’. Yet leading dealers’ expertise and their extensive commercial networks created a mutual dependency with their elite customers, thus problematizing the rigid social hierarchies of Victorian society. Lindsay’s relationship with Quaritch is contextualized through comparison with other customers such as John Ruskin and William Tyssen-Amherst. Ludovic and Bal had much looser, more business-like relationships with suppliers, and I propose that in adopting a more independent approach they were differentiating themselves from bourgeois collectors who relied heavily upon expert dealers and connoisseurs to shape and confirm their taste.\(^1\)

The earls’ relationships with fellow collectors and dealers converged in the saleroom. I investigate how the earls engaged in auctions, both directly and vicariously, examining the tactics that they and their agents deployed, as well as the wider socio-cultural significance of auctions, which ostensibly functioned as instruments of plutocracy in a period when the aristocracy’s social, economic and political influences were waning. I consider how Lindsay demonstrated his taste and cultivated manners in his engagements with auctions, whereas his agent, Quaritch, could be ferocious towards his opponents. Ludovic and Bal, by contrast, personally participated in auctions, again distancing themselves from their bourgeois competitors. However, through direct involvement in the plutocratic milieu of auctions they risked contaminating themselves with bourgeois manners and diminishing their aristocratic distinction.

3.2 ‘Secluded habits and want of acquaintance’: Lord Lindsay and Bibliophilic Networks

Formal networks or societies of (male) bibliophiles proliferated during the nineteenth century, although bibliographical societies combining the interests of

---

collectors, bibliographers and scholars did not develop until the end of the century.\(^2\) Collectors’ clubs satisfied a desire for homosociality, provided a forum for knowledge-exchange, emulation and competition amongst collectors, and performed a legitimating and normalizing role, as Pearce asserts: ‘Collecting […] is regarded with some ambivalence by society at large, but within the group a collecting norm can be established, which is supportive and nourishing. Clubs have their own kind of legitimacy.’\(^3\) Societies functioned as ‘imagined communities’, conceptually uniting geographically dispersed collectors, who might congregate only rarely, through shared interests and mutual identification. David Matthews points out that clubs fostered a sense of community as much by exclusion and absence as by inclusion.\(^4\) Exclusion on grounds of gender, nationality, social class and/or cultural capital did not need to be overt: self-exclusion operated, typifying Bourdieu’s ‘symbolic violence’. Being the ‘right sort’ was a prerequisite for membership and anyone lacking sufficient capital and an appropriate habitus was unlikely to apply in the first place. In thus enforcing and reinforcing distinction, elite bibliophilic and collectors’ groups discharged a similar function to the metropolitan gentlemen’s clubs, membership of which was, Amy Milne-Smith argues, a visible sign of social status in a period when class identities required continual reinforcement.\(^5\) This was a period of growing social fluidity, when the aristocracy’s role was being challenged, ‘new men’ were entering its ranks and the term ‘gentleman’ was an increasingly contested signifier. Status markers such as membership of elite clubs therefore assumed great importance.


\(^3\) Pearce, *On Collecting*, pp. 231–2.


The Roxburghe Club, oldest and most exclusive of bibliophilic societies, was founded to commemorate the sale of the Duke of Roxburghe’s library in 1812; its name proclaimed aristocratic bibliomania and its membership ‘cemented the somewhat feudal relations between aristocrats and aspiring litterateurs’. Other associations in which book collectors figured prominently included the Society of Antiquaries of London, its Edinburgh counterpart, and the trio of Scottish antiquarian clubs founded in the early nineteenth century – Bannatyne (1823), Maitland (1828) and Spalding (1839) – although these fulfilled primarily a publishing rather than a social function.

The Philobiblon Society, founded by Richard Monckton Milnes and others in 1853, restricted itself to a patron and thirty-five elected members interested in ‘the history, collection, or peculiarities of Books’. As well as printing limited-edition Miscellanies, the Society organized bibliographical breakfasts at members’ homes during the London Season. Manuscript collectors such as James Crossley, Robert Curzon, Robert Holford, Henry Huth and Walter Sneyd featured prominently amongst the membership.

Likewise the Burlington Fine Arts Club, whose objects were ‘to bring together Amateurs, Collectors, and others interested in Art’ and ‘to provide accommodation for showing and comparing rare works in the possession of the Members and their friends’, counted many collectors or owners of manuscripts within its ranks, including Bragge, Curzon, Holford, Huth, Ferdinand de Rothschild, Ruskin and Sneyd. The Burlington’s membership was comparatively large, standing at 343 in 1878, but its social composition was strictly controlled: proposers of new members were required to certify ‘from personal knowledge that the Gentleman proposed will, from his social position, as well as from his cultivated taste, interest in Art, or other qualifications, be a desirable Member of the Burlington Fine Arts Club’.

Matthews, p. 87.


were specifically excluded. On the other hand, there were comparatively few peers among the membership: this was a club primarily for entrants into the bourgeoisie who wished to demonstrate their wealth and refined taste in the competitive environment of the Burlington’s displays.⁹ The club thus exemplified Bourdieu’s thesis that the bourgeoisie use culture to normalize and legitimate their privileged position, since they cannot invoke right of birth, ‘which their class […] has refused to the aristocracy’.¹⁰

Lindsay was a member of neither the Roxburghe nor the Burlington clubs. While his absence from the latter is unsurprising, for the reason just outlined, Lindsay’s aristocratic pedigree, connoisseurship and pre-eminence as a collector made him an ideal candidate for the Roxburghe. Francis Wrangham, a member who took a paternalistic interest in Lindsay as both a fellow poet and a collector of similar outlook, offered to nominate him for election in 1841, but Lindsay demurred:

> my pursuits and collections are more of an historical and (so far as belles lettres are concerned) modern character than those of your eminent colleagues. Indeed some years ago, when it was proposed to me to join the Maitland and Abbotsford club, I determined to content myself with the honour of being a member of the Bannatyne and to purchase as the

---


¹⁰ Bourdieu, Field, p. 235.
opportunity occurred such works printed by the other societies as I wished to add to my collection.\textsuperscript{11}

Phillipps and Ashburnham were other notable absentees from the Roxburghe lists. Ashburnham was a man of ‘glacial hauteur’, ‘rather calculated to inspire fear than love or respect to those he came in contact with’, while Munby argues that Phillipps was ‘much too busy collecting books to think it worth while to join a body that was merely sociable about them. [...] It was very much in character for so professional a book-buyer to distrust those he conceived to be dilettanti.’\textsuperscript{12}

While Lindsay subscribed to the Bannatyne Club, Spalding Club, Arundel Society and Society of Antiquaries of Scotland, his involvement in their affairs was minimal: membership was purely a means to obtain their publications rather than an opportunity to commune with like-minded antiquaries and collectors.\textsuperscript{13} Tanya Ledger notes that Lindsay was ‘the most learned historian of art’ on the council of the Arundel Society, yet ‘clearly he had not expected to play an active part in the running of the Society for when it emerged in 1851 that this was required, he promptly resigned.’\textsuperscript{14} In 1852, when he was elected \textit{in absentia} to the committee of the Bannatyne, he told the club’s secretary, David Laing, that he was compelled to decline ‘from not being well & other circumstances [...] & I do not like to undertake


\textsuperscript{13} Subscriptions are recorded in CLR, 1855–68.

any office without giving it due attention.’ Two years later, when Laing informed him that he had been elected vice-president of the club, Lindsay once more refused the honour: ‘having been much overworked for several years past, repose is necessary and indeed prescribed to me; I have for some time therefore been endeavouring to lessen the number of my engagements.’

In Lindsay’s case, it was not so much hauteur or contempt for ‘dilettanti’ that dissuaded him from joining the Roxburghe and other collectors’ clubs, but an assured, well-formed habitus that required no corroboration from formal association with fellow collectors, combined with his acute shyness and life-long aversion to company, and an abhorrence of committees and offices. Lindsay refused invitations to be a trustee of the National Gallery and the British Museum, telling Gladstone that ‘my secluded habits & want of acquaintance (partly the result of great shortsightedness) with other men of standing in London, disqualify me to a great degree from any similar duty.’ Moreover, as I previously observed, Lindsay constructed his library on (liberally construed) utilitarian principles and never regarded collecting as an end in itself. He thus had little time for the formal accoutrements and rituals of collecting celebrated by the clubs.

While clubs and societies constituted the formal structures of bibliographical sociability, in common with most other collectors Lindsay developed a network of more informal, individualized relationships with fellow bibliophiles and scholars. He was situated within an ancient tradition of book collecting and sociability that reached back at least to Jean Grolier (1489/90–1565), whose famous motto ‘et amicorum’ proclaimed his munificence and echoed classical antecedents. Thomas

---

15 Letters from Lindsay to David Laing, 12 December 1852 and 13 December 1854; Edinburgh University Library, Papers of David Laing, La.IV/18/109–10, La.IV/18/105–6.

16 Letter from Lindsay to Gladstone, 15 February 1874. British Library, Add MS 44442, Gladstone Papers, vol. CCCLVII, fol. 252. See also Barker, BL, p. 268. Lindsay’s daughter blamed his aversion to society on poor eyesight: ‘Owing to his blindness my Father disliked going into Society, which was a pity in many ways but very natural, as he could never recognize without being told the person he was addressing.’ Meynell, pp. 29–30.

17 G. D. Hobson, ““Et Amicorum””, The Library, 5th ser., 4.2 (1949), 87–99; Anthony Hobson,
Mahieu (Maiolus), secretary to Catherine de’ Medici, was one of several other early modern collectors who adopted the same adage. Dibdin, panegyrist of bibliophilic sociability, assumed that his nineteenth-century audience was ‘intimately versed’ in the contents of Grolier’s library; likewise, Mahieu was ‘eagerly hunted after by modern bibliomaniacs’.¹⁸ In the Library Report, Lindsay invokes Grolier and Mahieu as archetypes of elite bibliophily, collectors who generously opened their libraries to friends and associates:

> Nor ought such a library to be limited to a family only; the friends of the family, and those whose friendship would do them honour, ought equally to have access to it; and in our own case the motto on its every volume should virtually be, like that on the books of Grolier and Maioli,

   LINDESIORUM PRINCIPIIS,
   COMITIS CRAFORDIAE,
   ET AMICORUM.¹⁹

There were numerous instances of Lindsay’s generosity in accommodating requests for access to specific manuscripts and books, whether at Haigh or by lending material out. Likewise, Ludovic advocated a liberal loan policy to his librarian: ‘You

---


¹⁹ LR, Introduction, p. 16. However, just as Lindsay’s emulation of the Medici did not translate into a desire to collect books and manuscripts directly associated with them, so he confined his collecting ambitions to ‘one Grolier – & possibly a good Majoli specimen’. Letter from Lindsay to Quaritch, 15 March 1863; CLL, Jan–June 1863, fol. 99. Ludovic adopted ‘*et amicorum*’ as the epigraph to several printed catalogues of the library.
can take this as general – where a Government or reputable society or individual apply I always say yes under ordinary safeguards.20

There is extensive literature on bibliophilic sociability in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, yet only recently have any studies been informed by sociocultural theory or been grounded in detailed empirical data. In his sensitive exploration of reading and the circulation of books during the Scottish Enlightenment, Mark Towsey has uncovered pervasive practices of informal book lending and discussions of literature, concluding that ‘the family library was one of the main focuses of genteel sociability in rural Scotland, with “privy” borrowing readily extending to other neighbouring families.’ Likewise, Edward Potten concludes that the extensive private library of Charles Winn at Nostell Priory ‘played an important role in the wider intellectual life of the local community’.21

In fact, Victorian private libraries were arenas in which competing demands for openness and closure were played out. Libraries served as private spaces, sanctuaries from society and sites for solitary, contemplative study, while less honourable motives such as possessiveness and paranoia prompted some owners (most notably Lord Ashburnham) to restrict others’ access to their libraries. Conversely, altruism, duty or sociability induced many proprietors to share their collections with associates and fellow collectors, whereas competitiveness and vanity were additional motivations for exposing libraries to the gaze of others.22

Lindsay’s attitude towards his library manifests these tensions. While he professed to have constructed it to serve the needs of his family and friends and of the wider

20 Letter from Ludovic to Edmond, 27 May 1897; CLL, May–June 1897, fol. 242.


scholarly community, and he was indeed generous in making the library accessible, in practice the library appears to have been little known and little used outside the family and a narrow circle of bibliographical experts. His mother-in-law, Lady Anne Lindsay, complained to Min: 'Nobody, at least not many people know what a wonderful library it is. And that vexes me.'\textsuperscript{23} He became so absorbed in the library and in his bibliographical and historical studies that he neglected his social networks. Anne lamented his lack of sociability: 'Minny is truly a happy woman, her only trial is her husband's increasing dislike of society and his over tasking his mind by sitting for hours over his peculiar pursuits.' On another occasion she quipped: 'Coutts is gone with Min to the Herbergs at Wilton. Lindsay would not go. He is getting worse and worse and soon will be fit for nothing but being bound up in Russia leather and stuck up on the Haigh library shelves.'\textsuperscript{24} Lindsay was never happier than when 'entomed' in his library, as Anne commented: 'It is such a pleasure to see him walking about singing and arranging his new Library.'\textsuperscript{25}

Lindsay thus conformed to Daniel Cook's model of the solitary scholar: 'the scholar's library entails separation in several senses both physical and ideal. [...] books form a literal carapace insulating the scholar from the outside world – and perhaps even from the distractions of home life.'\textsuperscript{26} However, Lindsay's preference to be a gentleman-savant clashed with the demands of aristocratic sociability. Although the \textit{vir civiliter eruditus} had classical antecedents and aristocratic dilettanti and amateur scientists made important contributions to knowledge in the eighteenth century, in the second half of the nineteenth century the roles of gentleman and scholar became increasingly incompatible.\textsuperscript{27} As a result of the

\textsuperscript{23} Letter from Anne Lindsay to her daughter Min Lindsay, 25 January 1864; CPP, 94/20.

\textsuperscript{24} Letters from Anne Lindsay to her son Robert Lindsay, 20 June and 27 July 1855; CPP, 94/17, fols 2623–4, 2646–9.

\textsuperscript{25} Letter from Anne Lindsay to her daughter May Holford, 17 August 1855; CPP, 94/17, fols 2658–9.


\textsuperscript{27} On the \textit{vir civiliter eruditus}, see Stephen M. Beall, 'Aulus Gellius 17.8: Composition and the
professionalization and ramification of knowledge, savants required access to specialist research facilities, libraries, and, above all, large amounts of time to undertake research and develop their expertise; this conflicted with the protracted rituals and rigid structures of elite sociability.28

I earlier discussed Lindsay’s unfulfilled ambition to relocate the library from Haigh Hall to Dunecht. In the Library Report he expounded his vision of creating a vast library-room capable of accommodating the entire collection in a self-containing space: ‘The Library thus constructed should bear an aspect, thoroughly comfortable indeed, but still that of a sanctuary of learning and thought, sacred to the Muses, where men and women may meet in converse on the common ground of graceful cultivation.’29 Lindsay’s aspirations to establish a modern Platonic Academy contained two contradictions. First, the library was to be ‘comfortable’, yet he intended it for serious study, disdaining the casual inconsequence of many Victorian country-house libraries where, according to Jennifer Ciro, guests wrote their correspondence, read newspapers and traded gossip.30 His library was to be furnished with ‘writing tables with moveable desks, and strong column-desks for the examination of very large volumes, [...] book-stands with narrow shelves for very large folio books of prints [...] and large tables for the reception of Atlases and books of constant reference’, rather than ottomans and sofas.31 Secondly, he envisaged the library as the centre of a community of scholars and thinkers (both men and women), yet it was to be located in rural Aberdeenshire, remote from the worlds of scholarship and letters. Lindsay’s dream was never realized; perhaps he reflected that this escapist fantasy of splendid isolation would have conflicted with his

---


29 LR, Epilogue, p. 15.


31 LR, Epilogue, p. 15.
gentlemanly obligations to make the library accessible beyond the immediate family.

Lindsay’s vision of a library where ‘men and women may meet in converse’ was notably progressive for this period, when women were effectively excluded from most institutional libraries. Ciro argues that during the nineteenth century both architecturally and performatively the private library became an increasingly public, social and less gendered space within the complex organism of the Victorian country house: it was transformed into one of the principal reception rooms, into which it became more socially acceptable for women to enter.32 However, at least one contemporary source implied that women were only grudgingly admitted to the country-house library. Robert Kerr, writing contemporaneously with the Library Report, contended that the library was ‘primarily a sort of Morning-room for gentlemen rather than anything else. Their correspondence is done here, their reading, and, in some measure, their lounging [...] At the same time the ladies are not exactly excluded.’33 The role of women in the Bibliotheca Lindesiana has hitherto been disregarded – part of a wider elision of women from the history of book collecting – but Lindsay’s wife Min and her mother, Anne Lindsay, exercised considerable influence over the formation and development of the library.34


had nurtured his early interest in matters art-historical and bibliographical and had encouraged his collecting practices, while Min became his coadjutor. The latter’s role remains largely silent in the archive, but one can occasionally glimpse the strength of their joint intellectual enterprise. For example, while holidaying at Vichy, Lindsay recorded in his diary: ‘Min and I are reading German, she Niebuhr’s Greek legends and I Chwolsohn’s book about the old Babylonian literature [...] we cross question each other and are very severe upon faults.’\textsuperscript{35} Neither work could be regarded as light vacation reading. Likewise, when Lindsay secured a collection of Samaritan manuscripts in 1872, he clearly expected his wife to share his enthusiasm: ‘Minnie, Minnie, Minnie!!! I have got a haul, you don’t know of what a valuable fish – Samaritan manuscripts! They are rarer than black swans.’\textsuperscript{36}

Lindsay developed and maintained relations with a number of individual collectors, albeit spasmodic and couched in the formalities of Victorian social intercourse. He owed some acquaintanceships to the booksellers Joseph Lilly and Bernard Quaritch, whose shops drew bibliophiles, men of letters, academics, clergy and statesmen. For example, Lilly persuaded Lindsay not to compete against one of his principal customers, Henry Huth, for a copy of the Tyndale Pentateuch at the sale of Edward Vernon Utterson’s books in March 1857. Huth thereby secured the Pentateuch for only £130. This initiated ‘an occasional exchange of friendly bibliographical courtesies’ between the two collectors.\textsuperscript{37}


\textsuperscript{35} Lord Lindsay’s diary entry, 15 July 1860; CPP, 94/20.

\textsuperscript{36} Letter from Lindsay to Min, 22 May 1872; CPP, 94/21. Quoted in Barker, \textit{Bl.}, p. 248.

\textsuperscript{37} LR, History, p. 19. Letter from Lilly to Lindsay, 23 March 1857; CLL, 1857, fol. 94. Lilly obtained another copy of the Pentateuch for Lindsay at the Bishop of Cashel’s sale in June
The following year Lindsay supplied Huth with a leaf from his own copy of Foxe’s *Book of Martyrs*, and in 1860 Huth was able to return the favour by presenting Lindsay with the woodcut title-page. Huth requested Lilly ‘to convey to his Lordship his acknowledgements for the courtesy shown him, and he avails himself of the opportunity now afforded him to thank Lord Lindsay again very sincerely for his great kindness.’ He invited Lindsay to view his library at Princes Gate, Kensington, the proposal being framed in the gentlemanly convention of self-deprecation:

As many of my books, if not most of them, have been procured from Mr Lilly, or through his instrumentality, he is perhaps not quite impartial in his description of my library. As yet my library is small, numbering not much above 3000 volumes, but I have taken great pains in the selection, and my books are a source of very great pleasure to me. There are some among them which are worthy of inspection by those who take interest in such things, and I need not say that I should be happy to show them to your Lordship at any time that may be convenient.

Seemingly to reinforce his claims to acquaintance, Huth reminded Lindsay that his brother had been Lindsay’s companion at preparatory school, while Huth himself (three years younger than Lindsay) had been at school with the latter’s brothers. While their occasional correspondence developed real warmth – Huth addressing him ‘Dear Lord Lindsay’ and signing off ‘Believe me your very truly’ – there is no evidence that Lindsay ever met Huth or visited his library. Indeed, when Quaritch


38 Letter from Huth to Lindsay, 25 August 1860; CLL, July–Dec 1860, fol. 305.

superseded Lilly as intermediary between the collectors, he asked Huth for his portrait, ‘thinking your Lordship would like to know the sort of man Mr. Huth looks, I am perhaps committing a gaucherie in showing the Portrait to your Lordship. Mr Huth is a very reserved man, but every in[ch] a gentleman: liberal, generous and enlightened.”

Another major manuscript collector with whom Lindsay became acquainted was Lord Ashburnham, albeit relatively late in their collecting careers. Belying his fearsome reputation, Ashburnham treated Lindsay with the civility due to one who was both his match as a bibliophile and his social peer. The two men met in the spring of 1869 at the home of Lindsay’s brother-in-law and fellow manuscript collector, Robert Holford. In May Ashburnham sent Lindsay a set of catalogues of his manuscripts, and an invitation to Ashburnham Place followed. Barker records that Lindsay and Min took up the offer soon after Ludovic’s wedding in July. However, the limits of Lindsay’s acquaintance were revealed in November when he declined Quaritch’s request to intercede on behalf of the eccentric collector Leonard Lawrie Hartley, who wished to obtain his own copy of a recent Ashburnham catalogue: Lindsay ‘could hardly do so with propriety’, since ‘his acquaintance with Lord Ashburnham does not extend beyond the merest acquaintance, much less approaches to intimacy or friendship.’ He imputed Ashburnham’s invitation ‘to a desire to shew some acknowledgement indirectly to Mr Holford, and very likely he may never come in contact with Ld Ashburnham again as there are no common friends between them’.

Lindsay established close friendships with only two fellow collectors. One was the Scottish antiquary David Laing (1793–1878), librarian of the Signet Library,

---

40 Letter from Quaritch to Lindsay, 14 June 1867; CLL, June–Dec 1867, fol. 278.

41 Letters from Ashburnham to Lindsay, 29–30 May 1869; CLL, 1869, fols 112, 115.

42 Barker, BL, p. 239.

43 Letter from Lindsay to Quaritch, Friday [12 November 1869]; CLL, 1869, fol. 321. On Hartley, see Germaine Warkentin and Peter Hoare, ‘Sophisticated Shakespeare: James Toovey and the Morgan Library’s “Sidney” First Folio’, Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America, 100.3 (2006), 313–56 (pp. 337–8).
indefatigable editor of historical texts, and inveterate collector of books and manuscripts. Their extant correspondence began in 1834, when Lindsay was elected to the Bannatyne Club, and continued intermittently for over forty years; they discussed club business and aspects of Scottish history, while Lindsay consulted the antiquary on points of his own family’s history. Book collecting rarely figured in their discussions, but they regularly exchanged their own publications and in 1866 they traded copies of the 1536 edition of Boece’s *Scotorum historia*, to enable Lindsay to perfect his own copy. As Pearce has noted, throughout the history of collecting, gift-giving and gift-exchange have been frequent devices for cementing relationships between collectors: the gift demonstrates the taste and refinement of the giver and sets up an obligation on the part of the recipient appropriately to reciprocate; gift-exchange reinforces the mutual recognition of both parties as fellow collectors. Indeed, according to actor-network theory, gift objects themselves are agents of social relations, just as much as the human actors.

Lindsay also enjoyed cordial relations with Robert Curzon (1810–73), a particularly genial character who charmed even the adamantine heart of Phillipps. Curzon represented an older, more romantic model of book collecting, associated with the Dibdinian era of bibliomania, whereas Lindsay, although only two years his junior, epitomized the increasingly scientific approach to collecting and descriptive bibliography that dominated the second half of the nineteenth century. They met

---


at a dinner party in 1850 and, according to Lindsay, ‘had a little bibliographical chat for just five minutes – he losing at once all his persiflage etc., and I enjoying what I never enjoyed before, (for I never yet met with a kindred soul on that subject)’.47 This parenthetical comment betrays the depth of Lindsay’s bibliophilic isolation. Like Lindsay, Curzon had travelled extensively in Greece, Egypt and the Levant in the 1830s, collecting venerable manuscripts, ‘the fruits of arduous field-work, of dangerous journeys in bandit-infested countries, of interminable parleys with suspicious monks’, and no doubt this shared experience helped to break down Lindsay’s reserve and cement their relationship.48 In 1859 Lindsay told Quaritch that he had given a ‘very curious’ manuscript of the Bhagavata Purana ‘to a friend (Mr Robert Curzon) some years ago’.49 A further indication of their amity occurred in 1868 when Lindsay purchased an important set of Coptic manuscripts that Henry Tattam had elicited from the monasteries of Wâdi el Natrûn thirty years earlier.50


47 Postscript by Lindsay in a letter from his wife to Anne Lindsay, 24 or 25 May 1850; CPP, 94/14, fol. 1859–60. Quoted in Barker, BL, p. 142.


49 Letter from Lindsay to Quaritch, Monday [4 April 1859]; CLL, 1859, fol. 103.

He immediately sent them to Curzon, who cast his expert eye over the material and commented:

It is very kind of you to send me those curious Coptic MSS. to look at, and I return them, with many thanks. [...] one is part of the life of St George I should like to know what it says about our patron Saint. He is renowned in the East for restoring mad people to their senses, I wonder whether he ever recovered a bibliomaniac. I fear you must suffer from that malady almost as much as your ever truly, R Curzon. 51

This initiated a sporadic but amiable correspondence, Curzon offering morsels of literary gossip, and expressing astonishment at the splendours of the Bibliotheca Lindesiana revealed to him by Lindsay. 52 Here one comes closest to Marvin Taylor’s ‘triangulated structure in which the book collector enjoys an intense homosocial relationship with another male collector, one that is enabled by describing the book as a female object’. 53 However, it would be easy to exaggerate the significance of the epistolary communion between Lindsay and Curzon: the handful of letters they exchanged is eclipsed by the voluminous and revealing correspondence Curzon maintained with Walter Sneyd over five decades. 54 Furthermore, in his extant correspondence Lindsay never employs the romantic and eroticized language in relation to books which, according to Taylor, characterizes the homosocial discourse of book collecting. In all of his writings I have found only a single instance where he feminizes books, in the Library Report: ‘Books printed on vellum I have put away from me (except in a very few instances) as seducing damsels, temptresses like those who assailed the virtue of the anchorites in the Thebaid.’ 55 It is significant

51 Letter from Curzon to Lindsay, 2 July 1868; CLL, June–Dec 1868, fol. 301a. Quoted in Barker, BL, p. 240.
52 Ibid., pp. 240–2.
54 Over 500 letters from Curzon to Sneyd are extant (1831–73); the other side of the correspondence seemingly has not survived. Fraser.
55 LR, Introduction, p. 11.
that Lindsay raises the spectre of erotic temptation in the self-denying context of his strict discipline as a collector: for him books are the objects of paternal affection, not erotic desire.

Mark Girouard argues that during the nineteenth century the concept of the gentleman as a man of taste was gradually subordinated to the public-school ethos of sporting prowess and martial chivalry.\textsuperscript{56} In the manly discourse of elite Victorian society, Lindsay was vulnerable to suspicions of effeminacy and indeed latent homosexuality, because of his secluded, scholarly habits, his dislike of society and especially of the male-dominated metropolitan club culture, and his interest in early Italian (and therefore Catholic) art, espoused in \textit{Sketches of the History of Christian Art}.\textsuperscript{57} Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick articulates how the confluence of these potentially enervating characteristics could elicit suggestions of homosexuality:

\begin{quote}
If we look at the history of distinctively homosexual roles in England, we find that something recognizably related to one modern stereotype of male homosexuality has existed since at least the seventeenth century – at least for aristocrats. The cluster of associations about this role [...] include effeminacy, connoisseurship, high religion, and an interest in Catholic Europe – all links to the Gothic.\textsuperscript{58}
\end{quote}

Perhaps aware of the equivocality of his situation, Lindsay responded by suppressing all instincts towards self-indulgence and indolence, and by practising the manly virtues of ‘earnestness, selflessness and integrity’.\textsuperscript{59} His attitude towards

\textsuperscript{56} Girouard, \textit{Camelot}, p. 262.

\textsuperscript{57} On Victorian manliness see, for example, John Tosh, \textit{Manliness and Masculinities in Nineteenth-Century Britain: Essays on Gender, Family and Empire} (Harlow: Pearson, 2005).


manliness is revealed in his concern over the adolescent Ludovic’s ennui and self-centredness, expressed to his brother-in-law, Robert Loyd-Lindsay:

His chief fault is one which lies deep below the surface, and almost out of sight – a self concentration, which makes his own pleasure and satisfaction, and not that of others, the principle of his actions. [...] I see a deterioration in his mental activity and vigour recently. His intellect was always indolent, and tobacco is deadening it into torpor. [...] I long to see him show manliness of character in facing faults and sending them to the right about.60

Lindsay regarded self-denial, particularly in the field of collecting, and strict morality as bulwarks against insinuations of effeminacy, while active manliness for Lindsay and other nineteenth-century collectors was displaced from the battlefield – the traditional arena of aristocratic prowess – to the auction room, as I shall explore later in this chapter.

In summary, Lindsay identified himself with Grolier and Mahieu, paradigms of the aristocratic tradition wherein libraries were made accessible to one’s amici. Yet he struggled to emulate his Renaissance archetypes, because he was only loosely implicated in the formal networks of book and manuscript collecting, and his relationships with individual collectors were etiolated. He defied stereotypes of Victorian bibliophiles – epitomized by Curzon and Sneyd – who participated in intense homosocial discourse. Paradoxically his reserve threatened the social and cultural capital that he sought to augment through the library; or rather, this capital was diverted from normal social relations into the library, and the return on the investment was deferred. His ambitions were realized later, in his affable son Ludovic, who employed his considerable social and cultural capital as a trustee and president of numerous cultural institutions, and in his grandson Bal, Cabinet minister and influential figure in the art world.

______________________

60 Letter from Lindsay to Robert Loyd-Lindsay, 3 January 1866; CPP, 94/20. Loyd-Lindsay, who won a VC at the Battle of Alma, was the epitome of Victorian manliness. Roger T. Stearn, ‘Lindsay, Robert James Loyd-’, Baron Wantage (1832–1901)’, ODNB (2004), online edn, May 2008 <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/34544> [accessed 19 June 2012].
Lindsay was doubtless aware of the negative connotations of *otium* amongst classical and Renaissance writers: while it could signify the repose and leisure requisite for scholarly and literary pursuits, more frequently it denoted indolence, self-indulgence and (forced) retirement from the affairs of the world.\(^{61}\) While he craved seclusion, he was conscious of the responsibilities of his social position. He thus enjoined his son to fulfil the public duties that he himself had eschewed: ‘from this privilege there arise duties, which I trust you will recognize and carry out in active life more fully than I – seeking out these truths, and truth in general, in the cloisters of retreat – have been able to do.’\(^{62}\) Ludovic was indeed far more gregarious than his father and he regarded public office as an obligation of his class gladly to be borne. He was elected to the Roxburghe Club in 1877 (although he attended not a single meeting), and was an assiduous trustee of the British Museum from 1885 onwards.\(^{63}\) He served as president of both the Bibliographical Society and the Library Association in 1898, and was chairman of Wigan Free Public Library for thirty-five years. He was entirely comfortable in the company of fellow collectors, and knew several of them socially. For example, in April 1901 Henry Yates Thompson visited Haigh to compare a psalter and *horae* associated with the family of St Louis, which he was intending to buy, with Ludovic’s Joan of Navarre Psalter. Although Ludovic was absent, as usual, Yates Thompson asked Edmond to pass on his ‘best regards to Lord Crawford’.\(^{64}\) Ludovic also enjoyed cordial relations with second- and third-generation collectors, or custodians of collections, such as Thomas Fitzroy Fenwick, grandson of Sir Thomas Phillipps, who permitted him to photograph the metal and ivory bindings in the Phillipps collection, and Alfred


\(^{64}\) Letter from Yates Thompson to Edmond, 22 April 1901; CLL, March–May 1901, fol. 409.
Henry Huth, son of Henry and a notable collector in his own right; Ludovic sent copies of his *Catalogue of English Newspapers 1641‒66* to both men. 65

The genial and clubbable Bal was, if anything, even better connected than his father with fellow collectors, bibliophiles and scholars, especially in the metropole. He was a trustee of the British Museum and the National Gallery, and a member of the Burlington Fine Arts Club, Roxburghe Club (president, 1936‒40) and Society of Antiquaries (president, 1924‒29); he was once described as ‘a most agreeable companion, as, apart from his great fund of expert knowledge, his general outlook is most pleasantly flavoured by his humanistic studies’. 66 As Ludovic’s day-to-day involvement with the library diminished, his son assumed greater responsibility for liaising with other collectors and manuscript experts. This trend was already apparent in 1893, when Ludovic agreed to send a Samaritan manuscript to the Oxford Orientalist, Arthur Cowley, seemingly on the strength of his friendship with Bal, then an undergraduate at Magdalen. 67 Bal was acquainted with Charles Fairfax Murray and Edward Burne-Jones, who introduced him to William Morris. He found the old socialist ‘irresistibly attractive’, their shared passion for illuminated manuscripts overcoming differences of age and politics. A flavour of their friendship is conveyed by Bal’s diary entry for 18 August 1895: ‘I lunched at Kelmscott with William Morris. He was in tremendous form and very reactionary. […] His library is certainly the most charming I have ever seen. The scholarly disposition of the books adds enormously to their beauty – and all his books have their original bindings, or else their modern coverings are executed in good taste.’ 68 Bal also fell under the spell of Morris’s secretary and Boswell-figure, Sydney Cockerell, who, though not


67 Letter from Ludovic to Edmond, 24 January 1893; CLL, Jan–April 1893, fol. 31.

68 Vincent, p. 30. ‘irresistibly attractive’: Bal’s diary entry for 16 February 1896, ibid., p. 33. Bal was not a member of the ‘Souls’, the exclusive set renowned for their intellect, wit and enlightened aesthetic sensibilities, but he shared these characteristics and moved in similar circles. On the Souls, see Angela Lambert, *Unquiet Souls: The Indian Summer of the British Aristocracy, 1880–1918* (London: Macmillan, 1984).
yet a collector in his own right, had already developed considerable expertise in and enthusiasm for illuminated manuscripts. As he engaged in the melancholy duty of disposing of Morris’s library, Cockerell offered: ‘If you would care to see any of the manuscripts again before we part with them, I shall be pleased to show them to you some afternoon.’ Bal even attempted – unsuccessfully – to interest the City of Birmingham in purchasing the entire collection.69 His grandfather would never have countenanced friendly relations with a coal merchant’s son, still less with a revolutionary socialist, but turn-of-the-century bibliophily was less respectful of social hierarchies.

3.3 ‘Your Lordship’s humble apprentice’: The Earls and the Booksellers

Lindsay and Ludovic not only engaged with fellow collectors and scholars; they also treated with a large number of booksellers and other suppliers to the Bibliotheca Lindesiana. These categories were not mutually exclusive, of course: the activities of marchands-amateurs such as Francis Fry, the ‘maker of Chocolate and Bibles’ with whom Lindsay had frequent dealings, elided the distinction.70 The earls’ relationships with commercial dealers were markedly asymmetrical, with an unequal distribution of social and economic capital between the aristocratic collectors and their petit-bourgeois agents. However, I shall investigate how the booksellers’ expertise and their ability to supply the earls’ desiderata established a mutual dependency, thus problematizing any binary division of the field into dominant and dominated fractions.

69 Letter from Cockerell to Bal, 20 January 1897; letter from Bal to Edmond, 7 February 1897; CLL, Jan–Feb 1897, fols 35, 121. See also Needham.

70 On Fry, see David J. Hall, ‘Francis Fry, a Maker of Chocolate and Bibles’, in The Book Trade & its Customers, 1450–1900: Historical Essays for Robin Myers, ed. Arnold Hunt, Giles Mandelbrote and Alison Shell (Winchester and New Castle, DE: St Paul’s Bibliographies and Oak Knoll Press, 1997), pp. 265–77. The sobriquet was coined by Robert Curzon. Fry complained of the trade’s hostility towards collector-dealers: ‘some of them dislike private dealing which they think an infringement of their privilidges’ [sic]. Letter from Fry to Lindsay, 7 March 1865; CLL, 1865, fol. 43.
Early in his career, Lindsay patronized a large number of metropolitan booksellers: Thomas Thorpe, Henry, John and James Bohn, Thomas and William Boone, William Straker, Joseph Lilly, and George Willis (later Willis and Sotheran); for foreign books he relied on Charles Molini and David Nutt (see Appendix 4).71 Looking back in 1865, he lamented: ‘Most of the bibliopoles I looked up to with reverence in those early days are now no more; and my contemporaries are, like myself, grey-haired men.’72 His dealings with Bernard Quaritch began in August 1852, when he ordered nine books from a catalogue of philological works and asked to receive future catalogues.73 Having established his own business in 1847, Quaritch rapidly rose to become the most successful bookseller in London and one of the greatest antiquarian booksellers in history; he counted almost all the major collectors amongst his clientele and dominated the sale-rooms for forty years.74

Lindsay’s patronage of Quaritch was initially modest: in the five-year period 1852‒56 his total expenditure amounted to only £538. In 1857 his spending increased to £450, but the breakthrough came in the following year, when Lindsay spent £1,265 with Quaritch. Thereafter the scale of Lindsay’s custom was astonishing: between 1858 and 1880 he spent £42,026 with the bookseller, accounting for two-thirds of his total expenditure on the library of £61,691 (see Appendix 3). In the ten-year period 1866‒75, Lindsay’s expenditure with Quaritch was £25,249, nearly three-quarters of the total outlay of £34,643. In the same period, annual earnings of a collier in Wigan were around £75, while a gardener at Haigh Hall typically earned £44–49 per

71 LR, Introduction, pp. 10, 12.
72 Ibid., p. 10.
73 Letter from Lindsay to Quaritch, 25 August 1852; CLL, 1850–56, fol. 18. Cited in Barker, BL, p. 166.
annum. Although Quaritch’s own accounts for this period have not survived, it is probable that Lindsay was his most valuable customer in the 1860s and 1870s. Preference for a particular dealer was not unusual amongst collectors: Henry Huth was said to have purchased books worth over £40,000 from Lilly, his ‘confidential caterer’, although he also regularly patronized Quaritch.

Dealers’ agency in the development of collections is often elided in bibliographic studies, yet leading booksellers such as Quaritch and Lilly played a significant supporting role in shaping private libraries, problematizing notions that individual bibliophiles were exclusively responsible for the formation of their collections. In his biographical profile of Huth, Quaritch generously acknowledged the profound influence that Lilly had exercised over the Huth library, and the collector’s gratitude for Lilly’s assistance. Towards the end of this life, Quaritch reminded Ludovic of his own contribution to the development of the Bibliotheca Lindesiana: ‘My share in the formation of your Lordship’s Library has been that of a devoted servant. Some of the choicest gems of the Library I had the honor (& the advantage) of selling to your Lordship and to the late Lord.’ While Quaritch took pride in his achievement, his self-characterization as a devoted servant suggests that he was

75 Coal-hewers in Wigan were paid 5–7 shillings per day, or 25–35 shillings weekly in 1873. House of Commons, Report from the Select Committee on Coal (London: HMSO, 18 July 1873); Evidence of William Pickard, 8 May 1873, p. 143, paras 3976–86. These figures assume full employment, which was rarely the case of course. In 1873 a gardener’s average weekly wage was 17–19 shillings, equivalent to £44–49 yearly. Wigan Archives Service, Records of the Haigh Estate and Earls of Crawford, gardens wages books, DD/Hai/C/46.

76 Letter from Lilly to Lindsay, 23 March 1857; CLL, 1857, fol. 94. Quaritch, pp. 164–5. Lindsay spent £3,538 with Lilly between 1854 and 1863; CLR, 1854–63. See also Appendix 4. Following Huth’s death, Quaritch told James Lenox: ‘he visited my shop almost daily. The place seems deserted now; “his” special chair other people now sit upon, makes me quite sad.’ Victor Hugo Paltsits, ‘The Bibliophilic Transactions of James Lenox with Bernard Quaritch, 1874–1880’, Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America, 40 (1946), 181–204 (p. 202).

77 On agency, see Rukavina, pp. 23–9.

78 Quaritch, pp. 164–5.

79 Letter from Quaritch to Ludovic, 2 September 1898; CLL, Sep–Oct 1898, fol. 317.
rooted in an earlier aristocratic, master-servant paradigm, whereby the agent
dedicated himself entirely to the service of his patron, rather than a modern
capitalist, mercantile model in which the agent was bound into a commercial
relationship with his customer, but was otherwise an independent operator.

The partnership between Lindsay and Quaritch was cemented through the
purchase of a 42-line Bible at the sale of the Bishop of Cashel’s library in June 1858;
Quaritch secured it for Lindsay for £595 against Lilly, who was bidding on behalf of
Huth.80 This achievement and the Libri sale of 1859, at which Lindsay spent some
£700, affirmed the places of Lindsay and Quaritch in the front rank of collectors and
dealers respectively. Quaritch acknowledged his debt to Lindsay, whose orders
‘have given me an impetus by which my general business has been extended in that
direction I most desired’.81 They developed a close relationship built upon mutual
respect and an almost daily correspondence sustained over several decades. The
collector appreciated Quaritch’s honesty and fair dealing; his mastery of the sale-
rooms; his detailed knowledge of Lindsay’s desiderata; his international network of
contacts, which ensured a steady supply of exceptional works beyond the capacity
of other dealers to obtain; and his willingness to go to any lengths to secure
material on behalf of his client, spending uncomfortable nights on cross-channel
steamers and continental trains to attend sales in person. For his part, the
bookseller valued Lindsay’s lucrative custom and prompt settling of accounts – an
important consideration for a dealer who operated with modest financial reserves
and relied upon credit with the auction-houses – and he respected him as a
discriminating collector and expert bibliographer.82 For example, in 1860 he

80 The relationship is discussed in Nicolas Barker, ‘Bernard Quaritch’, in Book Collector: A
Special Number to Commemorate the 150th Anniversary of Bernard Quaritch Ltd, ed. Richard

81 Letter from Quaritch to Lindsay, 11 April 1859; CLL, 1859, fol. 116.

82 Lindsay was proud of his financial fair-dealing, which admittedly had an element of self-
interest: ‘I have always (let me add) kept short accounts and dealt liberally with my
professional agents, and hence they have generally given me the first or an early offer when
rare articles, such as they knew or thought I must be on the look-out for, came before
them.’ LR, Introduction, p. 12. In 1873 Quaritch attributed his modest reserves to Lindsay’s
congratulated Lindsay on his analysis of the first two German Bibles, albeit with a heavy dose of self-deprecation: ‘Your Lordship handles this difficult and intricate subject of the first two German Bibles with the pen of a master and the ease of a genealogist. I must candidly confess myself to be only your Lordship’s humble apprentice. I am willing to learn and to improve myself.’

The courtesies that Lindsay habitually accorded to fellow collectors were extended to the ‘better sort’ of bookseller, such as Quaritch: he always treated them with respect, unlike Phillipps who held dealers in contempt. When Quaritch exceeded his commission to secure a vellum copy of the Mainz Catholicon in the Solar sale in 1860, Lindsay rewarded him with a ‘most magnificent and beautiful copy’ of Mentelin’s edition of the work, ‘intending that he should make his profit by it’. Quaritch instead chose to keep it in his personal library, as a ‘memorial of kindness and good will’. Lindsay comments on this episode in the Library Report: ‘Such are the amenities which subsist, and ought always to subsist between booksellers of the higher or antiquarian class and their amateur clients.’

Leading bibliopoles like Quaritch blurred the fine distinctions that pervaded and defined Victorian society, demarcating classes and differentiating tradesmen and their clients. Lindsay averred: ‘A cordiality and almost affection subsists between a bookseller and his client such as hardly exists in any other similar relationship.’ Indeed, when Quaritch learnt of Lindsay’s death, he reported to Ludovic: ‘I was stunned, unfit for reflection, but during the night, I could only think & dream of him, whose devoted servant I had been for 30 years.’ Quaritch’s shop was frequented by cabinet ministers, bishops, aristocrats and ambassadors, just as F. S.

83 Letter from Quaritch to Lindsay, 10 March 1860; CLL, Jan–June 1860, fol. 102.
84 LR, Belles-Lettres, p. 9, footnote.
85 LR, Introduction, p. 10.
86 Letter from Quaritch to Ludovic, 7 January 1881; CLL, 1881–82, fol. 2.
Ellis’s bookshop on New Bond Street became ‘a gathering place of the literati’.87 Within the narrow bounds of bibliophily, Quaritch’s clientele accorded him the respect that his expertise and market dominance warranted.88 Likewise, in the wider literary field he held significant cultural and social capital, as a publisher as well as a bookseller, and his ambitions to cultivate his own networks of men of letters and collectors met with some success. Thus in June 1882 Quaritch hosted one of his literary dinners in honour of the explorer Richard Burton, several of whose works he had published. He invited Ludovic, while other guests included Henry Stanley, Baron Stanley of Alderley (a friend of both Burton and Quaritch), Henry Yates Thompson and John Ruskin.89 However, as Andrew St George notes, gentlemen were increasingly distinguished from tradesmen in this period, and, moreover, the second-hand book trade generally had a doubtful reputation: for every leading firm there were scores of dingy bookstalls and barrows, and even eminent booksellers such as Quaritch and Ellis invariably rose from modest backgrounds.90 Tainted by ‘trade’, Quaritch was condemned to remain the inferior


88 Similarly, the Edwardian West-End hatter Frederick Willis recalled: ‘you had to be an expert in your particular line, otherwise you met with disaster. [...] Here you were dealing with customers who knew, and this developed respect on both sides of the counter.’ Frederick Willis, A Book of London Yesterdays (London: Phoenix House, 1960), p. 131. See also Alison Adburgham, Shopping in Style: London from the Restoration to Edwardian Elegance (London: Thames and Hudson, 1979), p. 174.

89 Letter from Quaritch to Ludovic, 3 June 1882, and printed menu card; CLL, 1881‒82, fols 77, 83. Ruskin discusses the dinner in Letters of John Ruskin to Bernard Quaritch, 1867‒1888, ed. Charlotte Quaritch Wrentmore (London: Bernard Quaritch, 1938), pp. 54–6. Ludovic was unable to attend, but it is clear that he was happy to accept the invitation.

90 Andrew St George, The Descent of Manners: Etiquette, Rules and the Victorians (London: Chatto & Windus, 1993), p. 40. On booksellers’ subaltern status, see James Raven, The Business of Books: Booksellers and the English Book Trade, 1450‒1850 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007), pp. 218, 322–4. Quaritch was the son of a Prussian soldier and officer of justice; Ellis’s father was an innkeeper; Toovey’s was a carpenter; Railton of Sotheran’s
of his elite clients within wider social networks. ‘I am a shopkeeper’, he told William
Carew Hazlitt, whereas his assistant Michael Kerney was a ‘gentleman’. Clearly
there is a degree of false modesty here, but the correspondence between Quaritch
and Lindsay (and later Ludovic) reveals the former’s yearning for social acceptance
and respectability, a desire for recognition as a gentleman-bibliophile rather than as
a bookseller. One can sometimes detect Lindsay’s discomfiture at Quaritch’s minor
breaches of social and business etiquette, when he crossed the bounds between
bibliophilic and wider social fields. For example, in 1870 Quaritch recommended his
was born in the Gorbals district of Glasgow. See also W. Roberts, *The Book-Hunter in
London: Historical and Other Studies of Collectors and Collecting. With Numerous Portraits
and Illustrations* (London: Elliot Stock, 1895); Laurence Worms, ‘The Book-Hunters of 1888
(3)’, *The Bookhunter on Safari* blog (17 May 2015)
10 January 2016]; Laurence Worms, ‘The Book-Hunters of 1888 (4)’, *The Bookhunter on
hunters-of-1888-4/> [accessed 10 January 2016]. The lowly status of booksellers contrasts
with the rising fortunes of fine-art dealers in the late nineteenth century. Hall, quoting
Ferdinand Rothschild’s ‘Bric-a-Brac’, 59–60; Christopher Maxwell, “Spurious Articles”: The
Purchases of the Department of Science and Art from the Hamilton Palace Sale of 1882’,
174; cited in Linenthal, ‘Sydney Cockerell’, p. 376. Hazlitt was contemptuous of run-of-the-
mill booksellers: ‘The worst thing of all to do is to trust to ordinary catalogues and dealers
of the commoner type.’ Ibid., pp. 144–5. Dring suggests that Kerney ‘was intended for the
Church whence he obtained his education’. E. M. Dring, ‘Michael Kerney’, in *Book Collector: A
Special Number to Commemorate the 150th Anniversary of Bernard Quaritch Ltd*, ed.
‘I know Mr. K. is every inch a gentleman, and he is the most accomplished scholar in
Europe. A business man he is not.’ Letter from Quaritch to Lindsay, 21 July 1876; CLL, 1876,
fol. 222. James McDonnell similarly argues that while William Pickering’s customers
respected his learning and expertise, ‘he was still but a superior kind of tradesman while
they were gentlemen.’ James Martin McDonnell, ‘William Pickering (1796–1854),
Antiquarian Bookseller, Publisher, and Book Designer: A Study in the Early Nineteenth
14.
own sister as singing tutor to Lady Crawford’s daughters (another socially equivocal situation), begging pardon for the ‘transgression’. Lindsay may have chosen to ignore this unorthodox proposal; certainly the Crawford Papers do not contain his reply.

Quaritch was thus fated to supply the books which reinforced the very social distinctions that he sought to surmount. He was always properly deferential (employing the salutation ‘My Lord’ and peppering his letters with references to ‘your Lordship’), sometimes to the point of obsequiousness, thus conforming to the etiquette required of a tradesman addressing a gentleman. Like many in his liminal position, who were economically dependent upon the elite and self-identified with them rather than their middle-class peers (William Roscoe was similarly situated in relation to Thomas Coke), Quaritch was a vigorous apologist for the aristocracy of his adopted country. He assured Lindsay that ‘at all times I think of your Lordship and your Lordship’s house with affection and loyalty. Should we in my life-time (not likely) ever see in England any anti-aristocratic movements I should put all my energy into the scales to combat the hydra of democracy.’

Of course, Lindsay was not the only collector to patronize Quaritch and enjoy cordial relations with him, and it is important to contextualize their relationship. Tyssen-Amherst and Ruskin were both long-standing customers, and substantial archives of letters from Quaritch to Tyssen-Amherst and from Ruskin to Quaritch

92 Letter from Quaritch to Lindsay, 26 September 1870; CLL, 1870, fol. 250.


94 Letter from Quaritch to Lindsay, 27 December 1878; CLL, 1878, fol. 286. He expressed similar sentiments to William Tyssen-Amherst: ‘I hold democracy & Radicalism in such utter contempt, that I gladly avail myself of any opportunity to promote loyalty to the Crown and affection for the Aristocracy. To-night, at home, in my family circle, we shall think of you and yours.’ Letter from Quaritch to Tyssen-Amherst, 24 December 1886; Thomas Fisher Library, University of Toronto, Amherst of Hackney Papers, Box 2.
Ruskin’s letters, spanning more than twenty years, are full of bibliographical badinage, discussions over his desiderata and purchases, and musings on their shared admiration of manuscripts. Ruskin, like Lindsay, had a deep respect for the bookseller, once telling him: ‘I think I know you now very thoroughly, and shall always count on you to tell me more than anybody else could about books, and many other matters, and to get for me, if anybody could, what of such things I wanted.’ He even once signed a letter off ‘Ever your devoted Disciple – and Fellow (Book)-Worm’.95

Thus Ruskin’s letters to Quaritch are noticeably more informal and intimate than those of Lindsay, due in part to the wider class divide which distanced the aristocrat from the bookseller. A closer social comparator to Lindsay was William Tyssen-Amherst, albeit he was not Lindsay’s equal in bibliographical expertise. Quaritch was similarly deferential in his dealings with the Norfolk landowner who was ennobled in 1892, flattering him, appealing to his competitive instincts, coaxing him into purchases, and submissively expressing gratitude for his patronage: ‘For your patronage we tradesmen are bound to render you faithful services, – and that I shall continue to do to the last day of my life.’96 Like Lindsay, Tyssen-Amherst regularly treated Quaritch to hampers of game at Christmas; while doubtless sincerely intended, such tokens of gratitude emphasized the social disparity between the bookseller and his landed customers. Marilyn Strathern has argued that in gift economies, ‘we might argue that those who dominate are those who determine the connections and disconnections created by the circulation of objects.’97 In 1886 Quaritch even assured Tyssen-Amherst that ‘It was your early patronage, which secured me that of the late Earl of Crawford, the late Mr. Henry Huth, the late Mr. Astor of New York. These three bibliophiles were in past times my best patrons,

95 Wrentmore, pp. 29, 111.
96 Letter from Quaritch to Tyssen-Amherst, 13 December 1878. Amherst Papers, Box 1.
now you are the best.'98 While there is an element of flummery here, the volume of their correspondence certainly intensified in the 1880s and '90s, at a time when Ludovic's patronage was diminishing.

Ludovic’s relationship with Quaritch and other booksellers was more business-like, his communications succinct, lacking the earnest bibliographical discussions that characterized his father’s correspondence. He treated them as commercial suppliers, rather than fellow experts. Initially he continued to depend upon Quaritch to furnish the bulk of his purchases; the bibliopole was delighted to find in the young earl a bold, impulsive purchaser. Gradually, however, as Ludovic gained confidence as a collector, he relied less on Quaritch and other firms with whom his father had enjoyed long-standing relationships, and opened up new channels of supply. Improved international communications and banking systems made it easier and safer to deal directly with continental booksellers, such as Joseph Baer of Frankfurt, the supplier of two enamel bindings in 1896; Ludwig and Jacques Rosenthal of Munich, who sold to Ludovic a thirteenth-century French *Bible Historiée*; and Calvary & Co. of Berlin, from whom he purchased nine Ciceronian manuscripts from the Braschi collection in Rome.99 The auction of François Vergauwen’s collection in Brussels in March 1884 illustrates his independent spirit and growing tendency to diverge from Lindsay’s time-honoured procedures for participating in continental sales. Whereas his father would unhesitatingly have entrusted his commissions to Quaritch in such circumstances, Ludovic negotiated directly with François-Jean Olivier, who had charge of the auction. Telegrams sped back and forth between Belgium and Italy, where Ludovic was holidaying, and he managed to secure the magnificent Dinant Gospels (Fig. 1.4), a volume of a

---

98 Letter from Quaritch to Tyssen-Amherst, 22 December 1886. Amherst Papers, Box 2. There are over 670 letters from Quaritch and his staff in the Amherst Papers.

monumental Flemish Bible and a manuscript of Terence. The total bill came to £437.\textsuperscript{100}

Quaritch’s confidence in Ludovic was shaken by the latter’s decision to sell the cream of the printed collections in 1887. Accusing him of acting ‘in a state of panic’, the bookseller offered his assistance to select £15,000-worth of run-of-the-mill works instead, which could have been sold ‘without injury to the Library’\textsuperscript{101}. Heedless, Ludovic ‘tore the heart out of his father’s collection’, in Barker’s phrase, dispersing the gems of the library (many crossed the Atlantic) for comparatively modest returns.\textsuperscript{102} A further distancing was initiated by the appointment of J. P. Edmond as librarian in 1891. As I discussed in the previous chapter, Edmond assumed responsibility for all routine correspondence with booksellers, whereupon Ludovic had few direct dealings with Quaritch and other suppliers. The librarian (himself liminally situated within the household hierarchy) preferred to discuss bibliographical issues with fellow professionals and academics, rather than booksellers, whom he often treated peremptorily, thereby asserting his superiority over ‘trade’; perhaps Edmond was distancing himself from his early career in bookbinding.

As I shall investigate shortly, Ludovic’s and Bal’s direct engagement in the sale-rooms resulted in a serious breach with Quaritch in 1895, which persisted until the bookseller’s death in 1899. Thus the profoundly significant relationship that Quaritch had enjoyed with the Bibliotheca Lindesiana for over forty years, and upon which his commercial success had in large measure been built, was abruptly and unhappily severed. While the personal characteristics of the three men may have

\textsuperscript{100} Draft telegram from Ludovic to Olivier, [February 1884]; telegram from Olivier to Ludovic, [12 March 1884]; letter from Olivier to Ludovic, 26 March 1884; CLL, Jan–June 1884, fols 25, 33, 44. Ludovic’s purchases are now Rylands Latin MSS 11, 16 and 47. On the Vergauwen sale, see F. J. Olivier, Catalogue de la bibliothèque de feu M. Fr. Vergauwen Membre du Sénat, Président de la Société des Bibliophiles flamands (Brussels: Olivier, 1884).

\textsuperscript{101} Letter from Quaritch to Ludovic, 14 January ‘1886’ [i.e. 1887]. Quoted in Barker, BL, p. 300.

\textsuperscript{102} Ibid. The sale raised only £19,073; a second sale in June 1889 yield £7,342. Ibid., pp. 298–304.
precipitated the rift, wider societal factors were also significant. I contend that aristocratic collectors like Ludovic and Bal sought to distinguish themselves from their bourgeois competitors by distancing themselves from booksellers and demonstrating that their connoisseurship, acquired through a lifetime’s familiarity with high culture, did not depend upon the advice of tradesmen. Moreover, it was becoming more socially acceptable for elite collectors to attend auctions in person and to engage directly in the bidding process, rather than relying on agents. It is to auctions that I now turn.

3.4 ‘Tournaments of value’: The Earls’ Engagements in the Auction-Rooms

The earls’ relationships with fellow collectors and dealers were concentrated in the auction-room, Baudrillard’s ‘crucible of the interchange of values’. This was a theatrical arena in which rival modes of evaluating an object’s worth converged in direct financial competition. In the following pages I investigate how the earls engaged in the auctions-rooms, the tactics that they and their agents deployed, and the wider social significance of auctions (which are ostensibly instruments of plutocracy) in a period when the aristocracy’s social, economic and political influence was dissipating.

103 Baudrillard, Critique, p. 112.

Auctions broadly conform to Arjun Appadurai’s definition of ‘tournaments of value’:

Tournaments of value are complex periodic events that are removed in some culturally well-defined way from the routines of economic life. Participation in them is likely to be both a privilege of those in power and an instrument of status contests between them. The currency of such tournaments is also likely to be set apart through well understood cultural diacritics.\(^\text{105}\)

Although book auctions were routine, frequent occurrences throughout the nineteenth century, the major sales, comprising material exclusively or predominantly from a single collection, attracted competition from the leading dealers and their elite clients, and they were reported in detail in the mainstream print media.\(^\text{106}\) Such events served as barometers of wider market conditions, and they often set new standards for the prices of rare books and manuscripts, thus establishing comparisons between them and other signifiers of cultural capital, such as paintings and antiquities. They also provided a highly ritualized and performative context within which to assess and demonstrate the relative dominance of the various players in the field, whether as dealers or collectors.\(^\text{107}\) Baudrillard argues that: ‘the essential function of the auction is the institution of a community of the privileged who define themselves as such by agonistic speculation upon a restricted corpus of signs.’\(^\text{108}\) While being competitive, auctions also reinforced the ‘imagined community’ of participants; imagined because many of the principals were represented by agents in the room. Following Baudrillard and Appadurai, one can argue that the primary purpose of auctions, apart from their obvious marketplace function, is in fact to hierarchize the participants.

\(^{105}\) Appadurai, p. 21.

\(^{106}\) Biltcliffe, pp. 216–17, notes that ‘Art sales, particularly at Christie’s, were highly publicised, spectacular events that aroused considerable attraction in the press.’


\(^{108}\) Baudrillard, *Critique*, p. 117.
The agonistic nature of auctions has elicited various sporting and martial metaphors. Brian Cowan has likened fine-art auctions to a duel or cock-fight, while Dibdin famously romanticized the golden age of bibliomania with mock-heroic descriptions of events such as the Roxburghe sale, as Jensen recounts: ‘it was the modern equivalent of the jousting field, that most aristocratic of meeting places. The market for luxurious books was a place for the public display, no longer of greed or profligacy, but of valorous aristocratic virtues, the weapons being not lances but money.’ By the late 1850s, when Lindsay entered the lists, the era of bibliomania was long gone, yet there remained echoes of this chivalric age both in the language employed by Lindsay and Quaritch to describe auctions and in the gentlemanly codes of conduct which regulated behaviour in the sale-room. For example, when Quaritch secured a vellum copy of the Mainz Catholicon at the Solar sale in Paris, he announced triumphantly:

Another Waterloo has been fought; this time without bloodshed, & on French ground; but I fear your Lordship will say with a heavy sacrifice. [...] Your Lordship must excuse my excentricity [sic] in comparing sales to battles, but really if balls were flying round me in good earnest, victory could not interest me more than a victory like the present, obtained for your Lordship and with your Lordship’s good money.

Lindsay invariably practised the courtesies becoming a gentleman-collector and regularly deferred to others in auction contests. In May 1869, for example, he not only agreed to Quaritch’s request to abstain from competing against the Reverend

---

109 Pearce observes that metaphors of war, hunting and sexual conquest are frequently attached to collecting practices. Pearce, *On Collecting*, p. 221.


111 Lindsay’s daughter later described him as ‘chivalrous and high-minded to a Quixotic extent, courteous with the courtesy of the heart’. Meynell, p. 25.

John Ayre for an item in a Sotheby’s sale; he proposed that Quaritch should bid up to his own higher commission of £5 5s, and send the book to Ayre, ‘charging merely the £2/2 or thereabouts commissioned & saying nothing about the excess. Mr Ayre evidently appreciates & would be pleased by possessing the volume & L[or]d L[indsa]y w[oul]d be too happy to cooperate with Mr Q. in placing it in his possession.’ Ayre duly obtained all the lots he desired.¹¹³

On the other hand, Quaritch and Lindsay regularly deployed their superior economic and social capital to dominate subordinate competitors. For example, when Quaritch secured for Lindsay the Tattam collection of Coptic manuscripts in June 1868, he failed to obtain one particularly significant item, a liturgia, for which another collector had left a higher commission. William Tyssen-Amherst later became a regular and lucrative customer of Quaritch, as I have already noted, but at this stage of his career he was not in Lindsay’s league. Quaritch therefore used his diplomatic skills to persuade him to relinquish it in Lindsay’s favour.¹¹⁴

Quaritch was famous for his domination of the salerooms, and most collectors preferred to collaborate rather than compete with him. He could be a ferocious opponent, once warning Phillipps, ‘I always act fair towards my customers. My opponents I naturally cripple as much as I can at sales.’¹¹⁵ Such tactics were not always successful, however. For example, in 1860 Quaritch attended on Lindsay’s behalf the sale in Utrecht of the library of the Dutch Orientalist, Hendrik Christiaan Millies (1810–68). Finding that the industrialist William Bragge, ‘an enthusiastic collector of rude Manuscripts’, was intent on obtaining the same South-East Asian manuscripts, the bookseller brokered an arrangement with him and thus secured fifty-five lots for Lindsay.¹¹⁶ However, Bragge was determined to take one particular


¹¹⁴ Letters from Quaritch to Lindsay, 16, 23 and 27 June 1868; CLL, June–Dec 1868, fols 267, 283, 294. Now Rylands Coptic MS 17.

¹¹⁵ Quoted in Munby, Portrait, p. 170.

¹¹⁶ Letter from Quaritch to Lindsay, 13 May 1870; CLL, 1870, fol. 136. On Millies, see J. L.
Batak manuscript home, breached the agreement, and refused Quaritch’s request to concede it to Lindsay. Quaritch described the incident:

Mr Bragge replied, that my request was absurd, and he could not give up one of his Batta MSS. nor would he exchange my imperfect one for one of the perfect ones. I told Mr Bragge*, that I asked as your Lordship’s agent, and that I had asked from unselfish motives, as I might easily have shown cheap courage at your Lordship’s expense.

*Knowing of the great deference paid by the English middle classes to the English Aristocracy.117

Unaccustomed to such determined opposition, Quaritch was affronted. He expected his middle-class rival to be as deferential towards the aristocracy as he was. But the bookseller had misjudged his opponent: Bragge, the self-made man, represented a new breed of collector, more materialistic and less reverential than the previous generation. His money was as good as Lindsay’s, and he saw no reason to yield to a nobleman.118

---


118 Lindsay would have the last word: Bragge lost much of his fortune in the notorious bankruptcy of his friend Alexander Collie of Manchester, and was obliged to sell his disparate manuscript collection in June 1876. See Sotheby, Wilkinson & Hodge, *Catalogue of Manuscripts in Indonesian Languages in British Public Collections*, London Oriental Bibliographies, 5 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977), p. xxvii.
Lindsay appears never to have attended an auction in person. While aversion to company may have been an additional deterrent in his case, elite collectors rarely frequented the auction-rooms in the middle decades of the nineteenth century. There were several reasons for this. First, auctions were fraught with risk for unwary bidders, because of exiguous catalogue descriptions and such unscrupulous practices as ‘rigging’ and the ‘knock-out’. These dangers could be reduced by employing an experienced agent to examine the material and advise the client.\textsuperscript{119} Quaritch or a member of his staff would invariably scrutinize lots in advance of sales and recommend bid limits, although Lindsay would regularly adjust these according to his own judgement; following an auction the material was carefully collated, and any defective lots were returned. Secondly, since direct participation in the bidding process might excite competition from rivals, prominent collectors preferred the anonymity of bidding through proxies.\textsuperscript{120} Finally, in the post-Dibdinian era auctions tended to function as wholesaling operations amongst dealers: ‘a subdued gathering of quiet men round a dingy green baize table’ in John Carter’s words. ‘Private collectors were not encouraged to bid in person and seldom did so.’\textsuperscript{121} Whereas the showrooms of West-End booksellers attracted aristocratic collectors, the auction-houses, where market mechanisms were fully exposed and culturally-charged objects were reduced to raw financial transactions, were an

\textit{a Magnificent Collection of Manuscripts, Formed by a Gentleman of Consummate Taste & Judgement, etc.} (London: Dryden Press: J. Davy and Sons, 1876). Copies at York Minister Library, Yorkshire Collection (Y/017 BRA/SOT), and at Sheffield Archives, William Bragge Collection (Acc 2005/56, MD7801), are fully marked up with purchasers’ names and prices. Quaritch explained the reason for the sale thus: ‘Mr Bragge lost recently 30,000£ by his friend Collie, hence the necessity of parting with his MSS.’ Letter from Quaritch to Lindsay, 13 April 1876; CLL, 1876, fol. 108.

\textsuperscript{119} On the ‘knock-out’ or ‘ring’, see Freeman and Freeman, pp. 29–57.

\textsuperscript{120} Macleod, \textit{Art}, p. 310, notes a similar desire for anonymity amongst fine-art collectors.

\textsuperscript{121} Carter, pp. 127, 131. Andrew Lang described book auctions in similar terms, concluding that ‘professionals always dislike amateurs, and, in this game, they have a very great advantage.’ Andrew Lang, \textit{Books and Bookmen} (London: Longmans, Green, 1892), p. 152.
unsuitable locus for gentlemen. Indeed, I suggest that by engaging in the auction process vicariously, though the agency of Quaritch, Lindsay was able to adhere to gentlemanly codes of conduct and preserve his aristocratic decorum, while benefiting from Quaritch’s robust domination of the salerooms; like a medieval knight or latter-day prizefighter, the bookseller fought on behalf of his aristocratic patron who thus remained aloof from the fray.

By the end of the nineteenth century, it was becoming more socially acceptable for gentlemen-collectors to attend book auctions in person. Authorized by the Settled Land Acts, many aristocratic libraries came onto the market in a series of landmark sales, which emulated fine-art auctions in their spectacle and in the media interest that they attracted. Nevertheless, it was still unusual for gentlemen to attend an auction and bid in person, rather than employing an agent. Bal did this on several occasions – thus transgressing the boundary between spectator and participant or player – most notably at the Howel Wills sale in July 1894, when he bid against Quaritch for a fifteenth-century Augustinian nuns’ offices in a contemporary metal binding. This earned a rebuke from the bookseller, who ‘explained loudly enough for the small fry and the budding auctioneer to hear that I had made a great mistake in not giving my commission to him as my noble father had always done’. Bal rejoined that his father had asked him to attend in order to study the tricks of the trade. Quaritch’s wrath was understandable: not only was he humiliated by the young aristocrat; this was a clash of competing financial and cultural capitals, which threatened to compromise his near-monopolistic control of the auction-rooms.

A further breach with Quaritch occurred in February 1895 over a commission for a ninth-century manuscript of Smaragdus in the sale of residual artworks and manuscripts from the Libri collection. It had formerly been Quaritch’s practice, when he held two or more rival commissions, to buy ‘as cheaply as possible for the

\[\text{\footnotesize\textsuperscript{122}}\text{Smith, p. 163, argues that auctions, in fact, ‘are not exclusively or primarily exchange processes’; rather, they (re)create social definitions of value and relations among participants.}\]

\[\text{\footnotesize\textsuperscript{123}}\text{Letter from Bal to Edmond, 14 July 1894; CLL, July–Sep 1894, fol. 304. Quoted in Barker, BL, pp. 323–4, who recounts the incident. Now Rylands Latin MS 100.}\]
gentleman who has fixed the highest commission’.124 Because of Quaritch’s market dominance, this arrangement suited both him and his customers. For example, if two clients entrusted him with commissions of £100 and £120 on the same lot, Quaritch might be able to secure the item for only £50 on behalf of the higher bidder, if there was no serious competition in the sale-room. By the 1890s, however, institutional clients and some American collectors demanded that their commissions be seen to be executed in full. In this case, the British Museum and Ludovic had left commissions of £210 and £250 respectively, so when bidding reached the low forties Quaritch’s son, Alfred Bernard, bid £211 outright to secure the manuscript for Ludovic. Such action would have been quite unexceptionable in the twentieth century, but Ludovic and Bal reacted with extraordinary vehemence to what they regarded as a serious breach of trust. The former, nostalgic for a more honourable era when gentlemen-collectors were less troubled by competition from institutions or wealthy Americans, told Quaritch senior that he would be ‘very chary of any commissions in future’. For his part, Bal expressed his indignation to Edmond in extreme terms: ‘I suppose he calls it “generalship”; I call it theft. He is a Jew, a German Jew, and a Berlin German Jew. Thermometer says 21° of frost; internally I’m at boiling point.’125

These exchanges, as well as exposing pervasive anti-Semitism, are perhaps indicative of aristocratic frustration at the commercial mechanisms of the sale-room. Auctions had always privileged financial power, although secondary factors such as social and cultural capital were also important determinants of success, and Walter Benjamin’s experience of being repeatedly run up by a rival demonstrates how economic considerations can be overridden by personal rivalries and other social factors.126 But in a period when the market for rare books and manuscripts was increasingly internationalized, with American plutocrats and European

124 These terms were declared on Quaritch’s printed letterhead, which occurs frequently in the Crawford Papers, e.g. CLL, 1874, fol. 180. The episode is discussed in Barker, BL, pp. 324–6. Now Rylands Latin MS 104.

125 Letter from Bal to Edmond, 8 February 1895; CLL, Jan–March 1895, fol. 105.

126 Benjamin, p. 67.
financiers dominating the field, and when public institutions were also engaging more effectively in the marketplace, it was no longer possible for British aristocrats to exert their superior social and cultural capital over subordinate players – whether dealers or bourgeois collectors. Auctions were sites where anyone with sufficient money could compete, regardless of class and cultural distinction. As many aristocratic families saw their finances undermined by the agricultural depression, their principal engagement with the auction process was as vendors rather than buyers. Conversely, Philippa Biltcliffe notes the popularity of auctions amongst businessmen, who were familiar with commercial transactions and the operations of the stock market: ‘for many of these middle-class men who lacked both a classical education and a familiarity with art objects, the public setting of the auction offered greater assurance than acquiring art through a private vendor.’

The scenes with Quaritch signify, I propose, seismic shifts in the field of cultural production, when the positions of dominant and dominated players were in flux. Bourgeois collectors, lacking aristocratic self-assurance and lifelong familiarity with culture, were often reliant upon expert dealers and fellow connoisseurs to shape and confirm their taste. Biltcliffe argues that ‘purchasing at auction provided more of a guarantee for a collector who was unable to ascertain authenticity for himself. Auction culture came to stand for a particular style of acquisition, relying on public taste rather than connoisseurship.’  

Haidy Geismar has shown how auction values are determined by such mechanisms as catalogues, viewings and discussions with dealers and fellow collectors in advance of a sale, as much as by the bidding process itself. Bourgeois collectors took advantage of these agencies, which compensated for their own lack of expertise and connoisseurship. Ludovic and Bal responded by asserting their independence of dealers, but ironically they were thereby obliged to enter directly into the increasingly bourgeois arena of the auction-room, and to adopt the manners and tactics of their bourgeois competitors. Auctions were

127 Biltcliffe, pp. 218–19.

128 Ibid., p. 219.

129 Geismar, 40, 43. She argues that – unlike commodity auctions – prices in art auctions are constructed from ‘complex social negotiations of value, across space and time’ (p. 29).
dangerous arenas where not only cultural goods were traded: social status and cultural capital were also at stake.

3.5 Conclusion

Lindsay professed to emulate Grolier and Mahieu in opening the library to his *amici*. Yet he was only weakly intricated in the formal and informal networks of bibliophilic sociability, due to his inherent shyness (later compounded by poor eyesight), aversion to company and utilitarian principles of collecting, which disdained the formal accoutrements and rituals of bibliophily. Consequently, the library was little known outside bibliographical circles, and there is no evidence that it was extensively visited or used by researchers. Lindsay’s cultural capital was invested in the library, to be realized later by his son and grandson.

Lindsay had an ambivalent attitude towards elite dealers, such as Quaritch. His social, cultural and economic capital was vastly superior to theirs, and as tradesmen they were duly submissive towards their aristocratic patron. Yet within the narrow bounds of bibliography there was a strong mutual respect, born of both their shared expertise in rare books and manuscripts and Lindsay’s dependency upon them to supply scarce and unique material. The antiquarian book trade in the mid-nineteenth century was an imperfect market where knowledgeable dealers acted as intermediaries between supply – material widely dispersed across private collections, auction-houses and dealers’ stockrooms – and demand from collectors like Lindsay. Quaritch’s success depended on his unsurpassed market intelligence and commercial networks.

Ludovic and Bal, by contrast, were much more closely integrated into the public and private networks of elite culture towards the close of the century. This partly reflects the increasing complexity and particularism of the literary and artistic fields in this period, and the greater opportunities afforded for sociability and the public display of artworks and cultural artefacts. Paradoxically, they came closer than Lindsay to the Grolieresque paradigm of encouraging friends and associates to engage with the library, through a generous loans policy and regular exhibitions at Haigh and in London. Use of the library expanded, thanks to their extensive connections within the cultural and academic worlds, Ludovic’s concerted
endeavours to issue catalogues of the library, and the expansion and divarication of academic disciplines.

Ludovic and Bal adopted a more mercantilist approach to collecting, with less emotional attachment to, and intellectual investment in, the library than Lindsay. Their relationships with dealers were more business-like, treating them as mere purveyors of books and manuscripts, just as they might deal with a tailor or wine merchant. Whereas Lindsay invariably used Quaritch’s dominance of the auction-rooms to his advantage and always entrusted his bids to the ‘Napoleon of booksellers’ (thus avoiding the dangers of personal participation), Ludovic and Bal circumvented dealers and engaged directly in the auction-rooms. In stepping across the divide between spectators and players, they threatened the booksellers’ cabal, but also risked contaminating themselves with the bourgeois manners and vulgarity of the trading floor.

There is thus a clear trajectory from Lindsay’s aristocratic paradigm (of ‘ease’, respect for dealers born of gentlemanly manners and incontrovertible social distinction, and detachment from the commercial arena of the auction-room) to a capitalist model, in which Ludovic and Bal treated booksellers as commercial suppliers, and competed directly with bourgeois collectors and American plutocrats in the auction-rooms. This transition reflected wider societal changes, such as the aristocracy’s weakening cultural authority, and its adoption of an unsentimental, mercenary approach to art collections and libraries, commoditizing them in the interests of financial (and thus social) self-preservation.\(^{130}\) It also presaged Ludovic’s eventual dismantling of the library in the face of financial adversity.

\(^{130}\) Michael Thompson goes too far in claiming that in the late Victorian age ‘aristocrats were the philistines, impressed only by the cash value of their stock of art.’ F. M. L. Thompson, *The Rise of Respectable Society: A Social History of Victorian Britain 1830–1900* (London: Fontana, 1988), p. 267. Cannadine offers a more balanced view: if aristocrats were compelled to part with their art collections, they ‘generally preferred to sell them to the highest bidder rather than to give them away’. David Cannadine, ‘Pictures across the Pond: Perspectives and Retrospectives’, in *British Models of Art Collecting and the American Response: Reflections across the Pond*, ed. Inge Reist (Farnham: Ashgate, 2014), pp. 9–25 (p. 20).
The next two chapters focus more closely on the formation of the library, and its Western and Oriental manuscript components in particular, in order to develop the theses that the library was constructed to reinforce Lindsay’s social and cultural distinction, and that it both instantiated and underpinned his interests in social, racial and epistemological classifications. I also extend the argument of the present chapter by demonstrating that Lindsay differentiated himself from other collectors in the types of material that he acquired, while he and his son displayed the generosity expected of gentlemen in welcoming fellow bibliophiles and scholars and in loaning material out.
Fig. 3.1. Engraved portrait of Bernard Quaritch, from a photograph by John Mayall, in E. C. Bigmore and W. H. Wyman, *A Bibliography of Printing* (London: Bernard Quaritch, 1880–86), vol. 2. Copyright The University of Manchester.
Fig. 3.2. Photographic portrait of David Lindsay ('Lord Bal'), by Alexander Bassano, half-plate glass negative, 1899. Copyright National Portrait Gallery, London.
Fig. 3.3. Drawing by ‘H. M. P.’ [Henry Marriott Paget] of a book sale at Sotheby’s in 1888, conducted by Edward Grose Hodge, with Bernard Quaritch immediately to the right of the rostrum. Wikimedia Commons public domain image.
4 Imaginative Geography: Oriental Collections and Classifications in the Bibliotheca Lindesiana

4.1 Introduction

In the second half of the nineteenth century the earls of Crawford assembled one of the most significant collections of Oriental books and manuscripts in Britain. It comprised large numbers of Middle Eastern manuscripts in Arabic, Persian, Turkish and Samaritan; South Asian works in Sanskrit and numerous modern Indian languages; Chinese and Japanese printed books and manuscripts; texts on palm-leaf, bamboo, bone and copper from South-East Asia; papyri from Egypt in Hieroglyphic, Hieratic, Demotic, Greek, Arabic and Coptic; as well as Syriac, Armenian, Coptic and Ethiopic Christian codices and scrolls. While it should be remembered that the Bibliotheca Lindesiana as a whole was predominantly a library of European printed material, the Crawford manuscripts constituted one of the largest and most diverse collections of Oriental works in Britain.

The earls' engagement with Orientalism spanned three-quarters of a century, from Lindsay’s precocious mastery of Persian while at Eton to the turn of the century when Ludovic was acquiring papyri from Egypt and ‘exotic’ materials from South-East Asia, shortly before the sale of the manuscripts in 1901. This was a period that began with 'lonely Orientalists', few in number, ‘undisciplined’, and with limited access to Oriental manuscripts and museum objects, through several decades of professionalization and complexification, to the end of the century when the discipline was becoming highly wissenschaftlich, with specialist research institutes, university chairs, and large state-run museums, libraries and archives. These trends, while slower to emerge in Britain than in mainland Europe, were to a significant extent inscribed in the development of the Bibliotheca Lindesiana.¹

¹ On disciplinarity in relation to Orientalism, see C. A. Bayly, *Empire and Information: Intelligence Gathering and Social Communication in India, 1780–1870* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996); Suzanne L. Marchand, *German Orientalism in the Age of Empire: Religion, Race, and Scholarship* (Washington, DC, and Cambridge: German
This was also the time when Britain’s empire was reaching its zenith, with thickening military, administrative, commercial and cultural networks across the globe.\(^2\) Said averred ‘the sheer knitted-together strength of Orientalist discourse, its very close ties to the enabling socio-economic and political institutions, and its redoubtable durability’.\(^3\) In practice, the Orientalist discursive formation was far from homogenized and cohesive; tensions and fractures ran through it, both synchronically and diachronically, and only by eliding these discontinuities can one synthesize a single ‘Orientalist discourse’, encompassing Charles Wilkins and William Jones on one side and Thomas Macaulay and James Mill on the other, empathetic late eighteenth-century Sanskritists and succeeding generations of inflexible Anglicists, or indeed German academic Orientalism and vigorous Anglo-French colonialism. John McLeod’s plural ‘discourses’ is therefore preferable, signifying a looser, less coherent set of structures, overlapping but not identical interests, modes of communication, ideologies and latent assumptions, all focused upon the East as more-or-less passive subject of the Western gaze. These discourses encompassed artistic, literary, scholarly, exploratory, commercial, colonial and military engagements with the East, many (but not all) of them involving racist and stereotyping attitudes towards the peoples of the East.

As I noted in Chapter 1, I shall examine the development of the library’s Oriental collections and the earls’ engagement with Orientalist discourses, through the lens of recent postcolonial studies, deploying several analytical tools, including Anderson’s ‘totalizing classificatory grid’; Foucault’s metonymic application – refined by Anne Brunon-Ernst – of Bentham’s Panopticon to a wide range of systems of discipline and control; Tony Ballantyne’s model of the British empire as a web rather than a centre and periphery; and investigations of the phenomenon of

---


\(^3\) Said, *Orientalism*, p. 6.
world’s fairs, or *expositions universelles*, by Paul Greenhalgh, Timothy Mitchell and John Ganim.\(^4\)

In Chapter 2 I examined the connections between Lindsay’s interest in racial classification and his preoccupation with the organization of libraries and knowledge. There, too, I revealed that under Lindsay there was extensive physical and conceptual imbrication between the Oriental collections and their Western counterparts, whereas the former were later segregated from and subordinated to the occidental material. The questions that this chapter addresses include: What motivated Lindsay and Ludovic to collect Oriental materials, when most nineteenth-century library builders confined their activities to Western manuscripts and printed books? How did the Oriental collections support Lindsay’s researches into racial classification, ethnology and comparative religion, and were there any links between these interests and his concern with social and cultural distinction? How did Lindsay and Ludovic assemble these collections, and were there any differences between their respective practices? How did the earls of Crawford compare with other collectors of Oriental books and manuscripts in terms of their backgrounds, interests, motives and mechanisms of collecting? And how did they engage with and contribute to wider Orientalist discourses in their acquisition of material, in their endeavours to exert intellectual control over such esoteric and intractable collections, and in opening them up to researchers?

---

4.2 ‘Literary catholicity’: Motives for the Formation of the Oriental Collections

Lindsay claimed not to be a collector of manuscripts per se: he told Quaritch that he ‘[did] not profess to collect MSS’, while in the Library Report he asserted that ‘I have never bent my thoughts’ in the direction of a manuscript library. Indeed, as I demonstrate in the next chapter, he generally eschewed the allure of illuminated Western manuscripts. His intention was rather to create a universal, panoptical library which would serve the present and future needs of the Lindsay family:

I have always [...] proceeded on the principle that a family library should be catholic in character – should include the best and most valuable books, landmarks of thought and progress, in all cultivated languages, Oriental as well as European. What one member of the family cannot, another may be able to read and appreciate. [...] On this principle of literary catholicity you will be prepared, I think [...] to recognise and acquiesce in the frequent occurrence in this Report of books in languages – as, for example, Arabic, Turkish, Armenian, Persian, Sanscrit, Chinese, Japanese, and others – very foreign to our European ears.

Lindsay’s ambition to create a comprehensive, polyglot library was grounded in his philosophy of holism: ‘Human Knowledge of every description is one whole, every part bearing relation to the other parts and all to one central principle which animates, governs and explains everything.’ Analogous to Pitt-Rivers’s comparative collection of anthropological artefacts, it was also aligned with wider spectacular

---

5 Letter from Lindsay to Quaritch, [10 May 1860]; CLL, Jan–June 1860, fol. 185. LR, Epilogue, p. 7.

6 LR, Introduction, p. 16.

7 Letter from Lindsay to Anne Lindsay, 30 March 1843; CPP, 94/11, fols 1192–3.

8 Pitt-Rivers argued that the object of an anthropological collection was to ‘trace out [...] the sequence of ideas by which mankind has advanced from the condition of the lower animals to that in which we find him at the present time, and by this means to provide really reliable materials for a philosophy of progress’. Augustus Henry Lane-Fox Pitt-Rivers, The Evolution of Culture and Other Essays, ed. Sir John Linton Myres and Henry Balfour
and epistemological trends such as the contemporary staging of international exhibitions, the popularity of panoramas and panopticons,\(^9\) a revival of interest in ‘primitive’ societies, and the development of comparative anthropology.\(^{10}\) As John Burrow notes, ‘an interest in the manners, customs, institutions and beliefs of primitive and oriental peoples ceased to be confined to travellers, antiquarians and satirists, and to take the study of them seriously became no longer merely a proof of eccentricity.’\(^{11}\) Lindsay thus confronted the central importance of manuscripts in Middle Eastern and South Asian cultures: in order to document the faiths, literatures, arts and histories of these regions, it was imperative to acquire a wide range of indigenous writings, as well as the secondary literature generated by Western Orientalists.

Lindsay’s interest in Oriental books and manuscripts was whetted by a visit to Egypt in 1836–37, when he obtained an exceptional copy of the Qur’ān, through the good offices of Johann Rudolph Theophilus Lieder (1798–1865). In his subsequent narrative of the expedition, he explains:

> It is forbidden to print the Koran, or even to sell it to a Christian; I have procured, however, through the kind mediation of my friend, Mr. Lieder, a most beautiful manuscript (once a vizier’s) of that holy volume, richly illuminated with gold and colours in the Arabesque style of our old missals, a

---

\(^{9}\) Mitchell observes that ‘the panopticon […] was a colonial invention. The panoptic principle was devised on Europe’s colonial frontier with the Ottoman Empire, and examples of the panopticon were built for the most part not in northern Europe, but in places like colonial India.’ Mitchell, p. 35. See also Brunon-Ernst. On panoramas, see Comment; Peter Otto, ‘Between the Virtual and the Actual: Robert Barker’s Panorama of London and the Multiplication of the Real in Late Eighteenth-Century London’, *Romanticism on the Net*, 46 (2007) <http://id.erudit.org/iderudit/016130ar> [accessed 27 July 2015].


\(^{11}\) Burrow, p. 80.
style, indeed, imported from the East by Rome, and which, though condemned by the classic taste of Vitruvius, Raphael thought not unworthy of revival.12

This statement is noteworthy both for Lindsay’s conforming of Arabic art to Western (classical) canons of taste, and for his espousal of the widespread belief that there was a prohibition on printing the sacred text of Islam. It situates him firmly within prevailing Orientalist discourses which essentialized Islamic societies as timeless and technologically inchoate. Modern commentators have adduced a range of factors – linguistic, religious, cultural, political and technical – to explain the late adoption of print in the Middle East and South Asia.13 Space limitations preclude a detailed explication of the competing theories here, but the fortuitous implication for Lindsay was that he was collecting Oriental manuscripts at a time when their indigenous cultural importance was diminishing; as they became displaced by print, they were more readily obtainable than in previous eras.

Allied to Lindsay’s utilitarian ambition of creating a universal, panoptical library, and the late adoption of printing in Middle Eastern and South Asian cultures, there


was a further reason for his collecting manuscripts from these regions: to support his studies of comparative religion, ethnology and linguistics, which were grounded in his profound Christian (Anglican) faith. Barker succinctly summarizes Lindsay’s aims:

To study the ancient literature of every nation, to understand the philological basis of their linguistic links, to know the other forms, in art and archaeology, in which ancient civilizations have been preserved, to recognize in all of them the grand design of God for all His peoples, underlies all his subsequent writing and speculation, and the formation of the Bibliotheca Lindesiana.¹⁴

Lindsay was, in fact, situated within long-standing Orientalist endeavours to construct a European identity distinct from and generally superior to other races. His theories on the development of civilizations were first expounded in Progression by Antagonism (1846), which was discussed in Chapter 2.¹⁵ This was published during the mid-century period when, as Nancy Stepan argues, the theologically-based, monogenist and diffusionist tradition of race science, popularized in Britain by James Cowles Prichard, was hardening under the influence of colonial encounters into a more biologically-focused, polygenist and blatantly racist approach to human racial diversity.¹⁶

Lindsay synthesized earlier theological and philological approaches – in particular Japhetanism and Sir William Jones’s discovery of the unity of Indo-European languages – with a Hegelian dialectic and overt nationalism, to conclude that

¹⁴ Barker, BL, p. 89.

¹⁵ Lindsay, Progression, discussed in Brigstocke, ‘Sketches’.

humanity had achieved its zenith in contemporary Britain. He argues in *Progression by Antagonism* that ‘truth’ lies at the ‘point of intersection or compromise’ between imagination and reason, which ‘meet, in national combination and reconciliation, first and solely, however imperfectly, in the character and constitution, Ecclesiastical and Civil, of Great Britain’. Lindsay’s classification of civilizations was based upon the post-diluvian tripartite division of humanity deriving from the three sons of Noah. He identifies the Egyptians, Chinese and Phoenicians – the least developed peoples – as the children of Ham, living in an era when ‘sense’ predominated; the Assyrians, Jews and Arabs as the sons of Shem, in which ‘spirit’ prevailed; and the superior ‘Hindu’ and ‘Medo-Persian’ (Aryan or Indo-European) races as the offspring of Japhet, amongst whom ‘imagination’ and ‘reason’ respectively prevailed (Fig. 4.1). This was not a scheme of Lindsay’s own devising but was grounded in a tradition that Colin Kidd traces back to Isidore of Seville’s *Etymologies* in the seventh century, in which Europe was associated with the stock of Japhet. In early modern Europe this identification was adopted by proponents of ethnic theology, who sought to explain the bewildering array of cultures and religions encountered by Europeans during their global expansion, through recourse to the Biblical account of Noachian dispersal.

To what extent were Lindsay’s views on ethnology and comparative religion supported by, or even dependent upon, his manuscript collections? Did the former determine or inform his collecting of Oriental materials? Certainly the bulk of the Oriental manuscripts was acquired after the publication of *Progression by Antagonism* in 1846, and so cannot have influenced its formulation. In the Library Report, Lindsay listed some thirty Oriental manuscripts, chosen to exemplify the

---

17 He claims that ‘it is from the collision of partial truths that Truth in the abstract, disencumbered from the alloy of earthly prejudice, soars aloft and darts onward to her goal.’ Lindsay, *Progression*, pp. 12–13. On Hegel see p. 71 above.

18 Ibid., pp. 17, 67.

extraordinary range of formats, materials, scripts and forms of decoration employed in written texts across many civilizations, but these ‘bibliographical curiosities’ were assigned to the extempore ‘Museum’ department (discussed in Chapter 2) and were deemed to have little research value. On the other hand, by 1865 he had already amassed major collections of Chinese and Japanese books, and in the following decade he would go on to assemble large collections of Arabic, Persian, Turkish, Hebrew, Samaritan, Coptic, Ethiopic and South Asian manuscripts. These were certainly acquired for their research potential, rather than as mere ‘wonders’, and it is perhaps significant that the manuscript collections embraced all three branches of humanity, as Lindsay conceived them. He continued to develop his theories of Japhetan superiority throughout his life, culminating in the posthumously published *Creed of Japhet*, an attempt to delineate the Ur-religion of the Aryan race, for which he drew extensively upon the philological researches of Max Müller, John Muir and Martin Haug on the Rigveda and the Avesta, copies of which were present in the library.\(^{20}\)

However, Lindsay’s limited linguistic skills (other than his early mastery of Persian) were a practical impediment to his close study of the non-Western collections. Thus the collections furnished Lindsay with broad impressions, not detailed, empirical evidence. They corroborated his views on the relative progress of various civilizations, and reinforced his liberal appreciation of their manifold contributions to human development, but it cannot be claimed that his theories were built upon any evidence they provided. Lindsay may have hoped one day to interrogate his Oriental collections, but he was primarily collecting on behalf of future generations of his family, and to benefit the wider world of scholarship.

\(^{20}\) Lindsay records his reliance on published editions rather than the manuscripts. Alexander William Lindsay, *The Creed of Japhet: That Is of the Race Popularly Surnamed Indo-Germanic or Aryan, as Held before the Period of its Dispersion; Ascertained by the Aid of Comparative Mythology and Language* (London: privately printed, 1891), p. xlvii. The work was published posthumously; his widow claimed that it was ‘looked upon by him as the great work of his life’ (p. xiii).
Indeed, it would be a gross distortion to argue that Lindsay collected Oriental materials merely, or even primarily, to corroborate his theories of racial superiority. One of the most striking aspects of the Library Report is the space and attention Lindsay accords to non-European cultures. He makes a series of generalized claims for the importance of non-Western civilizations, which are remarkably enlightened for the mid-nineteenth century:

It is not, in fact, Europe but Asia which should take bibliographical and literary precedence in the present department of the class of History. The great Universal Histories of the East are of higher importance than any of the preceding, as being written in many cases by men of science, observation, and experience, philosophers and statesmen, the Tacitus, Macchiavellis, and Montesquieus of their time and clime. [...] I cannot and I will not apologize for these various works of history or topography of which I have enumerated so many, whether as in our possession or as desiderata – the sources and springs of Oriental story. [...] it will be seen that, apart from and independently of the great line of thinkers and actors familiar to Europe, and whom we commonly consider as the exclusive agents of the Almighty in promoting that progressive development, a thousand tributary rills of influence have poured in from unsuspected sources to swell and affect the main general current of human destiny. It is as the keys to these sources – of a remoter and yet nearer and more universal Nile – that I seek for these obscure and uncouth-sounding volumes of Oriental history, which at the first sight and aspect appear so uninteresting and uninviting. [...]21

Lindsay even exhorts his countrymen ‘not to despise either Hindoo or Chinese as a barbarian, a “nigger,” but to recognize in him a kinsman in thought as well as in blood, and one too of an elder stock, still deserving of reverence’.22 For the post-Rebellion 1860s this was an astonishing assertion – one hears echoes of

21 LR, History, pp. 15, 68.

22 LR, Historical Paralipomena, p. 19.
Montesquieu, Voltaire and Sir William Jones – to which I shall return in the following section.

In summary, Lindsay was motivated to collect Orientalia by his ambition to create a panoptical library, embracing all the world’s major civilizations, which would furnish data for his and others’ researches into ethnology, comparative religion, linguistics and other disciplines. While Lindsay claimed not to collect manuscripts per se, the central importance of the manuscript tradition in Middle Eastern and South Asian cultures obliged him to amass such material in order adequately to represent their achievements.

Ludovic did not share his father’s expansive interests in comparative religion, ethnology, and the diverse cultures of the East. He may have come to the realization that Lindsay’s dream of a universal library was neither attainable nor necessary, given the rise of institutional libraries. Krzysztof Pomian argues that the development of public museums (and, by implication, libraries) relieved the private collection of its cognitive functions, liberating it to become, ‘sans réserve’, an expression of the collector’s personality.23 While Pomian exaggerates the public–private dichotomy, the Bibliotheca Lindesiana instantiates a shift towards subjectivity and selectivity in private collections.

Thus Ludovic concentrated his collecting on particular types of material, such as illuminated Western manuscripts and jewelled bindings, incunabula, scientific books, proclamations and broadsides, French Revolutionary documents, philatelic material, exotic manuscripts from South-East Asia, and Egyptian papyri. It is difficult to perceive any coherence or philosophical structure to this bricolage, and he moved rapidly from one field of collecting to another. Enthusiasm rather than scholarship seems to have been his primary motivation. He was particularly drawn to decorated manuscripts and exemplary, rather than representative, items. His librarian reported to Bal: ‘Lord Crawford told me he did not care to increase the number of ordinary Oriental MSS.; his desire being rather to secure any, such as the

Kufic Koran, of extraordinary interest, either for antiquity or beauty of workmanship.’ Ludovic appears to have treated such items as bibelots – curiosities – rather than research tools.24 His interests in Egyptian papyri (discussed further below) and in South-East Asian manuscripts were kindled by his own visits to those regions, and thus these Oriental manuscripts functioned as Susan Stewart’s ‘souvenirs of the exotic’: ‘on the one hand, the object must be marked as exterior and foreign, on the other it must be marked as arising directly out of an immediate experience of its possessor.’25

4.3 ‘A kinsman in thought as well as in blood’: Racial Classification and Social Distinction

Having considered Lindsay’s primary motives for collecting Oriental books and manuscripts – his ambition of creating a universal library containing ‘the best that is known and thought in the world’, and his desire to support his and others’ studies of comparative religion, ethnology and linguistics – I intend to test the proposition that there was an intrinsic connection between, on the one hand, his interest in racial classification and the consequent collecting of Orientalia and, on the other, his deployment of the library in order to affirm his own social and cultural distinction, which I shall discuss in Chapter 5. Lindsay believed that social hierarchies within nations were inherently linked with wider racial classifications between nations. The most successful nations were formed through the fusion of two anterior and antagonistic peoples, characterized by Reason and Imagination respectively, resulting ‘in a third, more powerful and enduring, of mingled blood and language’.26 It was the role of the aristocracy to maintain the balance of competing characteristics in the compound nation. In the Library Report he explains:


25 Stewart, p. 147.

26 Lindsay, Progression, p. 54.
The subject [genealogy] is one of deep interest and of unspeakable practical and political importance – if it be true, as I believe, and as might, I think, easily be proved, that the progress of mankind has arisen from the successive predominance of heroic or noble races – families originally, nations in their growth and development – who have at successive epochs established themselves in the fairest regions of the world, subjugated the earlier, more numerous, and less warlike inhabitants, mingled with them in marriage, and generated in due time in each instance a compound race, combining the genius and merits of both stocks, and inheritors of a vigour of mind and body which has carried them triumphantly to the several goals of their providential mission upon earth. [...] On the other hand, while such has been the process in ascent to the culminating point of progress in the history of all these compound races, the rulers of mankind, it is only [...] so long as the higher or more generous blood, as represented by the gentry or noblesse of each respective country, maintains its ascendancy, not in matter of exclusive privilege but in the spirit of political government, that national greatness continues, – from the moment that the tide turns and that the plebeian element begins to predominate, [...] the result is inevitably, sooner or later, the absolute government of the mob, the sovereignty of the people, ending in anarchy, leading ^subsiding^ to military despotism.27

In this remarkable passage Lindsay combines his racial theories, based upon the supposed superiority of the Japhetan stock, with his belief in the benign, paternalistic influence of the aristocracy within the British constitution. Indeed, he implies a metonymic relationship between the ‘noblesse’ and Britain itself: both perform hegemonic and tutelary roles, one within the nation, the other between nations or races – the so-called Pax Britannica. His argument is of course facilitated by the linguistic ambiguity in the metaphor of blood to signify both aristocratic lineage and racial distinction. The importance that Lindsay attached to his illustrious pedigree (or blood-line) has already been remarked upon, and I discuss it further in Chapter 5. Robert Young has identified a similar conflation of the

27 LR, Historical Paralipomena, p. 1.
meanings of ‘blood’ in the French racial theorist Arthur de Gobineau’s *Essai sur l’inégalité des races humaines* (1853‒55): ‘Gobineau adapts this aristocratic notion of race as ancient stock to the modern notion, derived from linguistic families, of families of races, and assumes that however large they too are distinguished by their “breeding”, by a particular blood that flows through their veins.’ The parallels with the passage from the Library Report quoted above are obvious, although there is no evidence that Lindsay was directly influenced by Gobineau, whose racism was of a much darker hue, later inspiring Nazi racial ideology. Whereas Gobineau used the notion of blood to argue for the supremacy of the Aryan race, Lindsay’s primary interest was to justify the continued hegemony of the aristocracy, while acknowledging kinship (however unequal) between races.

Lindsay’s dual interests in racial and social classification were not unique in this period, and they should be contextualized within wider discourses around race, culture and the role of the aristocracy, which were particularly active in the mid-nineteenth century. Matthew Arnold famously couched his binary categorization of Victorian society in racial terms borrowed from Heine, although James Caufield and Joep Leerssen warn against presentist, essentializing readings of Hebraism and Hellenism; these were forces, Caufield argues, ‘simply colorful embodiments of his pale abstractions’. While Arnold was certainly more critical of the dominant influence of Hebraism in Victorian society – and thus vulnerable to charges of anti-

---


29 The 1910 catalogue of printed books at Haigh does not include Gobineau’s *Essai*.

Semitism – he also censured Hellenism’s lack of compassion and sought to reconcile the two forces through education of the middle classes.31 Likewise, Mark Crinson claims that ‘Race and nationhood were key issues for John Ruskin’, although there was a marked shift in Ruskin’s views: his notorious invective against the Indian Rebellion in The Two Paths (1859) contrasts with his earlier, largely favourable opinions regarding the Arabic influences upon Venetian architecture; Crinson in fact admits that Ruskin’s attitude to Islam in the early 1850s was ‘generally positive’.32

The degree of association between race and nationhood in mid-century Britain remains contested. While Britain had its own crop of scientific racists like Robert Knox, Peter Mandler argues that ‘the vitality of the social-evolutionary tradition inhibited the development of biological racism and organic nationalism in England.’33 While not denying the pervasiveness of anti-Semitism and other manifestations of racial prejudice in this period, I share Mandler’s scepticism over retrospective formulations of race and nation. National character was a complex construct, fashioned predominantly through distinctions between Britain and other


European nations – notably France, Germany and Italy – rather than through race: rival Europeans were ‘arguably more important in the definitions of culture and national character than imperial possessions and peoples’.\textsuperscript{34} Internally, national character was of course subject to appropriation and refashioning by rival political factions and social groups, and Lindsay participated fully in these debates.

In Lindsay’s case, there was a link between race and nationhood, but it was indirect. ‘Race’ was, in any case, a flexible concept for him: in common with traditional practice, he used the term loosely to denote any large group with a distinct cultural or geographical identity, such as the ‘princely races of central and northern Italy’ or indeed the Lindsay clan.\textsuperscript{35} Lindsay’s racism was not based upon polarities of white and black, Aryan and non-Aryan; instead it arose from a series of triangulations: the aristocracy stood at the apex of British society; Britain at the apex of Europe; and Europe (or the Aryan race) at the apex of the tripartite Noachian descent. This complex, interlocking model helps to explain how Lindsay’s interest in racial classification (and therefore his collecting of Orientalia) and his preoccupation with his own social and cultural distinction were mutually reinforcing. It also permits his monogenist racial theories to be reconciled with the generosity he manifested towards non-European cultures, as I noted earlier.

It was arguably easier for Lindsay, a member of the privileged elite, to show magnanimity towards ‘inferior’ races, than it was for a European subaltern in the colonial contact zone. However, Lindsay’s benevolence was not (simply) the result of the comfortable social and geographic distance between him and the subordinate races: the ‘telescopic philanthropy’ of Mrs Jellaby in \textit{Bleak House}.\textsuperscript{36} It was in fact


\textsuperscript{35} LR, Historical Paralipomena, p. 8; Epilogue, p. 18. On earlier meanings of ‘race’, see Beasley, p. 2.

intrinsic to his elite habitus. Just as he keenly felt the heavy social responsibilities of his class, by which he fashioned his identity as a member of the aristocracy – upholding the highest standards of gentlemanly conduct, demonstrating consummate taste, fulfilling his duties within extended social and familial networks – likewise he felt obligated to be generous towards lesser races and nations. He treated them like impecunious members of a cadet branch of the family, according them respect as distant kinsmen, but not considering them his equals.³⁷

4.4 ‘Spoils of many a distant land’: Mechanisms for the Development of the Oriental Collections

Lindsay deployed a variety of strategies to develop his Oriental collections: he purchased single manuscripts through the market mechanisms of booksellers and auction-rooms; he bought entire collections assembled by academic and professional Orientalists; and he employed local agents, missionaries especially, to acquire material on his behalf ‘in the field’. I shall briefly examine each of these methods in turn, before considering Ludovic’s collecting policy and practices.

Lindsay accumulated the printed collections and Western manuscripts largely through the purchase of single items, whether from booksellers, at auction, or occasionally by gift or exchange with fellow collectors. Some Oriental manuscripts were acquired in similar fashion, from a magnificent Shahnameh bought from the bookseller Joseph Lilly in 1855, to a manuscript of the Legends of Damar Wulan, illustrated with two hundred images derived from the Javanese shadow-puppet tradition, for which he paid Quaritch £40 in 1877.³⁸ However, these were generally the more important items, which were accorded connoisseurial and commercial

³⁷ Catherine Hall argues that white colonies were regarded as children of the mother-country, whereas dependencies with predominantly non-white populations were treated differently. Hall, p. 10. In Lindsay’s case, there is no evidence of such discrimination.

³⁸ Letter from Lilly to Lindsay, 3 January 1855; CLL, 1850‒56, fol. 140. Now Rylands Persian MS 932. Letter from Lindsay to Quaritch, [15 October 1877]; CLL, 1877, fol. 112. Now Rylands Javanese MS 7.
status similar to that of Western manuscripts; the bulk of Oriental material was acquired by other means.

In his introduction to the hand-list of Arabic, Persian and Turkish manuscripts, Ludovic remarked upon the contrast between his father’s purchases of entire collections of Middle Eastern manuscripts and his normal practice of drawing up long lists of desiderata and employing agents to seek out the works he wished to obtain: ‘The principle here adopted was undoubtedly a good one – […] each private collection bought entire represents, as it were, and concentrates into the moment of such sale and purchase, a lifetime of watchful success and accumulation.’ Ludovic borrows the wording used by his father in the Library Report, Introduction, p. 17. This was a pragmatic solution to the practical difficulties of obtaining material from the East. Moreover, since Lindsay lacked the expertise to assess the collections himself, he relied heavily upon the reputations of the collectors from whom he purchased in order to validate and valorize the material.

From the early 1860s onwards Lindsay purchased a series of major collections that propelled the Bibliotheca Lindesiana into the forefront of Orientalist libraries. One of the first collections he acquired was that of Pierre Léopold van Alstein (1792–1862), which was sold at Ghent in 1863. Quaritch attended the auction and succeeded in securing the entire collection of Oriental manuscripts for 3,000 francs (£120), colluding with the directeur de la vente to outwit the hapless librarian of the Bibliothèque Royale in Brussels, who had received a grant to buy the collection. It is significant as the first collection of Japanese books to reach Britain, reflecting Lindsay’s innovative tastes in book collecting, but it also contained important Chinese works. An auction of books from the collection of the French Orientalist

39 Lindsay, Oriental Manuscripts, pp. ix–x. Ludovic borrows the wording used by his father in the Library Report, Introduction, p. 17.

40 Letter from Quaritch to Lindsay, 2 June 1863, and letter from Lindsay to Quaritch, 8 June 1863; CLL, Jan–June 1863, fols 271, 281. The sale is described in Barker, BL., p. 211.

41 On Lindsay’s Japanese collection, see Kornicki. On the collecting of Japanese books in this period, see P. F. Kornicki, ‘Collecting Japanese Books in Europe from the Seventeenth to the Nineteenth Centuries’, Bulletin of Portuguese/Japanese Studies, 8 (2004), 21–38; Lindsay is discussed on p. 29. Stephen Jones notes the influence of the Great Exhibition in fostering interest in Japanese art, arguing that ‘intellectual curiosity about Japanese art, as opposed to...
Jean-Pierre Guillaume Pauthier (1801–73), in June 1870, afforded an opportunity to augment the Chinese department; a further sale took place in Paris after Pauthier’s death, in December 1873, at which Lindsay secured twelve lots of Chinese books at a cost of £118 10s.42

Lindsay also took advantage of the opening up of China to purchase material through agents in Beijing and Shanghai, such as Rev. Joseph Edkins and Rev. Alexander Wylie.43 Lindsay’s reliance on missionaries reveals the contingent and ambivalent nature of the trade in Chinese books and manuscripts in the aftermath of the Second Opium War and the Taiping Rebellion. Although the Treaty of Tientsin of 1859 and the Peking Convention in the following year had compelled the Chinese government to permit Western traders and missionaries to travel unhindered throughout China, in practice movement beyond the toehold treaty ports was still fraught with difficulty and danger. Peripatetic missionaries were amongst the few Westerners with sufficient knowledge of the indigenous language and culture and with suitable Chinese contacts to enable them to acquire books in parallel with their proselytizing activities; they infiltrated Christian texts into China.


42 Anon., Catalogue des livres de linguistique et d’histoire relatifs à l’Orient (Arabes, Persans, Sanskrits, Indiens et Chinois) la plupart rares et précieux provenant de la bibliothèque de M. G. Pauthier… dont la vente aura lieu le mardi 7 juin 1870… (Paris: Adolphe Labitte, 1870); Anon., Bibliothèque chinoise: catalogue des livres chinois composant la bibliothèque de feu M. G. Pauthier (Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1873). Receipt from Quaritch to Lindsay, 16 April 1874; CLR, 1871‒92, fol. 1396.

and exported Chinese books to Europe. Thus within a decade Lindsay succeeded in building one of the largest and most important collections of Chinese books and manuscripts in Britain; it comfortably exceeded the 299 titles recorded in Edkins’s catalogue of the Bodleian Library in 1876, for example.

Ludovic discontinued his father’s practice of purchasing entire collections, adopting different strategies to augment the Oriental collections. He developed a particular interest in the literatures of South-East Asia, stimulated by a cruise to the Far East in the winter of 1897. Although his enquiries after manuscripts in the region were fruitless, on his return to Europe he purchased a considerable number through the agency of Cornelis Marinus Pleyte (1863–1917), a director of the Leiden-based publishers E. J. Brill and the author of several works on the languages and cultures of South-East Asia. Pleyte managed to obtain manuscripts in numerous languages – Achinese, Balinese, Batak, Buginese, Burmese, Javanese, Kawi, Madurese, Makasarese and Malay – procuring them both via missionaries and colonial administrators, and first-hand during his own visit to the region in 1899. Again one observes the collector’s reliance on trusted field-workers such as missionaries and government officials. While Lindsay had sought a few examples of South-East Asian manuscripts to populate his universal library of world literatures, Ludovic’s motives


are harder to penetrate. As noted earlier, the exoticism of the material seems to have held appeal, and the broad range of media on which the manuscripts were written is noteworthy: palm leaf, bamboo, bone, bark and copper sheet. He instructed his librarian: ‘Get all the Batak he [Pleyte] will let you have especially the Bamboo ones.’

Lindsay had been content to possess a few specimens of ancient Egyptian texts, which he assigned to the ‘Museum’ department. Ludovic, by contrast, developed an enthusiasm for papyri at the close of the century, which reflected growing awareness of the historical significance of the papyrus fragments that had been preserved in the Egyptian desert, matched by concern over their rapid destruction, as ancient rubbish tips were mined by local farmers as a source of fertilizer (sebākh), or sold to collectors and museums. The socio-political context was also significant in opening up Egypt to both archaeological investigation and cultural tourism in the late nineteenth century. Following the ‘Urābist revolt, in 1882 British forces occupied the country and reinstated the pliant Khedive Tawfiq within a de facto British protectorate; this, together with the introduction of steamships and railways, made it safer and easier for wealthy European tourists and archaeologists to visit and travel around the country. Egypt (or rather ancient Egypt) was packaged and presented to the gaze of the Western tourist, who had already been conditioned by such framing devices as the panopticon and expositions universelles, which conflated reality and its representation, most notably in the famous ‘Rue du Caire’ at the Paris exhibition of 1889. Dominic Montserrat has also drawn attention to the intense media interest that swirled around the startling discoveries

47 Letter from Ludovic to Edmond, 15 October 1897; CLL, Sep–Oct 1897, fol. 106.


49 For a contemporary justification of the Protectorate, see Alfred Milner, England in Egypt, 5th edn (London: Edward Arnold, 1894).

50 Mitchell, pp. 1–33; Greenhalgh, pp. 102–3; Reid, pp. 191, 252–3.
of papyri made at al-Bahnasā (ancient Oxyrhynchus) by the ‘Oxford Dioscuri’, Arthur Hunt (1871–1934) and Bernard Grenfell (1869–1926), and indeed was actively encouraged by them and by the Egypt Exploration Fund, which sponsored their annual expeditions from the winter of 1896–97 onwards.51

It was in this context of heightened academic and popular interest in Egyptian antiquities, and especially in the survival (almost uniquely in Egypt) of classical and early Christian writings, that Ludovic embarked on an expedition to Egypt aboard his yacht Consuelo in the winter of 1898–99.52 In a series of letters home he breathlessly reported a stream of remarkable purchases. ‘I have got hold of 14 [corrected to 12] papyrus fragments & 2 on vellum Greek from the Fayum which are curious. [...] Am in negotiation for a rolled papyrus in Demotic writing, & another already opened.’ Two days later he purchased approximately 2,300 Greek, Coptic and Arabic fragments, on papyrus and paper, from one Sheik Faràk. From another dealer came two Hieroglyphic and Hieratic rolls, ‘about 300 or 400 Greek papyrus scraps gummed to paper [...] a number of Greek Papyri which have been Carbonised by fire, laid down on paper but legible’, and ‘a very fine old large Koràn’.53

When Ludovic returned to England, he made arrangements for the collection to be catalogued. At the suggestion of Frederic Kenyon of the British Museum, he contacted Hunt, who responded that he and Grenfell were too busy at present with

---


their work for the EEF and William Tyssen-Amherst, the first major collector of papyri in England:

Possibly however Lord Crawford may not object to some delay; and in that case I should be very glad to do what I can for his collection. I have, I believe, a fairly accurate idea of its contents, since I had seen all that was for sale in Cairo and the Fayyûm before his arrival. That is one of the reasons for the absence that you notice, of literary fragments, which had been previously sifted out by ourselves.  

Hunt delivers a devastating critique: the material that Ludovic had carried away from Egypt in triumph was in fact the chaff winnowed out by Grenfell and Hunt and scarcely merited publication, since it lacked the literary material that they had extracted before it came to Ludovic’s notice. This is by way of preparation for an audacious proposition: rather than chasing around Egypt for papyri himself, Ludovic should follow Amherst’s example and commission the professional papyrologists to do the work for him. Hunt offers his and Grenfell’s services to build the collection: an ‘expenditure of from £50 to £100 during two or three seasons would probably be quite sufficient, together with what Lord Crawford has already acquired, to provide material for a really attractive and valuable publication.’ They had the papyrological expertise and negotiating skills required to obtain at a fair price papyri regarded as being of the first importance: literary (classical) and Christian texts. Unsurprisingly, Ludovic accepted the proposal and told Hunt that he and Grenfell could spend up to £250 in the coming season. Ludovic was treating papyrus collecting as a commercial investment.

Here are laid bare the Orientalist attitudes so prevalent in papyrology in this period: the privileging of classical and Christian fragments over ancient Egyptian material; an almost total disregard of medieval Arabic texts; and the eliding of contemporary (Islamic) Egypt, which intrudes only in references to unscrupulous dealers and the wanton vandalism of the sebakh diggers.55 Ludovic’s accounts of his activities in Egypt, and the correspondence with Hunt, conform with David Fearn’s assertion that Western appropriations of Greek literary papyri from Egypt were consistently represented as ‘rightful recoveries of cultural heirlooms which instantiated British intellectual hegemony over Egypt and its native inhabitants as imperial subjects’.56 Egypt was treated as the ‘happy hunting-ground’ of wealthy collectors and of the archaeologists who served them, just as the plains of sub-Saharan Africa provided sport for big-game hunters.57

4.5 Position-Takings: Contextualizing the Earls of Crawford in Relation to Other Collectors of Oriental Manuscripts

The earls of Crawford were not unique or even unusual in acquiring Oriental books and manuscripts: pervasive Orientalism ensured that many private libraries incorporated such material during the nineteenth century, in Britain and elsewhere in Europe. In order to assess more fully the earls’ significance as collectors and to distinguish any atypical or unique features of their collecting – in terms of motives,


57 ‘The papyrus-hunter of the present day sets out on his laborious task with the set purpose of looking for papyri and for nothing else. That is not to say, of course, that other objects of antiquity and interest will be despised, should they come in his way during his pursuit of his main quarry, any more than one can imagine a big-game hunter refusing to bag a lion because he is on the look-out for elephants.’ James Baikie, Egyptian Papyri and Papyrus-Hunting (London: Religious Tract Society, 1925), p. 226; quoted in Fearn, p. 179.
methods, scale and focus – they must be contextualized in relation to other collectors.58

Most collectors of Oriental manuscripts in the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries fall into three broad categories. The first comprised ‘field’ Orientalists – officers of the East India Company (EIC), its European rivals and their respective armies, and those who followed in their wake, such as missionaries and traders – who acquired manuscripts in the colonial ‘contact zone’, as war booty, or through the more-or-less legitimate acquisition of indigenous libraries and single manuscripts; these men were in Bayly’s ‘vanguard of the imperial information collectors’.59 Secondly, there was an expanding cohort of metropolitan Orientalists – independent scholars and, increasingly, those holding positions within the academy – who acquired manuscripts to support their research. The third group consisted of elite collectors who obtained specimen manuscripts to exemplify the highest standards of Eastern art and calligraphy, and to stand as comparators with their illuminated manuscripts from medieval and Renaissance Europe.

Of course, there were notable exceptions to this tripartite classification: William Beckford (1760‒1844) and William Bragge, for example, defy easy categorization. Beckford, ‘lone wolf among collectors’, embodies the syncretism of medievalism and Orientalism, those mutually reinforcing ‘othernesses’, which flourished during the era of Romanticism.60 Ganim has explored this linkage, pointing out that geographic and temporal alterities are to some extent interchangeable: the past is another country.61 Thus as well as medieval, Renaissance and modern European


60 The phrase ‘lone wolf’ comes from Munby, Connoisseurs, p. 77.

61 Ganim, p. 3.
paintings, furniture and objets d’art, Greek and Roman antiquities, and an
impressive library of printed books and European manuscripts, Beckford assembled
a significant collection of Oriental manuscripts, while Lucian Harris claims that his
albums of Indian miniatures probably constituted the largest private collection of
such material in Britain in the early nineteenth century.62

‘Company Orientalists’ were responsible for acquiring tens of thousands of
manuscripts during Britain’s long history of engagement in South Asia. Notable
collectors included: Colin Mackenzie (1753–1821), Surveyor-General of Mysore and
later Madras;63 the Swiss scholar-mercenary Antoine Polier (1741–95), a prolific
collector of manuscripts who adopted a ‘double persona’ as gentleman-Orientalist
and Mughal nobleman;64 Charles Wilkins (d. 1836), translator of the Bhagavadgītā;65

62 Lucian Harris, ‘Archibald Swinton: A New Source for Albums of Indian Miniatures in
William Beckford’s Collection’, Burlington Magazine, 143.1179 (2001), 360–6 (p. 360). See also
William Beckford, 1760–1844: An Eye for the Magnificent, ed. Derek E. Ostergard (New
Brandoi, and “the Rajah”: Aspects of an Eighteenth-Century Collection’, Apollo, 143.411
75–92.

(1991), 128–50; Bernard S. Cohn, Colonialism and its Forms of Knowledge: The British in India
Histories and Native Informants: Biography of an Archive’, in Orientalism and the
Postcolonial Predicament: Perspectives on South Asia, ed. Carol A. Breckenridge and Peter
van der Veer (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1993), pp. 279–313; Seda
Kouznetsova, ‘Colin Mackenzie as a Collector of Javanese Manuscripts and Manuscript BL

64 Maya Jasanoff, Edge of Empire: Conquest and Collecting in the East, 1750–1850 (London:
Harper Perennial, 2006), p. 52. See also Sanjay Subrahmanyam, ‘The Career of Colonel
Polier and Late Eighteenth-Century Orientalism’, Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of

Sir William Jones (1746–94); Claudius James Rich (1786/7–1821), the EIC’s resident in Baghdad; Henry Thomas Colebrooke (1765–1837), Professor of Sanskrit and Hindu Law at Fort William College in Calcutta; Sir Gore Ouseley (1770–1844), who amassed a magnificent library of manuscripts during his mission to Tehran in 1810–14; and his brother, the Persian scholar Sir William Ouseley (1767–1842).

Such collections exemplify the hybridity of the EIC itself, which was a curious amalgam of private enterprise and imperialist agency of the British Government in the East. The collections both mirrored the individualized experiences, tastes and interests of the officers who assembled them – exhibiting the qualities of souvenirs or trophies – and simultaneously manifested and were authorized by the policies and practices of the EIC and of the British Government, in seeking to outmanoeuvre their European rivals and subjugate indigenes in the name of trade and empire. The collections were heavily implicated in imperialism, which was itself a form of collecting on the national scale, as Elsner and Cardinal have explicated. Many

---


70 On trophies, see Stewart, p. 147.

71 Elsner and Cardinal, p. 2. See also Maya Jasanoff, ‘Collectors of Empire: Objects,
ended up in the possession of the EIC and other institutions, underscoring their equivocal public-private status; the presence of indigenous manuscripts within institutional collections at the heart of empire continually reaffirmed – indeed re-enacted – British conquests (military, political and cultural). Manuscripts thus functioned as instruments of colonial intelligence gathering and control; they constituted an additional component of Anderson’s ‘totalizing classificatory grid’, alongside the census, the map and the museum, which ‘illuminate the late colonial state’s style of thinking about its domain’.72

One of Said’s tenets is the implication of academic interest in the East with colonialism, or muscular Orientalism. Certainly it is impossible to draw clear distinctions between ‘Company’ Orientalists and their counterparts in the academy, in terms of the personnel involved, their networks, their competences, or their motives for engaging with the East. At the beginning of the nineteenth century, many experts in Sanskrit, Arabic and Persian languages and literatures were Company men, whose duties demanded at least some linguistic abilities in order to communicate with the people over whom they ruled. One such was Turner Macan (1792–1836), chief Persian interpreter to the Commander-in-Chief of India, who assembled an important collection of books and manuscripts, including a copy of the Shahnameh said to have belonged to the Kings of Oudh, which formed the basis for Macan’s published edition, and was purchased by Lindsay in 1854.73 Even Orientalists firmly situated within British universities engaged with colonialism, such as Edward Granville Browne (1862–1926), Professor of Arabic at Cambridge, who trained officers of the Egyptian and Sudanese civil service and the diplomatic

---

72 Anderson, p. 184.


During the nineteenth century there arose a cohort of collectors like Lindsay, whose interest in Oriental manuscripts was neither inspired by first-hand experiences of the East, nor motivated by the imperatives of their official positions as functionaries of the EIC or the British Government. In 1866 Lindsay purchased the manuscripts of two stay-at-home Orientalists, Nathaniel Bland (1803–65) and Duncan Forbes (1798–1868). Bland was a gentleman-scholar of Persian literature, who served on the council of the Royal Asiatic Society and published several articles in the Society’s \textit{Journal}.\footnote{Henry Beveridge, ‘Bland, Nathaniel (1803–1865)’, rev. Parvin Loloi, \textit{ODNB} (2004), online edn, September 2011 <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/2613> [accessed 27 July 2015]. The Bland collection comprised 204 Arabic, 12 Hindustani, 1 Parsi, 2 Pashto, 366 Persian, 2 Sanskrit and 69 Turkish manuscripts, as well as 5 Chinese and 9 Japanese books, and an unknown number of Chinese drawings; information kindly supplied by my colleague Elizabeth Gow. I am grateful to John Morris of Leatherhead for sharing with me his unpublished biography of Nathaniel Bland.} Bland appears to have begun collecting manuscripts in the 1820s, buying extensively from the booksellers John Cochrane, Howell & Stewart, and William Straker, who all specialized in Oriental books and manuscripts. He also made substantial purchases at the sales of the earl of Guilford (1835), Turner Macan (1838), Rebekah Bliss (1842), and Silvestre de Sacy (1842).\footnote{On Bliss, see Davies, ‘Rebekah Bliss’; the sale is mentioned on p. 55.} By 1838 his expenditure on manuscripts had amounted to over £600.\footnote{Bland summarized his purchases of manuscripts up to 1838 on a small sheet headed ‘MSS’, now bound into a volume of his papers, memoranda and notes on Oriental literature and superstitions. British Library, Add MS 30378, fol. 199.} Quaritch described him as ‘a first
class Arabic and Persian scholar, who bought MSS. 20 and 30 years ago almost at any price, he was then very rich.’ Unfortunately Bland lost his entire fortune to gambling and shot himself at Bad Homburg in August 1865. The following June Quaritch sold his manuscript collection to Lindsay in two instalments of £450 and £400.78

Bland’s friend Duncan Forbes epitomizes the gradual academicization of Orientalism in England during the nineteenth century. After a residency at the Calcutta Academy in 1823–26, curtailed by ill health, he spent the remainder of his career in London; from 1837 he held the chair of Oriental languages at King’s College, despite a lacklustre scholarly reputation. Lindsay purchased fifty-six Forbes manuscripts from William H. Allen & Co., publishers to the India Office, paying a total of £362 2s.79 Quaritch remarked: ‘In former years Dr. Forbes used to scoure [sic] the London market, but he would rarely buy anything but low priced articles.’80 This was a scholar’s working library, enlivened by a few choice literary texts.

From ‘field’ and scholarly Orientalists, I turn to the third group of collectors. It was not unusual for elite manuscript collectors and bibliophiles to possess a handful of exemplary Oriental items, alongside their Western illuminated codices and printed books, which provided a veneer of Oriental exoticism. They especially favoured richly decorated Persian and Sanskrit manuscripts and calligraphic Qur’āns, which were selected according to similar aesthetic criteria as illuminated Western codices, reinforcing the perennial association of the East with luxuriance and excess. Like exotic flowers uprooted by plant-hunters and classified along ‘scientific’ principles, the manuscripts’ specific cultural and religious contexts were elided in a process of

78 Letters from Quaritch to Lindsay, 6 and 25 June 1866; CLL, Jan–July 1866, fols 214, 239.


80 Letter from Quaritch to Lindsay, 28 August 1866; CLL, Aug–Dec 1866, fol. 299.
assimilation into European artistic and literary canons, while they simultaneously retained a generalized ‘otherness’, and were often appended to, rather than fully integrated with, collections. Bhabha’s famous conceit, ‘Almost the same, but not white’, originally applied to colonial mimicry, is equally pertinent to the ambivalence of Oriental manuscripts when transposed to the connoisseurial context of elite libraries.81 Thus Henry Huth owned fine copies of the Bhagavadgītā and Shahnameh, an Ethiopic Prayerbook, and an Armenian Evangelia.82 Frank McClean’s collection of two hundred manuscripts, bequeathed to the Fitzwilliam Museum, included ten Arabic and Persian manuscripts and single examples of Ethiopic, Armenian and Pali.83 Similarly, the seventy-one manuscripts recorded in the catalogue of William Tyssen-Amherst’s library were overwhelmingly European; the nine Oriental manuscripts – a complete Qur’ān and portions of three others, two Persian codices including a collection of Ferdowski’s poetry, and three Arabic manuscripts – were relegated to the final section of the catalogue.84 At the apex of collecting, the cabinet of Baron Edmond de Rothschild (1845‒1934) epitomized the taste for superlative examples of the art of illumination within the Judaeo-Christian traditions; the few Oriental manuscripts he possessed, including the incomparable Shah Tahmasp or ‘Houghton’ Shahnameh, half of the famous Akbar-Nameh, and three albums of Indian and Persian miniatures, conformed to the dominant aesthetic of Western connoisseurship.85

An interesting comparator to Lindsay and Ludovic, one who stands apart from the previously discussed categories of collector, was the Sheffield industrialist William Bragge. While susceptible to the allure of illuminated medieval manuscripts, Bragge also acquired a wide range of material from across the world, with some thirty languages represented in his collection. In addition to manuscripts in Arabic,

81 Bhabha, p. 128. Fulford.
82 Huth and Ellis, pp. 140, 518, 1181‒2, 1449.
84 de Ricci, Hand-List.
85 de Hamel, Rothschilds, pp. 28, 53‒9.
Persian and the other principal languages of the Middle East and South Asia, Bragge owned material on palm-leaf and bamboo from South-East Asia; Mexican, Ethiopic and Tibetan manuscripts; and volumes of Chinese and Japanese drawings. The collection thus reflected Bragge’s own cosmopolitan life, the growth of industrial and commercial networks across continents, and the globalization of the manuscript market in this period. When the manuscripts were sold in 1876, one-quarter of the five hundred or so lots comprised Oriental material.86

The Bragge collection closely parallels the manuscript portion of the Bibliotheca Lindesiana in the broad range of cultures, languages and writing formats represented, albeit on a much smaller scale. Like Lindsay, Bragge was a major patron of Quaritch, who discerned similarities between his two customers, as he explained to Lindsay in 1864: ‘I thought to find in a man of such a calling, a most refined taste and most enthusiastic feeling for what ever is curious and beautiful in Manuscript Literature, was a curious fact, worth mentioning to your Lordship, especially as Mr Bragge’s principle of collecting MSS. is the same as your Lordship’s.’87 However, the correspondences should not be overplayed. Bragge’s motives for collecting Oriental manuscripts are difficult to penetrate, but he may be characterized as a serial collector: alongside manuscripts he collected editions of Cervantes, pipes and smoking paraphernalia, books on tobacco, and precious gems. He appears to have collected Oriental manuscripts as curiosities, in the Wunderkammer tradition, or as personal souvenirs, more akin to Ludovic’s interest in exotic material purely for its eclecticism, in contrast to Lindsay’s more rigorous intellectual approach. There is also no evidence that Bragge’s manuscripts were catalogued before their sale in 1876, and they were rarely consulted by scholars.88

Thus the earls of Crawford were quite unlike other nineteenth-century collectors of Oriental manuscripts, both in the scale of their acquisitions, and in the broad

86 Sotheby.

87 Letter from Quaritch to Lindsay, 12 April 1864; CLL, Jan–May 1864, fol. 157.

88 I have identified only one academic paper citing manuscripts while they were in Bragge’s ownership: Augustus W. Franks, ‘On Two Manuscript Psalters in the Collection of William Bragge, Esq. F.S.A.’, Archaeologia, 46.1 (1880), 241–8.
geographic and cultural horizons of their collecting. They differentiated themselves from elite or ‘cabinet’ collectors by not restricting their Orientalia to a small number of superlative specimens. Neither did they confine their collecting to material from a particular region or culture, whereas most academic and ‘Company’ Orientalists tended to acquire manuscripts from the countries where they were stationed or where their academic interests lay. And notwithstanding the analogies between Bragge and the earls of Crawford – in terms of the mechanisms by which they assembled their collections and the range of material represented in them – they were separated not merely by social class but also by the scale and (at least in Lindsay’s case) the intellectual underpinnings of the Bibliotheca Lindesiana. The earls of Crawford were indeed exceptional in the scope and ambition of their collecting of Oriental manuscripts.

4.6 Border Crossings: The Earls of Crawford and their Engagement with Orientalist Discourses

Some of the ways in which the earls of Crawford engaged with Orientalist discourses have already been discussed: the mechanisms by which they acquired manuscripts, their interactions with scholars and experts in the ongoing project to impose intellectual control over the collections, and their endeavours to make the Oriental material available to researchers. It is now appropriate to explore these modes of engagement in greater detail, before I consider whether and to what extent the Oriental collections of the Bibliotheca Lindesiana themselves contributed to and advanced wider Orientalist discourses.

Many British collections of Oriental manuscripts were directly implicated in militant imperialism, as I have already observed. For example, after the fall of Seringapatam several thousand volumes were transferred from Tipu Sultan’s library to Fort William College, where they were catalogued by Charles Stewart; some were later transferred to England and ultimately resided in the British Museum and the universities of Oxford and Cambridge, thus corroborating the mutually reinforcing associations between academic Orientalism and active imperialism.89 In the preface to his catalogue Stewart recorded that very few of the books had been purchased by

---

89 Bayly, p. 150.
Tipu Sultan or his father: instead they had been plundered from the libraries of other Indian states.⁹⁰ No doubt this helped assuage British consciences, but it also warns against simplistic, reductive readings of manuscript collecting as the unequivocal manifestation of a brutal imperialism imposed upon innocent indigenes. Rather, one should acknowledge the nuanced, contingent positions of both rulers and ruled within imperialism. It must also be remembered that spoliation was a characteristic of European wars too: colonial forces simply exported practices honed on native soil.⁹¹

Although Lindsay was not directly engaged in imperialism (unlike his grandfather, Alexander Lindsay, who as governor of Jamaica in the 1790s had viciously suppressed a Maroon rebellion, or his great uncle Robert, who grew rich from private trading ventures while serving with the EIC), his collecting practices certainly benefited indirectly from aggressive colonialism. In the Library Report he openly declares that he sought to form the Bibliotheca Lindesiana by ‘bringing the spoils of many a distant land, through the compulsion of peace, towards its subsequent edification’.⁹² While the oxymoronic ‘compulsion of peace’ encapsulates the contradictions at the heart of imperialism, Lindsay states explicitly that the development of the library was predicated upon the simultaneous expansion of Britain’s empire, and it is certainly the case that a large number of his manuscripts derived, albeit indirectly, from military exploits around the world. In 1862, for example, Quaritch informed Lindsay that he had recently acquired an exceptional copy of the Guru Granth Sahib, the sacred book of Sikhism, said to have been ‘wrested out of the hands of a Sikh Priest at the battle of Guzerat by an Officer of


⁹¹ On the effects of Napoleon’s campaigns upon the book trade, see Jensen, pp. 32–67.

the 52nd Bengal Native Infantry’. Overlooking such doubtful provenance, Lindsay told Quaritch that he would ‘be glad to keep the Sikh MS, which is of great curiosity & value’.93

In 1868 Lindsay acquired two collections of manuscripts that were closely associated with recent colonial campaigns. In July he paid £400 for 717 Arabic, Persian and Turkish manuscripts and sixty-four printed books offered by the executors of Colonel George William Hamilton (1807–68), who had served with the EIC as a regimental interpreter in central and northern India. Hamilton exemplified the Company soldier-scholar: he ‘always paid great attention to the native languages, not merely the vernaculars, but also to the Arabic and Persian, and gradually collected a good oriental library’, while during the 1857 Rebellion, ‘he marvellously held his ground and kept the soldiery from breaking out into violence.’94 Both Quaritch and Charles Rieu of the British Museum advised that Hamilton’s manuscripts had been looted, the former claiming that ‘although the MSS. as a general rule are not of any antiquity, they were for the most part transcribed for the Kings & Nabobs of Oude, being in fact plunder from the libraries of Lucknow – which is some warrant for their correctness.’ Quaritch thus inverted the customary ethics of connoisseurship, arguing that their illicit provenance, far from detracting from their desirability, actually substantiated their significance.95

93 Printed catalogue slip, presumed to be from Bernard Quaritch, pasted into the unpublished ‘Handlist of Hindustani, Marathi & Panjabi MSS’ in the Bibliotheca Lindesiana, now at the John Rylands Library. Letter from Lindsay to Quaritch, n.d.; CLL, 1862, fol. 144. Dating from the late seventeenth century, the manuscript (now Rylands Punjabi MS 5) is one of the earliest surviving Granths and an object of deep reverence by Sikhs.


While Lindsay was negotiating the purchase of the Hamilton manuscripts – fruits of imperialism in India – Quaritch was securing for him a collection of Ethiopic manuscripts, booty from the Anglo-Indian expedition to Abyssinia. Less than three months after the sacking of Magdala, Quaritch informed Lindsay that he had just bought a ‘very curious’ collection of seven Ethiopic manuscripts from the infamous Magdala hoard, of which some 350 manuscripts were presented to the British Museum:

Though it was stated that all the Manuscripts looted at Magdala had been given up to Mr [Richard] Holmes for the British Museum, it appears that Mr [Hormuzd] Rassam contrived to have some private loot or private purchase at one of the Churches at Magdala, which acquisition, he not being a soldier, was not surrendered. Captain [Howard] Coghlan [...] bought these MSS. from Mr Rassam at Magdala and brought them to London. Captain Coghlan landed only yesterday, to-day they were offered to me for £150, but I bought them at a price to be able to sell them to your Lordship at £100.96

Both Quaritch and Lindsay admitted some scruples over the circumstances of the manuscripts’ removal from Magdala, the latter commenting: ‘Lord L. cannot but lament, with Mr Quaritch, that the fate of war should thus deprive the poor people of what is not only their scanty literature but the material means of carrying on their religious worship. Still Magdala and its neighbourhood is but a fragment so to speak of Abyssinia.’97 This accepting attitude accords with Lindsay’s views on the comparative development of different races and civilizations, as expressed in Progression by Antagonism, and with prevailing notions of Western supremacy, which were propagated through scientific, racial and imperialist discourses and by Christian doctrine.98


97 Letter from Lindsay to Quaritch, 21 July 1868; CLL, June–Dec 1868, fol. 339.

98 Leerssen notes Carlyle’s similarly unsentimental acceptance of the extermination of
In both cases, the Hamilton library and the Ethiopic manuscripts, it is significant that the British Museum had already obtained material from the same sources. The Museum’s official acquisition procedures not only validated the importance of the manuscripts, but also legitimated them and absolved the doubtful circumstances through which they were obtained, thereby justifying and sublimating the collector’s private purchases.

The implication of manuscripts in colonial conflicts persisted throughout the nineteenth century and beyond. In May 1898 Edmond reported that he had received on approval two Javanese manuscripts taken from the Rajah’s palace at the capture of Cakranegara, during the Dutch military intervention in Lombok four years earlier. Ludovic expressed no compunction in accepting them. However, not all Javanese manuscripts were procured forcibly: many local owners were happy to sell their manuscripts to Western collectors and their agents, while Behrend notes that in the early twentieth century manuscripts were produced specifically to satisfy the demand from Dutch scholars.

Examples such as this of indigenous ‘talking back’ are reminders that local agency was a significant – if largely occluded – factor in the formation of the library. Only rarely did the earls deal directly with indigenes, such as when Ludovic purchased papyri from dealers in Cairo. Nevertheless, many of their suppliers (fellow native Americans. Leerssen, 66–7.

99 Letter from Edmond to Ludovic, 16 May 1898; CLL, May–June 1898, fol. 236. One of the items is now Rylands Kawi MS 2; the other has not been identified. The Dutch removed 425 lontar manuscripts from Cakranegara in 1894: Elizabeth B. Fitzpatrick, ‘The Public Library as Instrument of Colonialism: The Case of the Netherlands East Indies’, Libraries & the Cultural Record, 43.3 (2008), 270–85 (p. 276).


collectors, booksellers and agents ‘in the field’) did treat with local informants, owners and vendors who, except in the extreme case of plunder, were to varying degrees able to influence the quality, quantity and prices of manuscripts that came onto the market. Collectors such as Ludovic complained both that the best material was withheld from them and that they were obliged to pay excessive amounts for second-rate manuscripts. Thus subaltern voices insinuated themselves into elite collections such as the Bibliotheca Lindesiana.\textsuperscript{102}

Even when the earls of Crawford were not directly implicated in aggressive imperialism, they benefited from the traffic of Oriental manuscripts that developed in the wake of colonial adventures. Ballantyne’s model of the British empire as a web is a more faithful representation of the shifting interdependences of colonialism than the traditional centre-and-periphery model, but there is no doubt that London was the focus of international trade in manuscripts, which were a commodity of empire alongside staples such as tea, sugar and cotton.\textsuperscript{103} Quaritch functioned as an entrepôt for books and manuscripts arriving in Britain from all over the world, although other booksellers also dealt in Orientalia, such as Charles John Stewart, from whom Lindsay purchased a collection of twenty-two Samaritan manuscripts for £450 in July 1872.\textsuperscript{104} Lindsay also acquired a large number of manuscripts on the Continent, where there was a longer tradition of collecting and studying such material, thanks to three hundred years of Dutch engagement in the East Indies and the concomitant expertise accumulated at the University of Leiden, whose pre-eminence in Orientalist studies was eventually supplanted by Paris during the first half of the nineteenth century.\textsuperscript{105}

\textsuperscript{102} On local agency, see Dirks. I am grateful to Dr Anindita Ghosh for this reference.

\textsuperscript{103} Ballantyne, p. 15.

\textsuperscript{104} Letter from Lindsay to Min, 22 May 1872; CPP, 94/21. Quoted in Barker, BL, p. 248.

Millies sales all furnished Lindsay with significant numbers of important manuscripts.

The earls of Crawford engaged with Orientalist discourses in other contexts. They collaborated with scholars and experts in their endeavours to impose intellectual control over the collections, and to make them more accessible to researchers and more widely known. The slow development of Orientalist disciplines within British universities, in comparison with their continental counterparts, is apparent in the continual difficulties that Quaritch and the earls experienced in finding suitable experts in Britain to catalogue the collections; instead they regularly turned to European scholars for assistance. Thus in 1870 Quaritch confessed that he knew of no-one who could catalogue Siamese manuscripts, while twenty-two years later Reinhold Rost of the India Office Library lamented that Edward Cowell in Cambridge was the only person in Britain competent to catalogue Zend and Sanskrit manuscripts. ‘But I doubt whether he would undertake this matter. In that event I would recommend Professor Geldner, of Berlin.’

The scholars and experts who were employed to catalogue the Oriental collections were an eclectic group. They included Sukias Baronian, Armenian minister in Manchester (Armenian); Sir Ernest Wallis Budge of the British Museum (Coptic); Frederick Cornwallis Conybeare of Oxford (Armenian); (Sir) Arthur Cowley of Oxford (Samaritan); Prof. Karl Friedrich Geldner of Berlin (Parsi); Abraham Löwy, minister at the West London Synagogue (Samaritan and Hebrew); Prof. George Karel Niemann of Delft (Batak); Léon Pagès of Paris (Japanese); Rev. John Medows Rodwell (Coptic); Dr Reinhold Rost of the India Office Library and St Augustine’s Missionary College, Canterbury (Punjabi); Prof. Albert Cornelis Vreede and Cornelis Marinus Pleyte of Leiden (South-East Asian manuscripts); Dr Edward William...


106 Schwab, p. 43, argues that ‘the Oriental Renaissance – though not Indic studies themselves – had only an ephemeral career in [...] England.’

107 Letter from Quaritch to Lindsay, 4 August 1870; CLL, 1870, fol. 227. Letter from Rost to Edmond, 6 January 1892; CLL, Jan–June 1892, fol. 15.
West, independent scholar (Parsi); and John Williams, Assistant Secretary of the Royal Astronomical Society (Chinese). The development of the papyrological collections brought other scholars within the ambit of the library: Walter Ewing Crum, Francis Llewellyn Griffith, Bernard Grenfell, Arthur Hunt, and Prof. Josef Karabaček in Vienna. In addition, Quaritch’s ‘mercurial, multilingual, and polymath’ assistant, Michael Kerney, catalogued the Arabic, Persian and Turkish manuscripts; he was an accomplished, self-taught linguist, who did much of the work in his spare time.108

The diversity of these experts – some situated within the academy, others located within the cognate fields of museums and libraries, and yet others independent researchers and those whose cultural and linguistic backgrounds were their principal qualification – demonstrates the contingent, transitional status of Orientalism in the second half of the nineteenth century: the exterior boundaries and internal structures of the discipline were as yet poorly defined; there remained significant intersections with theological and classical studies; and distinctions between amateur and professional were faintly drawn.

There was a strong element of self-interest in these experts’ engagement with the library: they were eager to study and describe the largely unexplored Crawford manuscripts because of the opportunities they afforded to make significant discoveries. The earls of Crawford were indeed munificent in permitting scholarly access to the collections, not only at Haigh Hall, but also by lending material out for sustained periods of study. For example, in September 1887 John Gwynn of Trinity College Dublin enquired through an intermediary if he might borrow Syriac MS 2, a New Testament, which was already on loan to Rev. George H. Gwilliam in Oxford. Permission was duly granted. When Edmond enquired in December 1892 whether Gwynn had finished with the manuscript, the latter explained that he had returned it to Gwilliam over a year earlier. Gwynn also provided a full report on the volume, claiming that it was ‘the only complete Syriac MS. New Testament ever brought

108 The epithets ‘mercurial, multilingual, and polymath’ come from Freeman.
from the East into a European Library’. After further prompting, Gwilliam eventually returned the manuscript in September 1893.109

The degree of academic engagement with the Bibliotheca Lindesiana is demonstrated by the adverse reaction to the sale of the manuscripts to Enriqueta Rylands in 1901. Far from welcoming their ultimate deposition in a public institution, scholars protested that their ready access to material had been abruptly curtailed. Browne was greatly inconvenienced by the recall of Persian MS 308, which he had been studying since 1898 for his edition of the Lubábu 'l-Albab. He told Edmond: ‘Lord Crawford has been so generous and yourself so kind in letting me have the MS. for so long that it would be most ungracious of me to complain of its recall, though I will admit that it is a disappointment, as I had been making it the pièce de résistance of my work.’110 Not content with private expressions of regret, Browne publicly criticized Enriqueta’s policy of limiting access: ‘I must still regard the passing of these MSS. out of the hands of their former most generous owner as one of the greatest calamities which have befallen Oriental students in recent times.’111 The theme was taken up by Reynold Alleyne Nicholson in his published review of Browne’s edition: ‘These MSS., we are glad to learn, have recently been made accessible, but until the wise and liberal policy of Lord Crawford is adopted, their transfer to the place mentioned must be regarded by Oriental students as a great calamity.’112 Such sentiments complicate any supposed public-private dichotomy of nineteenth-century libraries: a private library such as the Bibliotheca


110 Letter from Browne to Edmond, 3 August 1901; CLL, Aug–Sep 1901, fols 870–1.


Lindesiana could be more accessible, at least to eminent scholars and gentlemen, than a rule-bound ‘public’ library such as Enriqueta Rylands’s foundation.

These forms of engagement with academic Orientalists were obviously circumscribed and specific, and there is no evidence that the earls of Crawford considered themselves members of an Orientalist community, however loosely defined.113 Neither Lindsay nor Ludovic engaged with the formal structures of Orientalism, which organized, disseminated and legitimated Orientalist discourses: they were members of neither the Royal Asiatic Society nor the Royal Geographical Society, for example. They were peripheral figures in the development of academic Orientalism in Britain. While they were generous in loaning material to scholars, the physical isolation of the collections in Wigan, remote from the principal loci of scholarship, and the lack of detailed catalogues inhibited their exploitation for research. When Bal complained in 1898 that the library’s Oriental department was little used, Edmond pointed out that he was sending a copy of the newly-published Hand-List of Oriental Manuscripts to Edward Browne in Cambridge, adding: ‘As the library gets better known the Oriental books will be more asked for.’114 However, this unsatisfactory situation persisted long after the transfer of the collections to Enriqueta Rylands; throughout the twentieth century they continue to be underutilized in comparison with analogous collections in the established centres of academic Orientalism in Britain and mainland Europe.

4.7 Conclusion

Lindsay was motivated to collect Oriental books and manuscripts by his desire to fashion a panoptical library, encompassing all major civilizations of the post-Noachian diaspora, in order to facilitate his and others’ researches into ethnology, comparative religion, linguistics and numerous other fields. His attitudes towards issues of race, imperialism and the East are complex and ambivalent, mirroring wider trends and debates in the middle decades of the nineteenth century. He was

113 Ludovic wrote: ‘It is right that I should here state why it is that so large a number of MSS. in strange tongues should be found upon the shelves of a private library, the owner of which is not in any way an Orientalist’ (my emphasis). Lindsay, Oriental Manuscripts, p. viii.

114 Letter from Edmond to Bal, 1 March 1898; CLL, March–April 1898, fol. 342.
prepared to deploy teleological arguments in support of British imperialism and overlooked acts of colonial violence by which manuscripts were wrested from their indigenous contexts. On the other hand, his possession of Oriental materials evidenced – and may have encouraged – an unusually enlightened attitude towards non-European cultures and their achievements, akin to Sir William Jones’s earlier quest for a sympathetic understanding of Indian civilizations. Lindsay’s racial theories synthesized earlier monogenist and philological – broadly liberal – approaches with a Hegelian dialectic and blatant nationalism, to argue for the superiority of the Aryan races, which he believed had reached their apogee in Victorian Britain. Yet he did so with that ‘delicate manner [...] wherewith anything can be said or done by a gentleman’. Unlike contemporary scientific racists, he acknowledged kinship, however distant, with ‘inferior’ races.

Indeed, Lindsay’s interest in racial classification connected to his concern with social distinction and class, and in particular his advocacy for the continued relevance of the aristocracy; he believed that social distinctions within nations were intrinsically connected to wider racial classifications, while his aristocratic upbringing and sense of social obligation inculcated paternalistic benevolence towards other races. These overlapping concerns reflect wider associations between imperialism and the self-fashioning of Britain’s social elite (a theme I explore in the following chapter), as Mark Girouard argues: ‘[t]he sources of imperialism and the sources of the Victorian code of the gentleman are so intertwined that it is not surprising to find this code affecting the way in which the Empire was run. [...] The philosophy of imperialism was essentially élitist.’

Ludovic developed the Oriental collections in new areas, although his motivations are more opaque, partly because his enthusiasms for papyri and South-East Asian manuscripts were short-lived, but also because he effectively withdrew from direct engagement with the library after the appointment of a professional librarian, as I discussed in Chapter 2. He seems to have treated manuscripts as ‘souvenirs of the exotic’, rather than as research resources. In any case, by the turn of the century
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115 LR, Epilogue, p. 17.

116 Girouard, Camelot, p. 224.
Orientalist disciplines were coalescing within universities, learned societies and museums, a process that would increasingly marginalize amateur Orientalist scholars and collectors, notwithstanding the complaints provoked by the sale of the manuscripts to Enriqueta Rylands.

While Said’s thesis has informed my discussion of the earls’ engagements with Orientalism, subsequent postcolonial studies have uncovered a more complex, contingent position: a matrix of loosely related Orientalist discourses, intersecting with the cognate disciplines of theology and classics, and enjoying a far from straightforward relationship with muscular imperialism. This more nuanced approach permits a fuller appreciation of the complex and sometimes contradictory relationships between the earls of Crawford and wider Orientalist discourses. They engaged with Orientalism in various ways: through their acquisition of books and manuscripts, some of which were implicated in aggressive imperialism, while others had been accumulated by academic Orientalists in Britain and Europe; via their employment of experts to catalogue the material; and by opening the collections to academic investigation. Lindsay made modest contributions to Orientalism through his published writings, and he pioneered certain fields of collecting in Britain, such as Japanese books and manuscripts. However, neither he nor his son were intricated in the official structures of Orientalism, which became increasingly formalized and ramified towards the end of the century.

My intention in this chapter has been to investigate the distinctive features of the Oriental collections, the factors, both structural and specific, which impelled their development, and the diverse ways in which they folded into wider issues of race, imperialism and organizations of knowledge. While the Oriental manuscripts dominated their occidental counterparts numerically, the latter performed a crucial function within the library, for which Orientalia were unsuited. I argue in the next chapter that the Western manuscripts helped to reinforce Lindsay’s cultural capital and to consolidate his family’s and the aristocracy’s hegemony within British society. They thus ‘speak to’ a related set of issues around social and cultural distinction and the aristocracy’s fitness to lead a modern global empire.
Fig. 4.1. ‘Descendants of Noah and the Progress of Intellectual Development’, from Lord Lindsay’s *Progression by Antagonism* (London: John Murray, 1846), p. 55.
Copyright The University of Manchester.
Fig. 4.2. Tiger, from the popular almanac *Edo daisetsuyō kaidaigura*, 1864; Japanese 2. From Frederick Dickins’s collection, which Lindsay purchased from Quaritch in 1871. Copyright The University of Manchester.
This manuscript formerly belonged to Nathaniel Bland, whose Oriental manuscript collection Lindsay acquired in 1866. Copyright The University of Manchester.
Fig. 4.4. Fragments of a vellum codex of Homer’s Odyssey, third–fourth century AD, obtained for Ludovic by Bernard Grenfell and Arthur Hunt in 1899; Greek Papyrus 53, fols 81–4. Copyright The University of Manchester.
5 Modern Medici: Constructions of Class and Distinction in the Bibliotheca Lindesiana

5.1 Introduction

In this chapter I shall contend that Lindsay deployed the Bibliotheca Lindesiana, and his medieval and Renaissance manuscripts in particular, both to fashion his own social and cultural identity as a gentleman of refined taste, discrimination and erudition, and to serve as a bulwark against the challenges which he believed were confronting his family and the aristocracy as a whole during a period of unprecedented social change. The Bibliotheca Lindesiana was thus a construction of class, taste and distinction, which positioned Lindsay within centuries-old traditions of elite collecting, exemplified by the Medici family upon whom he overtly modelled himself.

Britain underwent profound social and cultural transformation in the mid-nineteenth century. Rapid industrialization, immigration from Ireland, and internal migration from the countryside into towns created a deracinated urban population, and weakened the traditional bonds between the nobility and client rural communities; London became the capital of a global empire and the largest city in the world.¹ The Oxford Movement, Catholic revival, evangelicalism and the rapid expansion of Nonconformist denominations challenged the Established Church and fractured the religious cohesion of the nation, while scientific naturalism led some to question the fundamental tenets of Christian belief.² An emergent middle class, drawn from the professional, mercantile and manufacturing sectors, assumed


increasing influence over the cultural and political life of Britain, prompting Matthew Arnold, Mark Pattison and other defenders of high culture to rail against its parochialism, narrow-mindedness and evangelical moralizing. Its ascendancy was facilitated by a proliferation of periodical publications directed at a bourgeois readership, and by the development of academic and cultural institutions, many of which promoted a centripetal, metropolitan dominance over provincial cultures.

While the Reform Act of 1832 was in reality a modest, conservative measure, which substantially preserved landed interests, the Second Reform Act of 1867 extended the franchise to the urban (male) proletariat, doubling the electorate and shifting the balance of Parliamentary power decisively in favour of towns and cities.

Although it would be several more decades before the nobility was divested fully of its political, cultural and economic power, the tectonic plates of British society had begun to move inexorably by mid-century, generating intense debate around the role of the aristocracy, and creating anxiety amongst the landed elite and its apologists over the perceived threats to its hegemony and the implications for the nation’s cultural prosperity. Attacks came on several fronts: linguistic, political and cultural. Social mobility was accompanied by volatility of language, and the designator ‘gentleman’ was increasingly contested. Seemingly anyone (or at least


4 Daunton; Levine.


any man – the term was self-evidently gendered) could now be a gentleman, and Samuel Smiles’s *Self-Help* and other best-sellers catered to middle-class aspirations to emulate the manners and tastes of their superiors. While radicals campaigned for constitutional reform and curtailment of the aristocracy’s political powers, Arnold argued that the nobility’s innate conservatism rendered it irrelevant, indeed an impediment, to the cultural development of modern Britain:

> Allowing, therefore, with Mr. Carlyle, the aristocratic class to possess sweetness, culture insists on the necessity of light also, and shows us that aristocracies, being by the very nature of things inaccessible to ideas, unapt to see how the world is going, must be somewhat wanting in light, and must therefore be, at a moment when light is our great requisite, inadequate to our needs.\(^8\)

Lindsay was a resolute champion of the nobility, writing to *The Times* to defend the aristocracy against the salvoes of John Bright, the Manchester free-trade radical.\(^9\) He was also deeply interested in his family’s pedigree and invested enormous energy and money into demonstrating and enhancing his own aristocratic distinction. Exhaustive genealogical researches resulted in *Lives of the Lindsays* (1840) and underpinned his successful claim, on behalf of his father, to the earldom of Crawford in 1848. Not content with securing the premier earldom of Scotland, Lindsay expended almost £12,000 in a vain (ambiguity intended) attempt to prove entitlement to the dukedom of Montrose in 1853.\(^{10}\) It is a plausible hypothesis that,

---

\(^8\) Arnold, p. 90.


\(^{10}\) Alexander William Lindsay, *Lives of the Lindsays; or, A Memoir of the Houses of Crawford and Balcarres*, 4 vols (Wigan: printed by C. S. Simms, 1840). On the peerage cases, see Barker, *BL*, pp. 45–6, 119–22, 140–1. Lord Crawford complained that the Montrose case had cost ‘close upon £12,000’. Letter from Lord Crawford to Lindsay, 20 February 1854; CPP,
having failed to augment his symbolic capital by acquiring an additional title, Lindsay diverted his energies and wealth into the library as an alternative means of reinforcing his family’s cultural capital. There is circumstantial evidence to support this proposition: annual expenditure on the library averaged £331 between 1851 and 1855, but leapt to £1,024 in the years 1856–60. Lindsay exemplified the association between collecting and dynastic ambition.\footnote{Financial data derive from CLR, 1851–60. Collecting and Dynastic Ambition, ed. Susan Bracken, Andrea M. Gáldy and Adriana Turpin (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars, 2009).}

I intend to demonstrate that the Bibliotheca Lindesiana did not merely reflect the social, cultural and political developments outlined above, but was intentionally constructed by Lindsay as a direct response to and bastion against the challenges which he believed were confronting his family and the aristocracy during this period, in particular the twin threats of democracy and the erosion of the aristocracy’s cultural authority.\footnote{On the decline of the aristocracy, see Peter Mandler, The Fall and Rise of the Stately Home (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997); David Cannadine, The Decline and Fall of the British Aristocracy (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990); J. V. Beckett, The Aristocracy in England, 1660–1914 (Oxford: Blackwell, 1986); Gregory D. Phillips, The Diehards: Aristocratic Society and Politics in Edwardian England (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1979); Andrea Geddes Poole, Stewards of the Nation’s Art: Contested Cultural Authority, 1890–1939 (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2010).} In his epic poem Argo, Lindsay portrayed the dangers of democracy in apocalyptic terms: ‘And Red Democracy, repress’d, but coil’d | Ready to spring, and propagating foul | Her venomous offspring to pollute the world.’\footnote{Alexander William Lindsay, Argo: or, The Quest of the Golden Fleece. A Metrical Tale, in Ten Books (London: John Murray, 1876), p. x.} He ardently believed in the continued relevance of the aristocracy: noble families like the Lindsays were ideally positioned to perform a ‘cardinal’ role in reconciling the opposing forces and interests of democracy and autocracy, of new money derived from industry and commerce and older landed interests, of
innovation and continuity. Lindsay’s intention was to build a library that would contain ‘the best that is known and thought in the world’, to quote Arnold’s famous phrase; the library would guide and educate the family in their duties and must therefore be broad-based and catholic. He thus elevated the library to a matter of national importance; it fulfilled a serious moral, political and cultural purpose to an extent perhaps unmatched by any other aristocratic library in Britain.

Through a close reading of the Library Report, this chapter investigates how and why Lindsay invoked the Medici as paradigms of elite collecting and patronage of the arts. Contextualizing this self-modelling within wider Victorian responses to medieval and Renaissance Italy, I contend that the aristocratic Lindsay re-appropriated the Medici from William Roscoe and the merchants of Lancashire who had usurped them for bourgeois civic purposes. I also explore Lindsay’s deeply ambivalent attitude to trade, which was the source of his family’s wealth and thus the basis upon which the library was created (in a conversion of economic to cultural capital), but which threatened to pollute the library at Haigh Hall, both materially and conceptually. Lindsay managed these anxieties, I argue, by displacing them onto the equivocal characters of Cosimo de’ Medici (1389–1464) and his grandson Lorenzo (1449–92).

Other questions that this chapter addresses include: How did the Library Report contribute to Lindsay’s construction of his identity as a gentleman of taste and learning, and how did he intend it to inculcate similar qualities in Ludovic? How was Lindsay’s interest in the Medici and in Renaissance Italy manifested in his collecting of books and manuscripts? How does Lindsay compare with other collectors of Western manuscripts, in terms of their tastes for particular types of manuscript and their degree of identification with the Medici and other Renaissance collectors? Indeed, how distinct was he from other collectors?

14 Lindsay wrote: ‘Such families are the cardines, the hinges of a society like ours in England, and, as such, are peculiarly bound to practise the cardinal virtues.’ LR, Introduction, p. 19.
5.2 ‘Corinthian capital of polished society’: Cultivating the Qualities of a Gentleman

The Library Report was originally addressed to Lindsay’s wife Margaret (‘Min’) and her mother, Anne Lindsay, while his son Ludovic was referred to in the third person. As I argued in Chapter 3, the two women played a significant – and inadequately explored – role in the formation of the library. At some point in the prolonged process of drafting the Report Lindsay decided to address his son directly, for in a number of passages references to Ludovic have been amended from the third person to the second, and in February 1865, while residing at the Villa Caprini in Florence, Lindsay added a 12,000-word introductory letter to his son (see Appendix 1). By then Ludovic was on the threshold of adulthood and beginning to take an intelligent interest in the library. Lindsay may therefore have felt that it was now appropriate and necessary to address his son directly, rather than through his mother and grandmother. These amendments thus constitute a rite of passage for the heir to the library and the earldom, and accord with Alberti’s recommendation that paterfamilias should gradually permit their sons greater autonomy, in order to prepare them ultimately to take full responsibility for the household. As Russell Belk notes, many collectors are preoccupied with the post-mortem fate of their collections and one solution is to cultivate an heir. The future survival and prosperity of the library required Lindsay (now in his fifties) to school his son in its stewardship, just as the aristocratic principle of primogeniture demanded a male heir. These amendments to the Library Report thus represent a diminution of female influence and (re)assertion of male heirdom and hegemony over the library.

---

15 ‘Nobility is a graceful ornament to the civil order. It is the Corinthian capital of polished society.’ Edmund Burke, Reflections on the Revolution in France (London: printed for J. Dodsley, 1790), p. 205.


In addressing his son directly, Lindsay was also following literary precedents. The epistolary framing device was common to several genres, including scientific communications, travel writing and fiction, and indeed had been employed by Lindsay many years earlier in his account of his Middle Eastern travels. In particular, the Report is situated within an enduring tradition of letters of advice from patrician fathers to their sons. Famous examples of epistolary exhortations include Cicero’s *De Officiis*, the classical paradigm for subsequent paternal admonitions, of which Lindsay possessed a ‘singularly beautiful’ copy of the *editio princeps*; Lorenzo de’ Medici’s precepts to his son Giovanni (the future Leo X), upon his appointment as a teenage cardinal in 1492, with which Lindsay was acquainted through Roscoe’s eulogistic *Life of Lorenzo*; and Lord Chesterfield’s posthumously published letters to his son Philip, spanning the years 1737 until the latter’s death in 1768.

The Report functions at several levels simultaneously in guiding and instructing Ludovic. First, and most obviously, Lindsay offers his son explicit advice and exhortation on what constitutes appropriate conduct and good manners in the management of the library, for example in being generous with loans of material to scholars. Secondly, the Report constitutes a blueprint for the continued development of the library, which would contain those texts deemed by Lindsay to

---


19 On *De Officiis*, see Marcia L. Colish, ‘Cicero’s *De Officiis* and Machiavelli’s *Prince*’, *Sixteenth Century Journal*, 9.4 (1978), 81–93, who notes (p. 81) that ‘it played an important formative role in the ethos of the Florentine civil humanists.’


be essential for the edification of his son and other members of the family. Thirdly, although both manners and modesty inhibit Lindsay from setting himself up overtly as a paradigm for Ludovic to follow, it is clear that he wishes his son to emulate his own refined tastes, especially in relation to the library, while acknowledging that Ludovic’s collecting interests may differ from his own.

Clearly, these levels of influence upon Ludovic are imbricated and mutually reinforcing. According to Bourdieu, ‘Taste classifies, and it classifies the classifier. Social subjects, classified by their classifications, distinguish themselves by the distinctions they make.’ The library confirms Lindsay as a gentleman of taste and refinement; it is the outward expression of his discrimination and gentlemanly cultivation of a wide range of interests. As the inheritor of the library, Ludovic will also assume these qualities, or at least that is his father’s aspiration and expectation. The books within it also influence Lindsay’s taste and help to develop his intellect, and he hopes that they will have a similarly beneficial effect upon Ludovic and other members of the family; indeed, he explicitly collects in order to educate present and future generations of the family. Thus a virtuous circle is established wherein taste influences collecting practices, which in turn refine one’s taste, thereby honing the collection, and so forth.

The obvious defect in any such scheme occurs when the collection is no longer the external manifestation and product of the collector’s intellectual abilities and inherent qualities, but becomes a superficial substitute for them, when the extrinsic and the intrinsic diverge (just as Lorenzo’s letter can be read as a cynical manifesto of the ‘art of gesture’, exhorting his son to attend to appearances rather than the cultivation of innate virtues). The Bibliotheca Lindesiana mapped so closely onto Lindsay’s mind, as I demonstrated in Chapter 2, that it was perhaps inevitable that

22 Bourdieu, Distinction, p. xxix.

Ludovic could never match his father’s self-identification with it. He did not possess his father’s panoptical intellect and, contrary to Lindsay’s aspirations, his engagement with the library did not engender much interest in academic pursuits. This may help to account for the seeming eclecticism, verging on incoherence, of his own collecting practices – as I noted in the preceding chapter – and to explain why in acts of bibliographical lobotomy he was prepared to sell large parts of the library. Indeed, at times in the Report Lindsay appears to sense that his son did not share his enthusiasm for the library: he repeatedly apologizes for the Report’s length and for specifying long lists of desiderata, as in this passage, which combines self-deprecation with dense literary allusions to reinforce the message that the library has served to develop his own erudition and civility:

This long list of titles must, I fear, have appeared to you as shadowy and unsatisfactory as the dishes which were placed in succession before the hungry Barmecide, or those which Sancho Panza was allowed to look at only before they were whipped away by order of his physician in Barataria. I am sorry for your disappointment, but it is only by an enumeration such as this that I can fulfil the object of a Report like the present.²⁴

Lindsay considered himself and Ludovic as (merely) trustees of the library for future generations: ‘the Library [...] which in the course of years you will inherit, and will view, I hope, in the light of a trust, to be transmitted, unimpaired, and perhaps in augmented value, to posterity’.²⁵ Such sentiments exemplify the longue durée of the aristocracy’s historical horizons – both prospective and retrospective – as expressed in the widespread contemporary practice of entailing landed estates by means of settlements.²⁶ Lindsay argues that great families leave their mark on history,

²⁴ LR, History, p. 23.
²⁶ When Lindsay was involved in drawing up a family settlement in the early 1850s, he told his father-in-law that ‘my object all along has been to secure the descent of the estates along with the honours, retaining at the same time as free and unfettered a power of sale or exchange as the law will allow under the conditions of an entail.’ Letter from Lindsay to Colonel James Lindsay, 23 October 1851; CPP, 94/14, fols 64–6. On settlements, see J. V.
building upon the successive achievements of previous generations, whereas the lives of common folk (such as the colliers of Wigan) are evanescent: ‘the great families of a nation – those that give it a history – do not rise and fall, generation after generation, like ripples of the sea, leaving no trace behind, but are each (as it were) perennial, rushing ever onward and pervading society like a flowing and Nile-like tide till the source that supplies their fount of being becomes exhausted.’27 His words echo Ruskin’s warning to the businessmen of Manchester in 1857 that advances in art and science are cumulative, founded upon but not superseding the achievements of the past.28 High culture could not be acquired overnight, or even in a lifetime. Likewise, Pearce argues that collections both instantiate and structure time through their gradual accumulation: ‘in order to be honourable and genuine, collections must have been acquired over the years, and piece or group at a time.’29

This expansive historical perspective was fostered in Lindsay’s case by his extensive researches into his family’s history, and by the development of a library which documented cultures spanning millennia. He was conscious both of the place of the Bibliotheca Lindesiana within the two-thousand-year history of great libraries, and of the historical layering observable in libraries such as his, built up over generations: ‘It is often very curious in an ancient family library [...] to observe the successive strata of literature, the deposits of successive generations, by which, through legitimate induction, we are enabled to conclude with accuracy as to the tastes of antiquary, divine, physiologist, or dilettante which successively governed the characters and lives of those who collected it.’30 The library and its associated archive have indeed preserved the traces – and evidence the tastes – of Lindsay and Beckett, ‘The Pattern of Landownership in England and Wales, 1660–1880’, *Economic History Review*, 37.1 (1984), 1–22.


30 LR, Arts and Sciences, p. 6.
other members of the family. However, as my earlier analysis of the Crawford Library Papers has demonstrated, the active agency of the library and the archive, as well as of Lindsay, in narrativizing the family’s history and achievements, should not be overlooked.

The Report contains numerous passages in which Lindsay enjoins his son to observe a gentlemanly, indeed chivalric code of ethics, as here where he exhorts Ludovic to display the same generosity towards scholars as he has shown:

I have in an early page of this Report insisted on the principle of literary Catholicity which has guided me in forming it, as for readers, among the Lindsays and their friends, of many varied tastes and avocations. I would add here that its treasures should, on sufficient cause shewn, and in the case of trustworthy persons, be liberally communicated. I have frequently lent books of great value to strangers known to me for their merits, and I have never had reason to repent the confidence. [...] Of course there is a judgment, a discretion, to be exercised in such matters. Indiscriminate loans of valuable books would be an equal error on the other side of the account. [...] The owner of such treasures, who is likewise in a manner the custodier and trustee of them for posterity, ought to provide for their safety, partly by example, through the reverence with which he personally deals with them, and partly (if necessary) by precept – conveyed in that effective but delicate manner, and with the good-humoured smile, wherewith anything can be said or done by a gentleman.31

Lindsay invokes the gentlemanly qualities of judgment and discretion, and the delicacy and good humour whereby ‘anything can be said or done by a gentleman’. Such innate self-assurance and effortless good manners are clear manifestations of Bourdieusian cultural and social capital:

The emphasis on manners, and through them on mode of acquisition, enables seniority within a class to be made the basis of the hierarchy within the class; it also gives the recognized possessors of the legitimate manner an

31 LR, Epilogue, pp. 16–17.
absolute, arbitrary power to recognize or exclude. Manner, by definition, only exists for others, and the recognized holders of the legitimate manner and of the power to define the value of manners – dress, bearing, pronunciation – have the privilege of indifference to their own manner (so they never have to put on a manner).  

By contrast, the parvenu is trapped in a choice between imitative hyper-identification and an ostentatious assertion of difference. A gentleman is, by definition, someone who does not have to try hard to be a gentleman; he is one by virtue of his family, upbringing, education, social networks, and indeed his library. In fact, the Report was written during the mid-century period when the notion of the ‘gentleman’ evolved from a signifier of social rank to a denominator of moral qualities. It was thus an equivocal concept, subject to misinterpretation and appropriation. Stefan Collini quotes Fitzjames Stephen’s observation on the fluidity of the term in 1862, exactly contemporary with the Library Report: ‘In our own days, though the notion of some degree of rank – such an amount of it, at least, as raises the presumption of a good education – is still attached to the word “gentleman”, moral and social meanings connected with it are constantly assuming greater prominence.’  It was therefore imperative for noblemen like Lindsay to (re)align the aristocracy with the new moral connotations of the word ‘gentleman’, in order to reinforce its traditional application as an indicator of social status, and to prevent the two constructions of the term from bifurcating. The Report, and indeed the formation of the library, can be seen as contributing to this endeavour.

There were numerous instances of gentlemanly conduct in Lindsay’s collecting career; his behaviour towards other collectors was unimpeachable, and he was

---

32 Bourdieu, Distinction, p. 88.

quick to acknowledge others’ courtesies towards him. In Chapter 3 I noted that Lindsay yielded a copy of the Tyndale Pentateuch to Henry Huth in 1857. Likewise, when a copy of De Officiis appeared in the Libri sale of 1862, Quaritch persuaded another collector to refrain from bidding against him. Lindsay wrote to acknowledge Thomas Joyce’s courtesy in leaving the field, while simultaneously warning that his aspiration to collect all the editiones principes was a ‘hopeless task’; he had limited his own ambition to possessing fifteen or sixteen of the more important editions.34 In other words, the arriviste Joyce should heed the warning of the ancient writers that he sought to acquire, follow the example of more measured collectors such as Lindsay, and practise moderation (sophrosyne).35 Lindsay extended these courtesies from fellow collectors to the ‘better sort’ of bookseller, as I demonstrated in Chapter 3, where I also argued that Lindsay was able to preserve his aristocratic decorum by employing Quaritch to participate in the cut-and-thrust of the salerooms.

Lindsay’s views on the didactic function of the library (as well as his immersion in classical literature) are revealed in this reference to art books: ‘The value of these artistic books in forming the taste when young, and in assistance and suggestion to us when in riper years we dream of emulating the ancients in their own immortal spheres, cannot be over-estimated; and therefore, I repeat, our deficiencies in this department ought to be carefully and judiciously supplied.’36 However, a broader statement of the mutually reinforcing influence of taste and book collecting occurs in the introductory letter to Ludovic: ‘I proposed to myself as an object the development of our library into one worthy of our family – not a mere bibliomaniacal congeries of undigested accumulation, but a library of intrinsic

34 Draft letter from Lindsay to Joyce, 28 July 1862; CLL, 1862, fol. 199.

35 Lindsay’s suspicions that Joyce was not entirely ‘sound’ were later confirmed by Quaritch: ‘Mr Joyce has turned out to be a very slippery truth-not-loving gentleman; landing his property in money-lenders hands.’ Private memorandum from Quaritch to Lindsay, 20 October 1863; CLL, July–Dec 1863, fol. 436.

36 LR, Arts and Science, p. 11a.
excellence, to contain the most useful and interesting books, old and new, in all walks of literature.37

Through his careful, controlled collecting, Lindsay differentiated himself from a self-confessed bibliomaniac like Sir Thomas Phillipps, whose passion for parchment broke all bounds of propriety. Phillipps spent between £200,000 and £250,000 during his fifty-year career, amassing sixty thousand manuscripts in his quest to save them from destruction at the hands of gold-beaters and glue-makers. He confessed that, ‘As I advanced, the ardour of the pursuit increased untill at last I became a perfect Vello-maniac (if I may coin a word), and I gave any price that was asked.’38 Phillipps admitted scholars to his manuscript midden, but the vicious feud with his daughter and son-in-law, his ‘damn-your-eyes’ arrogance, intense rivalry with other collectors, contempt for most booksellers and, above all, his all-consuming mania for parchment ensured that, while he may have been a baronet, he was not a gentleman in the modern, virtuous sense. As the illegitimate son of a Manchester calico printer, Phillipps’s gentlemanly credentials were doubly doubtful.39

5.3 Modern Medici: Appropriating Renaissance Paradigms

Italy functioned as a finishing school for several generations of the English upper classes: the Grand Tour enhanced young aristocrats’ cultural capital by exposing them to the achievements of classical antiquity and the Renaissance.40


39 Munby, Portrait, pp. 266–7: ‘his arrogance had a robust, damn-your-eyes quality less unattractive to me than the glacial hauteur of Lord Ashburnham or the dark pride that secretly gnawed at [Frederic] Madden’s vitals.’

40 Viccy Coltman, Fabricating the Antique: Neoclassicism in Britain, 1760–1800 (Chicago:
century artists and writers projected contemporary issues and attitudes onto the Italian Renaissance which, being sufficiently distant from yet offering clear correspondences with Victorian England, constituted a safe proxy for discussing issues of identity, ethics and the individual’s place in society.  

An important aspect of Lindsay’s project to reinforce his social and cultural distinction, I shall contend, was a close engagement with Italy, and with Florence especially, extending over half a century. Lindsay first encountered the city in 1829, following the well-trodden route of the youthful aristocrat’s Grand Tour; he returned in 1839 and 1840, during more extensive explorations of the peninsula in the company of his future parents-in-law, James and Anne Lindsay; and in 1841–42 he spent several weeks intensively studying the city’s art and architecture, in the course of researches for what would become *Sketches of the History of Christian Art* (1847). In later life Lindsay adopted Florence as a second home, renting several grand villas before purchasing the Villa Palmieri (Fig. 5.4) – the putative setting of Boccaccio’s *Decameron* – where he died in 1880. Lindsay was enchanted with Florence: his spirits were rejuvenated, his senses whetted; he was alive to the rich

---


historical and cultural associations of the city and its surroundings. He underwent the transformative experience of many British travellers who, enervated by dark, dismal winters, burdened by business, family and social responsibilities, and constrained by the rigid mores of Victorian society, were revivified by the warmth and sunshine of Italy.43

Lindsay completed his monumental Library Report at the Villa Caprini, next door to Landor’s house, in December 1864.44 There too he added the introductory letter to Ludovic, concluding it with a passage that is central to any consideration of his engagement with Italy, and with Florence and the Medici in particular (p. 338 below). It begins with Lindsay’s ekphrastic description of his idyllic surroundings, inspired by the saturated multisensory experience of gazing out over distant Florence, listening to birdsong mingled with the peal of bells, and imbibing the scent of spring flowers and loquats.45 He then moves into different registers, historical and literary, with references to ancient Thebes and to Gray’s poem ‘Farewell to Fiesole’. The former evokes the familiar trope of the immutability and atemporality of the Italian landscape, famously expressed by Ruskin in Modern Painters – ‘the links are unbroken between the past and the present’46 – while the

43 Pemble, pp. 149–64.


45 This passage bears striking similarities with Lindsay’s description of observing a sunset over Florence from the Villa Palmieri in 1875, in the ‘Proplyæum’ to Argo, pp. xvi–xvii.

allusion to Gray hints at the English appropriation of Florence since the eighteenth century. These references also support Viccy Coltman’s assertion that visitors’ experience of Italy was preconditioned by their classical education and reading; they arrived with well-formed mentalities and expectations, for which they sought confirmation, rather than being susceptible to new impressions. Lindsay was steeped in classicism, thanks to his schooling at Eton, where the curriculum, little changed since the mid-eighteenth century, was dominated by rote learning of Greek and Latin. Classicism had a profound effect on Lindsay’s book collecting – especially in his youth – and on his habitus; on one occasion he even dispelled a headache by composing a Latin ode, which ‘formed itself in his mind without the least exertion of his own’.

Lindsay redirects his gaze northwards, to the Villa Medici, which geographically and figuratively dominates the landscape, and his attention switches to Cosimo and Lorenzo de’ Medici, for whom he declares a life-long admiration. He draws an


47 Sweet, pp. 65–98, has charted the evolution of British interest in Florence during the eighteenth century, from an initial interest in the art and architecture of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, to a more diversified fascination with the city’s republican past, its role in the early revival of the arts, and the relationship between commerce and patronage. See also Hale; Law and Østermark-Johansen; Alison Milbank, _Dante and the Victorians_ (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1998), pp. 58–82.

48 Coltman, p. 30.


50 Letter from Anne Lindsay to her son Robert Lindsay, 16 February 1855; CPP, 94/17, fols 2494–5. Lindsay began collecting classical literature while at Eton: ‘I collected […] as many books (chiefly classical and philological) as sufficed to cover an entire wall of my room at Eton.’ LR, Introduction, p. 9.

51 There is a vast literature on the Medici’s collections and art patronage; see, for example,
audacious parallel between his own family and the Medici: the two dynasties are connected through their shared endeavour to use the wealth they derived from commerce for the creation of libraries, converting economic into cultural capital. Lindsay’s love of Florence is insufficient to explain his admiration and emulation of the city’s most famous family. To understand this more fully, it is necessary to examine the various appropriations of the Medici in late eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Britain, for Lindsay was not alone in drawing parallels with the Renaissance princes: they were enlisted by numerous individuals and groups to reinforce their cultural and social pretensions.52

In 1795 the Liverpool art collector William Roscoe published his popular and influential hagiography, *The Life of Lorenzo de’ Medici*, in which he promoted his subject as a paradigm for the synthesis of mercantile, artistic and political domains. For Roscoe – the son of an innkeeper who became a prosperous attorney, politician, collector and patron of Fuseli – Lorenzo provided a comfortable model upon which to construct his self-image as a man who combined a successful commercial career and considerable personal wealth with public benefaction.53 Arline Wilson asserts

---

*The Medici: Citizens and Masters*, ed. Robert Black and John E. Law, Villa I Tatti Series, 32 (Florence: Villa I Tatti, Harvard University Center for Italian Renaissance Studies, 2015);


53 ‘As a statesman [Lorenzo] was without doubt the most extraordinary person of his or perhaps of any time. Though a private citizen and merchant of Florence, he obtained not only the decided control of that state […] but raised himself to the rank of sole arbiter of Italy, and operated with considerable effect upon the politics of Europe.’ Roscoe, I, vi–vii.
that ‘For Roscoe, Florence and its ruler came to symbolize the apotheosis of the union between commerce and culture.’\(^{54}\) As a modern-day Lorenzo, Roscoe became the most important influence on artistic patronage in Liverpool, the Florentine classical revival under Lorenzo’s patronage paralleling, indeed inspiring, the neoclassicism of Roscoe and his aristocratic sponsors such as Thomas Coke, earl of Leicester.\(^{55}\)

As Manchester eclipsed Liverpool as the archetypal mercantile and industrial city of the mid-nineteenth century, it deftly appropriated its rival’s carefully constructed identification with the city-state of Florence.\(^{56}\) The comparison was not without solid foundations, commercial, political and architectural: Manchester’s wealth was


similarly built upon thriving textile and banking sectors; it was fiercely independent of metropolitan influences; its governance was dominated by the mercantile classes; and its streets were lined with grandiose warehouses modelled on Italian palazzi. Florence also served as a focus for, and reinforcement of, a growing civic cultural consciousness. Mid-century Manchester was determined to shed its reputation as a philistine, muck-and-brass, industrial city, devoid of cultural refinements. The most conspicuous exemplification of this endeavour was the Art Treasures Exhibition of 1857, the largest assemblage of privately-owned art ever attempted in Britain. The exhibition’s official journal asserted a clear correlation between Manchester and Florence, in terms remarkably similar to Lindsay’s rhetoric in the Library Report: ‘Now she steps forward in her aggregate character to emulate the glorious example of Florence of old, under her prince-merchants the De Medici, to display to the world the richest collection of works of fine art the resources of the country afford.’ The exhibition was intended to demonstrate that commerce and culture were complementary, not antagonistic; the Medici served as paradigms for


mercantile patronage of the arts, for the enlightened application of private wealth to the civic good.\(^{60}\)

Thus Lindsay’s appropriation of the Medici is partially explained and justified by the precedents established by Roscoe and the mercantile elites of Liverpool and Manchester, who had adopted the Medici for civic purposes. And yet he skilfully manipulates this analogy for his own ends. Whereas civic leaders emulated the Medici in their commercial enterprises and in their use of private wealth to aggrandize cities through civic architecture and the founding and enriching of cultural institutions, Lindsay suggests that he is the true heir to the Medici, in creating a private library and art collection which are open to others, albeit a select few. He calls for a return to the Renaissance paradigm of the great collector who makes his books, artworks and ‘wonders’ accessible to his patronage-network. Indeed, his ambition (discussed in Chapter 3) was for the library to become a nineteenth-century Platonic Academy, wishing that it ‘should bear an aspect, thoroughly comfortable indeed, but still that of a sanctuary of learning and thought, sacred to the Muses, where men and women may meet in converse on the common ground of graceful cultivation’.\(^{61}\)

Lindsay also implies an additional, temporal connection with the Medici, insofar as his family’s lineage reached back to the era of Cosimo and Lorenzo, and beyond. The Lindsays had entire armies at their command when the Medici were arriviste bankers, but the circumstances of feudal Scotland were unfavourable for the collecting of books: ‘our revenues in actual coin [...] were comparatively small, and would not have availed for the collection of books or pictures, even had the taste for such gear existed in those days in feudal Scotland.’\(^{62}\) Now the collieries of Wigan are providing the means for Lindsay to make good this deficiency, and to build up the

\(^{60}\) Analogies between Manchester and Florence also operated in reverse, with Florence being described as ‘the Italian Manchester of the Middle Ages’: James Montgomery Stuart, The History of Free Trade in Tuscany: With Remarks on its Progress in the Rest of Italy (London: Cassell, Petter and Galpin, 1876), p. 10.

\(^{61}\) LR, Epilogue, p. 15.

\(^{62}\) LR, Introduction, p. 18.
Bibliotheca Lindesiana ‘after the example of the Medici’. Roscoe and the traders of Lancashire could claim no such coeval connection. While Lindsay draws a clear distinction between his ancestors’ unrefined tastes and the family’s more recent cultural sophistication, he also implies that his cultural capital is superior to that of modern financiers and industrialists because of its slow accumulation over centuries. This emphasis on longevity accords with Bourdieu’s claim (echoing Thorstein Veblen) that aristocratic marks of distinction (‘accumulated, crystallized history’), such as titles, stately homes and art collections, simultaneously master time and depend upon a surfeit of it for their acquisition.63

The rightful succession to the Medici was thus a contested space, upon which were displaced the tensions in Victorian society between a predominantly rural, landed aristocracy (albeit, in cases such as the Lindsays, financially underpinned by their commercial ventures), and the new urban, self-made industrial-mercantile elites. The Medici were well positioned to fulfil a mediating role between town and country, ancient and modern, new money and old, since they themselves were ambivalent figures, at the epicentre of Florentine civic and mercantile life, while maintaining magnificent country villas where they performed the role of landed aristocrats.64 Lindsay situated himself geographically and conceptually within the liminal zone of the Medici’s suburban villas, where town and country met. He (and they) could have his cake and eat it: enjoying the classically-inspired *locus amœnus* while the civic amenities and cultural life of Florence were within easy reach; celebrating and espousing aristocratic lineage and values while reaping the profits of commerce.65


64 See, for example, Kent. In the fifteenth century the term *villa* signified not merely the landowner’s residence but the whole estate complex: Amanda Lillie, *Florentine Villas in the Fifteenth Century: An Architectural and Social History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), p. 58.

65 In the Florentine hinterland, ‘Hillside villas were perfectly placed for gazing at distant
Lindsay had an equivocal attitude to trade. He freely acknowledged that the family’s wealth depended upon coal – ‘the growth of trade and commerce has, by a strange recompense, afforded us, through the possession of coalfields in England, the means of doing that which our more powerful ancestors, the contemporaries of Cosimo, could not have compassed’ – and he followed his father’s example in being closely involved in the running of the Wigan Coal & Iron Company. Indeed, the earls of Crawford were not unique as aristocratic entrepreneurs: the dukes of Devonshire and Sutherland, the marquesses of Bute and Londonderry, and the earls of Lonsdale and Fitzwilliam were all heavily implicated in mining and industrial enterprises.

And yet the propinquity of Haigh Hall and the collieries of Wigan brought social and material dangers. Lindsay’s class distinction required a social distancing from the neighbouring working-class communities of Wigan; his father-in-law once warned him to avoid ‘disagreeable intimacy with the Burrough’, when Lindsay vistas, in accordance with the 19th-century taste for a secluded position in the countryside, and ideal for the comforts to which the foreign upper classes were accustomed.’ Grazia Gobbi Sica, *The Florentine Villa: Architecture, History, Society* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2007), p. 98. Lindsay commented: ‘You have no idea what a number of Englishmen have established themselves in the villas around Florence. The two finest, grand old piles half villas, half castles, did belong to Englishmen 3 years ago – but one of them [the Villa Salviati] has just been bought by Mario, the singer. What a degradation! Another Englishman (Mr Leader) has bought 14 farms, with the view of forming a large estate in the neighbourhood.’ Letter from Lindsay to Lord Crawford, 8 March 1856; CPP, 94/18, fol. 2816.

66 LR, Introduction, pp. 18–19.

suggested hosting dinners for the townsfolk.\(^{68}\) Materially (and ironically), the collieries and foundries of Wigan, which helped to fund the library, were also sources of industrial pollution that imperilled it. Lindsay lamented: ‘the abundant and increasing dirt, produced by collieries, iron-works, and factories, and the humidity of the atmosphere for which South Lancashire is remarkable, are very prejudicial to the health of the object of my present solicitude, the books.’\(^{69}\) In a parallel to contemporary discourse over the relocation of the National Gallery’s collections outside London, in response to the perceived threats of air pollution and irruptions of common folk who had no appreciation of fine art, Lindsay contemplated transplanting the library to Dunecht in rural Aberdeenshire, as I discussed earlier (p. 78). He drew up plans for a library wing constructed ‘in the Italico-Lombard style, but with perhaps a more massive character, in remembrance of the old Florentine palaces, the Riccardi, Strozzi, and others’.\(^{70}\) Lindsay’s (unrealized) dream was to immure himself in a library closely modelled upon those of his Renaissance paradigms, the Medici or the Strozzi.

Ultimately, however, Lindsay’s appropriation of the Medici proved deeply problematical. Sismondi and Montalembert had already exposed the Medici as contentious figures, simultaneously patrons of the arts and murderous tyrants.\(^{71}\) Burckhardt and Symonds also equivocated, emphasizing the Medici’s cultural

\(^{68}\) Letter from General James Lindsay to Lord Lindsay, c.20 June 1852; CPP, 94/15, fols 2108–9.

\(^{69}\) LR, Epilogue, p. 15.


achievements while acknowledging their despotic tendencies. If elites regarded democracy with deep suspicion in the 1860s – Burckhardt was as hostile to it as Lindsay – by the end of the century it had become normalized in Britain and national and municipal authorities assumed greater responsibility for the promotion and patronage of culture, displacing individual, private endeavour. The model of cultural benefaction embodied in the Medici was now discredited as elitist. In a self-congratulatory paean to municipal munificence, the Lord Provost of Glasgow proclaimed in 1896: ‘And so it was with the emperors and kings, with the ruling families, the Medicis and other Italian tyrants; their patronage of art and science and their magnificent collections were not for the people, but for their own selfish gratification and for the ostentatious display of their wealth and power.’ It was now time for democratic municipalities to collect ‘for the instruction and the gratification of the people at large’.

---


73 Geddes Poole.

However, it is a testament to the potency of Medicean myth-making in the nineteenth century that Lindsay emulated Cosimo and Lorenzo, despite their equivocalness, while overlooking the arguably closer correspondence between himself and another Florentine family, the Strozzi. Like Lindsay, the Strozzi had a distinguished pedigree: they were one of the oldest patrician families in Florence, larger, richer and more powerful than the Medici at the beginning of the fifteenth century. Palla di Nofri, by far the wealthiest man in Florence in 1427, was a notable patron of the arts and other members of the family are known to have collected manuscripts. However, Palla's financial and political fortunes collapsed when he was exiled by the Medici in 1434, rendering him a questionable role-model for Lindsay; the Strozzi's vicissitudes epitomize the precarious foundations of the mercantile aristocracy in Renaissance Florence. Moreover, as Crabb and Goldthwaite have argued, the Strozzi were primarily concerned to protect l'onore e l'utile (the honour or prestige and profit or advantage) of themselves as individuals and of the family; their artistic patronage was one means to achieve this end. The Medici were similarly motivated (as was Lindsay himself, of course), but they acted on an even grander scale and, through their self-identification with the city, their patronage was elevated to the status of a civic enterprise. They may therefore have appeared to be more appropriate paradigms for Lindsay, who advocated the enlightened application of private wealth for public benefaction, not merely for personal aggrandisement.

In fact, Lindsay’s Medicean analogy was deeply flawed: as arriviste bankers lacking aristocratic pedigree, the Medici were more comparable with the merchants and


77 Crabb, p. 5; Goldthwaite, pp. 69–70.
industrialists of nineteenth-century Britain than with the heir to Scotland’s senior earldom. Furthermore, in his patronage of contemporary artists and writers, Lindsay does not sustain comparison with either the Medici or the Strozzi. Although he had early ambitions to foster a revival of fresco-painting and, like many visitors to Italy in the pre-photographic era, he commissioned copies of frescoes and panel paintings that he encountered on his travels, he did not collect nineteenth-century art or patronize artists, preferring the early Italian masters. It is one of the ironies of nineteenth-century art history that the Pre-Raphaelites, inspired by the early Italian art that Lindsay himself had championed, were largely patronized by middle-class industrialists. However, the comparison with the Medici does have validity when one considers the scale, quality and diversity of his collecting of books, manuscripts and works of art. Lindsay was a modern Medici: he shared their fascination with the literary and material legacy of classical antiquity, as well as with Oriental objects, which demonstrated the cosmopolitan reach of their commercial, political and patronal networks.

How was Lindsay’s interest in the Medici and in Renaissance Italy manifested in his collecting of books and manuscripts? The Library was, unsurprisingly, rich in works of Italian literature, history and genealogy, from the fifteenth century to the mid-nineteenth. These were acquired over many years, both through London dealers such as Molini and Quaritch, and locally during Lindsay’s frequent visits to Italy.

79 Macleod, Art, who argues that such collectors were not typically parvenus (pp. 4–6); Fraser, p. 96.
81 Lindsay spent £611 with Charles Frederick Molini during the 1850s: Crawford Library
During a tour of Italy in 1842, his carriage became a travelling library: ‘there literally is not a corner vacant – there are books above and books below and books everywhere – I cant make out how they accumulate so.’\footnote{Letter from Lindsay to Lady Anne Lindsay, 31 July 1842. Published in Brigstocke, ‘Travel in Italy’, 251.} Over several pages of the Library Report Lindsay enumerates the most important of the Italian works, concluding:

A stranger might be surprised (but you will not be so) at finding so many books of this description in a British library. I have not assembled them together without a motive. Italy has always been to me as a second home, and one of my early dreams was to write a book of travels in which the mediaeval and romantic story recorded in these local annals and attaching to her picturesque towns and noble old castles might have a prominent place, standing out in light and shade and personal distinctness in front of the general background furnished by Muratori and Sismondi. The peculiar and instinctive feeling, as much Celtic as Teutonic, which clothes every ruin in Scotland or on the Rhine with ivy-wreaths of tradition, is not native to Italy – a roofless castle is but a heap of dead stones to the peasant of Tuscany or Naples – he lives in the present, not the past – the great names of the middle ages, Caraffa, Colonna, Orsini, Della Jherardesca, Pepoli, Carrara, are to him empty breath – traditions, in the Northern sense of the word, there are few or none – it is only in these obscure local histories that the passing and recent events are recorded which an appreciative traveller might hang as a votive offering on the hoary and desecrated walls to which he makes his summer pilgrimage.\footnote{LR, History, p. 29.}
This passage is noteworthy as an example of the English infantilization of Italians, who were habitually characterized as ignorant and undeserving of their rich cultural patrimony; it was therefore the responsibility of the English to preserve and interpret it on behalf of Italians and the rest of humanity. In *Sketches of the History of Christian Art*, Lindsay had appealed to the rulers of Italy ‘in behalf of the grand old frescoes which are either perishing unheeded before their eyes, or that lie entombed beneath the whitewash of barbarism, longing for resuscitation, pining for the light of day’. Likewise, Ruskin mourned the destructive modernization of Florence, ‘the wreck of it being now too ghastly and heart-breaking to any human soul that remembers the days of old’.84

Elsewhere in the Report it is clear that the library augments, indeed partially substitutes for, Lindsay’s direct experiences of Italy. For example, his collection of atlases and illustrated topographical books enables him to walk the streets of Rome and Florence in his imagination, as a flâneur of the printed page, just as, like Goethe before him, his actual explorations, his ‘watchful wandering’, of the cities were informed and enriched by the knowledge accreted through years of study in the library: ‘You can take a walk in the bird’s eye views of Rome or Florence in these forgotten volumes (fancy in abstraction supplying the blue sky, sweet breeze, and balmy sunshine) as easily and agreeably as you can in the actual localities.’85

---


These Roman views [by Rossi and Piranese], and the two series by Zocchi representing Florence [...] enable us, in conjunction with the plans given by Zeller and other old topographers, to retrace, as it were, the steps of Time, and transport ourselves into the very Rome and Florence of one hundred and two hundred years ago.86

In a period when Florence and Rome were experiencing rapid architectural and topographical transformation, the library elided all traces of modernity in Lindsay’s imagination.87 Moreover, in his ‘ambulatory contemplation’, Lindsay implicates himself in a literary trope that extended back to the classical period, which associated walking with intellectual and meditative activity, and thus his flânerie, while anticipating the experience of the detached, alienated urban wanderer of the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries, also reinforces his classical cultural credentials.88

Lindsay’s emulation of the Medici manifested itself in a number of printed items which had particular associations with the Florentine family. For example, he possessed a fine copy of Lorenzo’s Poesie Volgari (Venice, 1554).89 He also owned an ‘important series of engravings after the collection of the Medici at Florence, then as now preserved in the Palazzo Pitti, […] a series very seldom indeed to be met with’,

86 LR, History, p. 29.
89 LR, Belles-Lettres, p. 16.
while his desiderata included the *Quaestiones Camaldulenses* of Cristoforo Landino (?1480), the record of the conferences of the Platonic Academy at Carreggi; this was later acquired by Ludovic.\(^90\)

However, when one examines the manuscript portion of the Bibliotheca Lindesianæ, there is little evidence that Lindsay identified with the Medici in his collecting practices. While he employed the Medici as paradigms of elite collecting, he did not aspire to collect manuscripts directly associated with them, and indeed refrained from doing so when the opportunity arose. For example, he bought several manuscripts at the Tite sale in 1874, but ignored a luxurious psalter and hymnal commissioned by a member of the Medici family, which went to Quaritch.\(^91\) In fact, as I previously observed, Lindsay claimed not to be a collector of manuscripts per se and sought only representative examples of Italian Renaissance manuscripts: ‘I have never as yet allowed myself to be tempted by those gorgeous and beautiful European MSS. the purchase of which would have interfered with the steady prosecution of my other plans. We have nothing, in a word, to put in competition with the treasures that Robert Holford has accumulated of this description at Dorchester House.’\(^92\)

In total Lindsay acquired some twenty manuscript codices of Italian provenance, the majority of which date from the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.\(^93\) He eschewed *horae*, gargantuan choirbooks and individual miniatures to which many amateur collectors were attracted, and sought instead representative and

---

\(^90\) LR, Arts and Sciences, pp. 1, 11.


\(^92\) LR, Epilogue, p. 3. Likewise, the catalogue of the Tyssen-Amherst collection claims that the manuscripts ‘were nearly always secured for their contents and rarely, if ever, because of the fact that they were written by hand’. de Ricci, *Hand-List*, p. 61.

\(^93\) Rylands Latin MSS 29–31, 32–37, 41, 49, 55, 65, 74, 76 and 81, and Italian MSS 1 and 2. Latin MS 43 comprises fragments some which may be of Italian origin; the provenance of Latin MSS 44 and 46 is uncertain, but they may have been acquired at the Libri sale in 1859.
superlative examples of Italian art and calligraphy, and textually interesting manuscripts, to complement his outstanding collections of Italian paintings and printed books. He was not remotely interested in accruing luxurious manuscripts as tokens of his wealth and taste. A possible explanation for this will be considered shortly.

One of Lindsay’s first purchases was a splendid copy of the poems of Dante and Petrarch (Fig 5.3). The colophon records that it was written by the scribe Paul for Lorenzo di Carlo Strozzi, who died in 1383. It featured in Guglielmo Libri’s sale of March 1859 but, unlike many of that notorious biblioklept’s books, this one had an unimpeachable provenance. Lindsay decided to bid up to £150 for it, but Quaritch was obliged to go as high as £250 against competition from Thomas Boone.94

In 1866 Lindsay paid Boone £200 for a three-volume manuscript of Nicolas de Lyra’s Bible Commentary, Postilla super Bibliam, written by Ugolino Marini Gibertuzzi of Sarnano and completed in 1402, and later presented by Ludovico Gonzaga to the Franciscan convent in Mantua. It is a superb example of Italian illumination, quite unlike anything else in the Bibliotheca Lindesiana.95 Two years later Boone contacted Lindsay with the astonishing claim that he had what he believed to be ‘the finest Illuminated Book ever offered for sale’, the splendid six-volume Missal of Cardinal Pompeio di Girolamo Colonna, a truly remarkable piece of High Renaissance art. The dealer suggested hopefully that the miniatures might be by Raphael himself, or ‘certainly under the superintendence of this great Master’. Hilary Fraser has shown that in the mid-nineteenth century, ‘Raphael was the undisputed embodiment of the classical achievement of the High Renaissance’, and works were therefore frequently attributed to him on slight evidence.96 Boone forwarded the volumes on inspection, proposing the ‘moderate’ price of £1,500 and

94 Letter from Quaritch to Lindsay, 2 April 1859, letters from Lindsay to Quaritch, 2 and [4] April 1859; CLL, 1859, fols 100–3. Now Rylands Italian MS 1.

95 Letter from Boone to Lindsay, 23 February 1866; CLL, Jan–July 1866, fol. 60. Receipt from Thomas & William Boone to Lindsay, 14 June 1866; CLR, 1863–70, fol. 1216. Now Rylands Latin MSS 29–31.

96 Fraser, p. 44.
claiming that they ‘should be cheap at even double the price now asked’. Lindsay disagreed with the attribution, but he was particularly impressed with the ‘extraordinary beauty’ of the first volume, and asked whether Boone could be induced to part with it separately. Fortunately the bookseller refused to break up the set, and Lindsay finally agreed to buy all six volumes in three instalments of £500.97

Not all of Lindsay’s purchases were splendidly illuminated manuscripts. An example of an undecorated but textually interesting item is a fifteenth-century copy of the *Divina Commedia*, from the library of Seymour Kirkup of Florence, famous for his discovery of the Bargello portrait of Dante in 1840. It was a suitable companion to the magnificent Landino edition of Dante (Florence, 1481), which Lindsay had obtained from Quaritch in 1867.98

97 Correspondence between Lindsay and Boone, 19‒23 June 1868; CLL, June‒Dec 1868, fols 277‒82. Discussed in Barker, *BL*, pp. 225–6. Now Rylands Latin MSS 32‒37. A seventh volume surfaced in London in 1895, but Ludovic refused to pay the £230 Quaritch proposed for it. It was reunited with the other six when the John Rylands Library purchased it at Christie’s in July 2011.

5.4 ‘Comparisons are odorous’: Asserting Distinction in Relation to Other Collectors

When Lindsay’s manuscript-collecting practices are compared with those of the Rothschild family, the differences are striking. Several members of the banking dynasty purchased illuminated manuscripts and books of astonishing luxury and pedigree, including items associated with the Medici and Strozzi families. Salomon de Rothschild, for example, purchased a splendid manuscript of Josephus, illuminated by Attavante for the Medici family; his brother, Edmond James, owned the manuscript of the Strozzi family’s wedding poem, Carmen Nuptiale, also illuminated by Attavante; and Anselm Salomon von Rothschild possessed a prayer book of Leo X. Other members of the extended family owned breath-taking items such as a volume of the Très Belles Heures, and the Belles Heures of the duc de Berry. Christopher de Hamel has noted the close cultural and commercial parallels between the Rothschilds and their Florentine precursors: ‘It must have been natural for Rothschilds to recognise a cultural kinship and to delight in manuscripts commissioned by their professional predecessors. The acquisition of a shelf of luxurious illuminated manuscripts of the high renaissance would have been a logical step for any Rothschild.’ Likewise, the New York financier J. Pierpont Morgan, whose collections of books, works of art and objets de virtu would by the

---

99 In the Library Report, Lindsay favourably compares the theological department of his library with those of Lord Spencer and Thomas Grenville, adding: ‘But comparisons, as Mrs. Malaprop says, “are odorous”, and I will therefore only say that I have been fortunate in bringing down so many fine birds on a moor where the birds are so few, shy, and wild.’ LR, Theology, p. 43a.


101 de Hamel, Rothschilds, p. 5.
turn of the century eclipse those of the earls of Crawford, obtained a number of
manuscripts associated with the Medici.  

The explanation for this contrast between Lindsay’s disregard of Medicean
manuscripts and the Rothschilds’ and Morgan’s attraction to them lies, I propose, in
the degrees of correspondence between the Medici and their respective nineteenth-
century emulators, and in the relative security of the latter’s social positions. The
careers of Morgan and the Rothschilds mapped more closely on to those of the
Medici than did Lindsay’s. Like their Renaissance forebears, they were men of
plebeian origins who rapidly acquired unparalleled wealth from their banking
enterprises. While they did not follow the Medici’s example and become statesmen,
through their loans to governments they were able to exercise a degree of indirect
political influence. Yet their social capital depended almost entirely on their
financial fortunes and it was therefore precarious, subject to the vagaries of the
capitalist system, whereas Lindsay’s was corroborated by his aristocratic lineage.
Moreover, in nineteenth-century Europe where anti-Semitism was endemic, the
Rothschilds were additionally disadvantaged by their ethnicity. As de Hamel puts it,
‘The Rothschilds were one of the most ennobled and most highly connected
families of Europe, but they were nevertheless Jews. No one quite forgot.’ There
was therefore an element of hyper-identification and literality in the Rothschilds’
and Morgan’s imitation of the Medici; they adopted the accoutrements of wealth
and patronage in order to acquire and then consolidate social respectability, using
deluxe books and manuscripts associated with the Medici to buttress their volatile

---

102 Examples now in the Morgan Library include manuscripts of Theophrastus and
Xenophon from the Toovey collection (MS M.118 and MS M.244); a copy of Lorenzo’s Rime
(MS M.479); and a miniature depicting Clement VII asperging the congregation (MS

103 de Hamel, *Rothschilds*, p. 65, who attributes an anti-Semitic remark to Lindsay which was
actually a comment by Quaritch on Baron James Rothschild: letter from Quaritch to
Lindsay, 3 February 1875; CLL, 1875, fol. 24.
cultural capital, and constructing proxy family pedigrees through the provenance of their possessions.\footnote{On provenance, see Frederick Baekeland, 'Psychological Aspects of Art Collecting', in Interpreting Objects and Collections, ed. Susan M. Pearce (London: Routledge, 1994), pp. 205–19 (p. 210); Muensterberger, pp. 138–9. Significantly, de Hamel records Ferdinand Rothschild’s advice that one should collect only items whose ‘pedigrees are of unimpeachable authenticity’. de Hamel, Rothschilds, p. 14.}

Lindsay, by contrast, abjured the refined ‘cabinet’ style of collecting perfected by the brewer Henry Perkins and by various members of the Rothschild dynasty, choosing instead to build an extensive, encyclopaedic library. ‘Amateurs again, especially in Paris, and of the generally of the nouveaux- riches class, [sic] have devoted themselves to the formation of small and special collections, cabinets instead of libraries, suitable to their restricted dwelling-places.’\footnote{LR, Introduction, p. 15. On cabinet collecting, see Pearson, pp. 181, 186. Alfred Pollard suggested that Henry Perkins, who was actively collecting in the 1820s, was the first to carry out ‘with conspicuous skill’ the ‘cabinet’ theory of book-collecting. A. W. Pollard, ‘Book-Collecting’, in Encyclopaedia Britannica, ed. Hugh Chisholm, 11th edn (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1910), IV, pp. 221–5 (p. 223); quoted in Carter, p. 19. On Perkins, see H. J. Spencer, ‘Perkins, Henry (bap. 1777, d. 1855)’, ODNB (2004), online edn, January 2008 <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/21969> [accessed 23 February 2015]; Quaritch, p. 222.} Moreover, he regarded the Medici as paradigms of elite patronage and collecting in a broad sense but, exemplifying aristocratic self-assurance and ‘ease’ (sprezzatura), felt no compulsion to associate himself with them directly through the acquisition of manuscripts with a Medicean provenance.\footnote{On ease, see Bourdieu, Distinction, pp. 252–3.} This was despite the pride manifested throughout the Library Report over books with an illustrious provenance – perhaps unconsciously echoing the preoccupation with his own pedigree.

Turning from the highest echelons of manuscript collecting during the nineteenth century to the lower strata, one finds a group of collectors who were associated with commerce and industry, including William Bragge (engineering), Sir Thomas Brooke (textiles), Frank McClean (engineering), Henry Huth (banking), and C. W.
Dyson Perrins (condiments). These were not self-made men – they came from middle-class backgrounds and several attended public schools – but in the precarious world of nineteenth-century industry and commerce they sought to consolidate their respectability and their positions within the ranks of metropolitan and provincial elites, and they treated their collections of books and manuscripts as external manifestations of their hard-won distinction.\(^{107}\) Bragge, for example, the son of a Birmingham jeweller, made a fortune from railway and engineering enterprises in Europe, South America and Egypt, and assembled one of the most diverse and interesting manuscript collections in the nineteenth century. In 1874 he lent eighty-five items to an exhibition of manuscripts at the Burlington Fine Arts Club (over half the total) and thus cemented his position at the heart of the metropolitan art establishment. When two years later he experienced financial difficulties and was compelled to sell his library, Sotheby’s described it as a collection ‘formed by a gentleman of consummate taste and judgement’, without identifying its owner. Notwithstanding the auctioneers’ customary hyperbole, this was a resounding endorsement of Bragge’s cultural capital: the manuscripts confirmed (at least temporarily) his status as a gentleman.

Most of these bourgeois collectors showed a distinct preference for horae and other richly illuminated devotional manuscripts from the late medieval period. In an era of industrial mass production, they may have been attracted to manuscripts – unique, handmade, distinctive objects – in absolute contrast to the standardized goods they manufactured or traded, but they were nevertheless locked into a serial mentality, collecting on an industrial scale.\(^{108}\) For example, Brooke possessed thirteen horae and seven missals; Huth owned twenty-four horae and four psalters;

\(^{107}\) They were generally second- and third-generation bourgeoisie; Brooke attended Cheltenham College, McClean Westminster School and Glasgow University, Perrins Charterhouse and Oxford. This pattern conforms with the analysis of Macleod, *Art*.

the McClean collection included thirty-four horae, fifteen psalters and six breviaries; and Bragge could boast of no less than seventy-one horae and offices, eighteen missals and fourteen psalters. 48% of Bragge’s Western manuscripts dated from the fifteenth century, and 53% of Huth’s, whereas they constituted just 28.5% of Crawford manuscripts.109 This position-taking within the field of book and manuscript collecting is typical of less well-established, less secure participants, who generally play safe and ‘follow the crowd’. In their collecting practices such ‘new men’, especially in their early careers, are more likely to be guided by the parameters of the market and to follow the recommendations of experts such as Quaritch; they are less willing to deviate from consensus positions. This behaviour, wherein ‘avidity combines with anxiety’, accords with Bourdieu’s observation that: ‘the entry of the petite bourgeoisie into the game of distinction is marked, inter alia, by the anxiety of exposing oneself to classification by offering to the taste of others such infallible indices of personal taste as clothes or furniture.’110

Ruskin deprecated such superfluity in art collecting, excoriating the pride and vanity with which industrialists accumulated pictures in order to enhance their ‘gentility’. But he also acknowledged the allure of a well-illuminated missal, or ‘fairy cathedral full of painted windows’. He managed to reconcile these moral and aesthetic judgements, justifying to himself his collecting of manuscripts on the grounds of utility, deploying them as source material for his research and teaching on the political economy and history of art, even breaking them up and framing decorative initials. ‘Missals’, he is said to have written, ‘for use, not for curiosities’.111

109 Data derived from Malcolm Beckwith Parkes, The Medieval Manuscripts of Keble College Oxford: A Descriptive Catalogue with Summary Descriptions of the Greek and Oriental Manuscripts (London: Scolar Press, 1979); Huth and Ellis; James, who notes that the McClean collection also contained a number of earlier manuscripts, from the ninth century onwards; Sotheby, Catalogue of a Magnificent Collection.

110 Bourdieu, Distinction, pp. 321, 50.

The work of Arjun Appadurai affords a fuller understanding of the role that luxury goods such as illuminated manuscripts performed in the nineteenth century. Refining Veblen’s concept of conspicuous consumption, whereby members of the ‘leisure class’ demonstrate their superiority by accumulating hand-crafted luxury objects, Appadurai argues that such goods should not be considered distinct from necessities, ‘but as goods whose principal use is rhetorical and social, goods that are simply incarnated signs. The necessity to which they respond is fundamentally political.’ From this perspective, the collections of Bragge, Huth and other bourgeois should not be dismissed as mere exercises in conspicuous consumption, containing expensive, hand-made objects with minimal utility value. Rather they served as ‘incarnated signs’ of their owners’ wealth and discrimination, and by this measure at least they were just as functional as the library that Lindsay had built upon the principle of utility.

The Bibliotheca Lindesiana was likewise an ‘incarnated sign’ of Lindsay’s wealth and status. After all, he spent over £65,000 on the library in the period 1850–80, purchasing copies of the 42-line (Gutenberg) Bible (costing £595), Mainz Catholicon (£500), First Folio (£525), and the Colonna Missal (£1,500). On the other hand, as a dominant figure in the field of collecting, he exemplifies the connoisseur whose seemingly innate knowledge and taste are actually acquired through a lifetime’s study of and familiarity with cultural objects, and who, knowing the ‘rules’ of collecting, is perfectly comfortable with breaking them and indeed redefining them. According to Bourdieu, ‘Connoisseurship is an “art” which, like the art of thinking or the art of living, cannot be imparted entirely in the form of precepts or


Appadurai, p. 38. See also Veblen, p. 75. Dettmar has applied Veblen’s theory to the late nineteenth-century fetishization of limited-edition books and the formation of affectatious ‘gentlemen’s libraries’, as a response to the greater availability of texts in cheap editions and in public libraries. Dettmar.

Total expenditure on the library was £65,841; CLR, 1850–80.
instruction, and apprenticeship to it presupposes the equivalent of prolonged
contact with the work (or with works of the same class)."114 Lindsay, and Ludovic,
did not need to collect countless horae in order to demonstrate their taste and
distinction. Instead, they adopted an alternative strategy and distinguished
themselves from other (lesser) collectors by deliberately eschewing such material: a
double movement of distinction. Bourdieu argues that excellence ‘consists in being
what one is, with reserve and understatement, urbanely hinting at the immensity of
one’s means by the economy of one’s means, refusing the assertive, attention-
seeking strategies which expose the pretensions of the young pretenders’.115
Lindsay’s purchases of Western manuscripts were, like Ruskin’s, highly selective
and purposeful – representative examples of the finest schools of illumination;
Carolingian and other early manuscripts; and undecorated but textually significant
codices. Ludovic, reacting against his father’s restraint and seeking to imprint his
own identity upon the library, was eclectic in his tastes, fond of jewelled bindings,
and early manuscripts, whether from Visigothic Spain or the Ottonian empire.116
But both men regarded their Western manuscripts as but one component of an
expansive library that encompassed material from across the globe, as I explored in
the previous chapter. It is this ambition that sets them apart from ‘cabinet’-style
collectors, even those of the calibre of the Rothschilds.

114 Bourdieu, Field. On connoisseurship, see Harry Mount, ‘The Monkey with the Magnifying
Glass: Constructions of the Connoisseur in Eighteenth-Century Britain’, Oxford Art Journal,
29.2 (2006), 167–84; David Carrier, ‘In Praise of Connoisseurship’, Journal of Aesthetics and
Art Criticism, 61.2 (2003), 159–69; Sydney J. Freedberg, ‘Some Thoughts on Berenson,
11–26; Carol Gibson-Wood, Studies in the Theory of Connoisseurship from Vasari to Morelli
(New York: Garland, 1988); John Steegman, Consort of Taste, 1830–1870 (London: Sidgwick
and Jackson, 1950).

115 Bourdieu, Field, p. 83.

116 Elsner and Cardinal argue that ‘one’s identity as an individual may depend on the
difference between one’s personal collection and that of one’s parents, or of anyone else.’
Elsner and Cardinal, p. 3.
5.5 Conclusion

Lindsay constructed the Bibliotheca Lindesiana to affirm and enhance his social and cultural distinction, at a time when the hegemony of the landed aristocracy seemed threatened by democracy and by an increasingly powerful bourgeoisie. He also intended the library to educate his son and future generations of Lindsays, not in a narrow, utilitarian sense, but by training their minds and refining their tastes in order to prepare them as gentlemen (and ladies) to assume the heavy responsibilities of their class. Thus the library and the family would serve as bastions of the high culture that Lindsay – like Arnold – believed was imperilled by middle-class philistinism and radical democracy. In this endeavour he overtly, if problematically, modelled himself upon the Medici, as paradigms of elite collecting and the enlightened patronage of culture, reclaiming them from Roscoe and the mercantile elites of Manchester and Liverpool.

However, unlike the Rothschilds and Morgan, whose financial careers mapped closely onto those of the Medici, Lindsay had no need to overidentify with his Renaissance paradigms by collecting manuscripts directly associated with them. Likewise, in a double movement of distinction, Lindsay and Ludovic distanced themselves from bourgeois collectors by eschewing late-medieval *horae* and other private devotional works, demonstrating their true distinction through ‘reserve and understatement’, rather than the ‘attention-seeking strategies’ of their competitors.

Despite his endeavours to construct a library to serve the present and future needs of the Lindsay family, neither his son Ludovic nor his grandson Bal were savants of Lindsay’s calibre. In any case, by the late nineteenth century the gentleman-scholar had largely been displaced by the academy and increasing disciplinarity, as I explored in Chapter 2, and the political influence of the aristocracy was rapidly diminishing. Although Bal held high office before and during the First World War, it would be difficult to argue that the library prepared him for political life. Yet Chapter 3 demonstrated that both Ludovic and Bal were exceptionally well connected within the networks of connoisseurship and elite collecting. Jane Ridley perceptively observes that Bal ‘moved from politics, where a hereditary peer had nowhere to go beyond junior office, to an art world where he had a real contribution to make’, thus confirming Andrea Geddes Poole’s assertion that in the
In the twentieth century the aristocracy ‘were relegated from the pivot points of power to positions of show with little substance’.\textsuperscript{117}

Thus, if Lindsay failed in his wider aspiration to buttress the social and political standing of the Lindsay family and of the aristocracy in general, the Bibliotheca Lindesiana at least endowed subsequent generations of his family with a cultivated habitus and sufficient cultural capital to achieve prominence within the narrower ambit of the art establishment.

\textsuperscript{117} Ridley; Geddes Poole, p. 226.
Fig. 5.1. Lord Lindsay’s Library Report, 1861–65, p. 1. Reproduced courtesy of the Earl of Crawford and Balcarres.
Fig. 5.2. Lord Lindsay’s Library Report, 1861–65, ‘Epilogue’, p. 3, enumerating individual manuscripts owned by Lindsay. Reproduced courtesy of the Earl of Crawford and Balcarres.
Fig. 5.3. Dante and Petrarch, *Sonetti e canzoni*, Florence, before 1384; Italian MS 1, fol. 3r. Lindsay acquired this manuscript at the Libri sale of March 1859. Copyright The University of Manchester.
Fig. 5.4. Postcard photograph of the Villa Palmieri overlooking Florence, undated. Lindsay died here in 1880. The photograph was probably taken to commemorate Queen Victoria’s stay in 1888. Author’s collection.
6 Conclusion

6.1 Summary of Research Problematics and Findings

The principal problematic that I have addressed in this thesis can be summarized thus: why did Lindsay and Ludovic invest vast amounts of financial and cultural capital to create one of the greatest private libraries of the nineteenth century, and why, more specifically, did they assemble one of the most significant collections of manuscripts in Britain? From this derive several further questions, including: what specific functions did the manuscripts perform, and how closely assimilated were they with the rest of the library, which predominantly comprised printed material?

I have argued that explanations for the library’s development must be sought both in contemporary issues of class and social change, race and empire, and the classification and organization of knowledge, and in the individual characteristics and interests of the earls of Crawford and the particular socio-economic circumstances of the Lindsay family. These two clusters of factors – structural and specific – are in fact broadly imbricated and cannot be treated in isolation: the Bourdieusian concepts of capital, habitus and field have helped to elucidate how wider issues played out in the development of the library; how the earls of Crawford were shaped by their privileged backgrounds, education, social positions and networks; and how they and the library in turn influenced the wider spheres of bibliophily, library science, taxonomies and classification schemes, nascent academic disciplines, racial and imperialist discourses, and elite taste.

Lindsay’s intent was to create a universal, panoptical library which would serve the present and future research requirements of the Lindsay family and of a wider circle of associates and scholars. This utilitarian ambition was founded upon a holist philosophy that averred the unity and interconnectedness of all human knowledge. Thus the library afforded Lindsay a comprehensive perspective across broad geographical, chronological and cultural horizons. However, it is imperative to contextualize the library’s development within wider performative and epistemological trends during the nineteenth century, such as the staging of
expositions universelles, growing interest in ‘primitive’ societies, and the advance of comparative religion and anthropology. The quest for conspectus and control was a response to the expansion and ramification of knowledge, the complexification of Western societies, and encounters with an array of indigenous cultures in the colonial ‘contact zone’.

Lindsay also developed the library explicitly to reinforce his own and his family’s social and cultural distinction, at a time when emergent democracy and an increasingly powerful bourgeoisie challenged the landed aristocracy’s hegemony. The library was designed to educate Ludovic and succeeding generations and to inculcate refined tastes, in order to prepare them to assume the nobility’s responsibility for leadership of the nation and empire. The library and the family would thus serve as bastions of the high culture that was imperilled by middle-class philistinism and radical democracy.

In this enterprise Lindsay overtly modelled himself upon the Medici, whom he regarded as paradigms of elite collecting and enlightened cultural patronage. In fact, his appropriation of the Medici proved problematical, both because he overplayed the parallels between his family and their Florentine antecedents, who were gente nuova, and because the Medici were contentious figures, simultaneously patrons of the arts and tyrants.

Ludovic’s motives for continuing to develop the library after his father’s death are more opaque. He retreated from Lindsay’s policy of building a catholic library, focusing instead on specific (and more realizable) fields such as papyri. Like other second-generation collectors, he sought to differentiate himself from his father, to leave his own distinctive mark upon the library. However, he was also responding to wider societal and epistemological trends, which had rendered Lindsay’s vision obsolete: by the late nineteenth century, a growing network of public and academic libraries had undermined the raison d’être of the Bibliotheca Lindesiana as a major research library in private ownership. It also became increasingly difficult for Ludovic to compete with institutional libraries and wealthy American collectors in the market for the finest rare books and manuscripts.
Manuscripts performed important functions within the Bibliotheca Lindesiana. Lindsay professed not to collect manuscripts per se, acquiring only ‘a few valuable specimens illustrative of the calligraphy of different ages and countries’. Adhering to utilitarian principles, he generally eschewed the obvious attractions of Western illuminated manuscripts, although his principles were sufficiently flexible to accommodate some spectacular items such as the Colonna Missal. However, because of the late adoption of print in many Eastern cultures, Lindsay was obliged to acquire indigenous manuscripts in order to document the faiths, literatures and histories of these societies. Thus from the 1860s onwards he assembled one of the most significant collections of Oriental books and manuscripts in Britain.

Ludovic did not share his father’s utilitarian principles of collecting. From 1884 onwards he acquired many important manuscripts in the major auctions that punctuated this period. He had a passion for jewelled bindings, early manuscripts from Visigothic Spain and Carolingian texts, and he was more susceptible to the allure of magnificent illuminated manuscripts, such as Lydgate’s Troy Book. Like his father, Ludovic differentiated himself from bourgeois collectors who were locked into a serial mindset and collected horae and other richly illuminated late-medieval manuscripts on an industrial scale.

The status and organization of the manuscripts within the library evolved over time. When Lindsay composed the Library Report, individual manuscripts occupied a liminal position, assigned to the impermanent ‘Museum or curiosity’ department. This reflected their ambiguous status (combining features of art objects and printed books) and Lindsay’s ambivalent and contradictory attitude towards these special items. He liberally acknowledged the achievements of the more advanced non-Western cultures and devoted considerable attention to Orientalia in the Library Report; there is no suggestion that they were subordinate to their occidental counterparts and there was a high degree of physical and intellectual integration between European and Oriental materials. Later, as the manuscript collections grew, especially under Ludovic’s hegemony, they gradually sedimented out from the printed books to form discrete sections of the library, while the Oriental materials were explicitly subordinated to their western equivalents. This trend reflected, I
have suggested, the hardening of racial and colonial attitudes in the European empires towards the end of the century.

I have also addressed the question of how (and how successfully) Lindsay and Ludovic maintained physical and intellectual control over this rapidly growing library. Anxieties over ‘information overload’ are as old as libraries, but were particularly acute in the nineteenth century, due to the rapid expansion of printed matter. Both father and son were deeply interested in and made contributions to the theory and practice of library classification. Lindsay’s life-long fascination with the subject led to his developing several classification schemes, which modulated between idealized (and highly fissile) taxonomies and practical proposals for the organization of actual collections such as his own. He made little attempt to document the library, beyond compiling basic accession lists. The library was his creature, the extrinsic manifestation of his mind, and he had no need of external devices such as catalogues to exercise control over it, relying instead on his prodigious memory and haptic familiarity with the topography of the library.

Unsurprisingly, Ludovic was unable to replicate his father’s self-identification with and intellectual control over the library. Instead he initiated major campaigns to catalogue the various departments, including the manuscripts. He withdrew from day-to-day management of the library, relying instead on an expanding cohort of professional staff, and exercising control vicariously, via documentation systems and administrative procedures. He thus pioneered the development of the scientifically organized and professionally managed library, reflecting wider epistemological and managerial trends towards disciplinarity, bureaucratization and specialization.

In confronting the question of how the earls of Crawford positioned themselves within networks of connoisseurship and collecting, I have revealed an evolving picture in which Lindsay’s relative isolation contrasts markedly with his gregarious son and grandson. Lindsay espoused the Renaissance paradigm of bibliophilic generosity. However, he was disengaged from formal and informal networks of bookish sociability: he eschewed collectors’ clubs, even the aristocratic Roxburghe Club, and was on close terms with very few individual collectors. As a result of this
isolation, the library was little known outside bibliographical circles, and it appears not to have been extensively consulted by scholars.

I have argued that Lindsay’s cultural capital was sunk into the library, and the return was realized later by Ludovic and Bal, who were much more closely integrated into the public and private networks of elite (and predominantly metropolitan) culture towards the end of the century. This reflects both their cultured habitus, partly inculcated by the library, and the increasing intrication of the literary and artistic fields in this period, with greater opportunities for formal and informal sociability. They realized Lindsay’s ambition of making the library accessible to a wide circle of friends and associates and, thanks to Ludovic’s concerted endeavours to publish catalogues of the library, it became more widely known and consulted than it had been in his father’s time.

Booksellers such as Bernard Quaritch played a pivotal role in the library’s development, problematizing assumptions over the earls’ principal agency. Despite their widely disparate social and economic capitals, Lindsay accorded Quaritch great respect in the bibliographical arena, and their relationship may be characterized as one of mutual reliance: the bookseller depended upon his client’s liberal patronage; Lindsay valued Quaritch’s expertise, far-reaching supply networks and dominance of the auction rooms, and the auxiliary services he provided such as cataloguing and periodical subscriptions. Ludovic and Bal, by contrast, adopted a more mercantile approach to collecting and treated dealers merely as suppliers of books and manuscripts.

Further questions have converged upon the library’s collections of Oriental books and manuscripts, which were exceptional in their scale and their broad geographic and cultural compass: what motivated Lindsay and Ludovic to collect these materials, how did they support Lindsay’s researches into racial classification, ethnology and comparative religion, and were there any links between these interests and his concern with social and cultural distinction?

I have demonstrated that Lindsay collected Orientalia in order to fulfil his ambition to create a panoptical library encompassing all the major civilizations of the post-Noachian diaspora, which would support his and others’ researches into ethnology,
comparative religion, linguistics and other subjects. He was preoccupied with racial classification, arguing for the superiority of the Japhetan races, while displaying a remarkably enlightened attitude towards non-European civilizations. However, there is no evidence that the manuscripts themselves materially contributed towards the development of his racial theories, other than affording generalized impressions of the relative ‘progression’ of various cultures. Ludovic, by contrast, developed the Oriental collections in new areas, such as Batak materials from South-East Asia, apparently without any overarching intention or plan; he treated manuscripts as ‘souvenirs of the exotic’, rather than research resources. In any case, by the end of the century Orientalist disciplines were coalescing within universities and specialist institutions, thus marginalizing amateur scholars and collectors.

Lindsay’s interest in racial classification folds back into his concern with social distinction and class, and in particular his championing of aristocratic hegemony on grounds of its ‘higher or more generous blood’. He believed that social distinctions within nations were intrinsically connected to wider racial classifications, while his aristocratic upbringing and sense of *noblesse oblige* instilled paternalistic benevolence towards ‘inferior’ races. These concerns must be contextualized within wider discourses concerning imperialism, the identity of Britain’s ruling classes, and the aristocracy’s fitness to lead a modern global empire.

### 6.2 Contributions to Knowledge and Implications of this Research

This thesis constitutes the first extended application of modern cultural theory to a manuscript collection, or indeed to any private library, in the nineteenth century. Cultural theory – especially the Bourdieusian concepts of field, capital and habitus – has provided the methodological instruments with which to investigate intensively how the Bibliotheca Lindesiana and the earls of Crawford were situated within wider social, cultural and epistemological contexts and networks, how the library and its creators and stakeholders were both affected by and implicated in this evolving landscape, and how the manuscripts interacted with other aspects of the library and with these broader forces. The library, and the manuscripts especially, function as a prism through which are refracted wider issues in Victorian society, such as the professionalization and complexification of knowledge, the
development of library science, the erosion of the aristocracy’s hegemony, and the ascendency of a mercantile bourgeoisie.

My research may not lead to a significant revision of existing scholarship in any of the above fields, still less to a fundamental reconfiguration of the fields themselves. Nevertheless, this examination of the Bibliotheca Lindesiana has uncovered several key issues and themes which have previously been unexplored in this or any other major private library of the nineteenth century.

First, I have demonstrated that the specific and structural reasons for the construction of the library reside substantially in various forms of classification, which preoccupied Lindsay and reflected wider societal trends and taxonomies: the classification of libraries and the organization of knowledge; racial classification and ethnology; Lindsay’s deployment of the library to reinforce his and his family’s social and cultural distinction, i.e. social classification; and the earls’ classification of themselves as collectors, in relation to other bibliophiles. These thickly connected interests not only warranted and motivated the development of the library; they were in turn informed and supported by it. The implications of classification – in all its ramifications – upon a Victorian private library have never previously been investigated.

Taxonomies and classificatory systems are ideologically charged, and the Library Report reveals that Lindsay’s interest in library classification was imbricated with his concerns over social and racial categorization. Lindsay’s classificatory schemes reflected his elite habitus, confirming Bourdieu’s assertion that judgements of taste classify the classifier. Furthermore, Lindsay believed that a well-ordered library, far from operating in an epistemological vacuum, promoted orderliness in society. I have also shown that his concern with social distinction and class hierarchies was metonymically associated with racial classifications, the former operating within nations, the latter between nations.

Lindsay’s concern with classifications instantiates wider contemporaneous anxieties over ordering, arrangement and categorization. This ‘taxonomania’ – which Foucault associates with his Classical episteme but which extended through the nineteenth century – manifested itself in diverse ways; for example, in increasingly
complex botanical, zoological and geological taxonomies; Charles Booth’s fine-grained analysis of the distribution of poverty in London, and the social investigations of local statistical societies; physiognomical studies of racial characteristics; and developments in library classification, such as Dewey’s scheme, and in museum taxonomies of anthropological artefacts.¹ As these examples demonstrate, classification and the organization of knowledge were connected with social ordering and control, and with colonial administration, as Bayly has argued.

Secondly, the library constitutes an important case study of the tensions between amateur traditions and growing professionalism and sectionalism in the nineteenth century, both within librarianship and across wider disciplines. Previous investigations of the professionalization of libraries have focused on the public library sector; this is the first study of its impact upon private libraries.²

Lindsay epitomized the gentleman-savant of wide-ranging interests, who was gradually marginalized as disciplines became institutionalized within the academy; the roles of gentleman and scholar became increasingly incompatible. Amateur scholars persisted longest in those fields where wealth brought material advantages; for example, astronomy, where possession of a private observatory such as Ludovic’s at Dunecht was a practical advantage as well as a status symbol; and art history, the field in which Lindsay made his most lasting contributions to knowledge, where an upbringing surrounded by art objects endowed members of the elite with the slowly-accumulated cultural capital necessary for connoisseurship.³ Confounding


² Black, ‘Information Society’.

his father's hopes, Ludovic was not a scholar of Lindsay's calibre: he published little and appears not to have undertaken sustained research within the library. Instead he promoted the trend towards greater professionalism by appointing Edmond as librarian in 1891. However, this distanced him from the quotidian operations of the library and exposed the tensions inherent in a family library organized along professional, scientific lines and employing a cohort of staff; ultimately this paradox became unsustainable in the twentieth century.

Thirdly, the development and eventual dismemberment of the Bibliotheca Lindesiana exemplify the decline of the aristocracy in the second half of the nineteenth century and the early decades of the twentieth, and the concomitant rise of the bourgeoisie. I have shown that Lindsay created the library as a bulwark of high culture, intended to reinforce his family's distinction and to prepare them to assume the mantle of leadership of Britain and its empire. However, by the mid-1860s, when he composed the Library Report, he was fighting a rearguard action and in subsequent decades the combined effects of Parliamentary reform, agrarian depression and punitive taxation would cripple the landed aristocracy and render Lindsay's project redundant. The Lindsay family were largely insulated from the effects of agricultural decline, but being dependent on the profits of the Wigan Coal & Iron Company, they were vulnerable to the vicissitudes of the trade cycle. Financial anxieties largely explain Ludovic's precipitate decisions to sell the finest printed books in 1887 and 1889, and the manuscripts in 1901. However, these disposals can also be interpreted as a pragmatic acknowledgement that his father's vision of an aristocratic library that would service the rulers of Britain and its empire was obsolete.

The rise of the bourgeoisie directly impacted upon the library, as industrialists and bankers increasingly collected rare books and manuscripts. Lindsay and Ludovic responded by eschewing the glistering *horae* that appealed to Frank McClean and other *nouveaux riches*. But they were also affected by increasing competition from American millionaires and European financiers, which drove prices to unprecedented heights. I have also observed that whereas Lindsay remained aloof from the sale-rooms, Ludovic and Bal engaged directly in auctions, thereby demonstrating their autonomy from dealers yet also risking *embourgeoisement*,
contamination with the vulgarity of the trading floor. Thus I have explicated a clear
trajectory in the history of the library, from an aristocratic paradigm epitomized by
Lindsay to a mercantilist one, culminating in the sale of the manuscripts to
Enriqueta Rylands, widow of Manchester’s most successful cotton manufacturer.
While the decline of the aristocracy and dispersal of aristocratic collections is a
familiar trope, this is the first study to contextualize the decline of a private library
within the struggle between the aristocracy and the bourgeoisie.4

By deploying cultural theory, I have been able to contextualize the library’s
development and decline within the wider socio-cultural landscape, in particular
the displacement of the landed aristocracy towards the turn of the century.
Bourdieuian methodologies have also enabled me to transcend the
subjectivist/objectivist dichotomy between the agency of the earls of Crawford and
the wider environment in which they operated, instead demonstrating how specific
and structural factors interlocked. In adopting this approach, I have significantly
derged from previous studies of this and other nineteenth-century private
libraries, which have focused on the precise contents of the collections and the lives
of their owners, thereby eliding others’ agency in the libraries’ formation and use,
and deracinating the collections from their socio-cultural and epistemological
contexts. I have thus responded to the calls of Potten and Purcell to re-evaluate
private libraries as social spaces, to examine their social and cultural functions, and
to position them within an epistemological landscape.5 My work complements
Towsey’s more expansive enquiries into reading practices and sociability within
Scottish provincial libraries.6 However, by interrogating several aspects of a single
library, I have been able to contextualize the library’s social functions against other

4 See, for example, Mark Purcell, ’Clumber, Nottinghamshire: The Rise and Fall of a Ducal
Library’, Library & Information History, 32.1–2 (2016), 88–99; Peter H. Reid, ’The Decline and
5 Purcell, ’Reassess’d’; Potten, ‘Iceberg’.
6 Towsey, Reading.
issues such as its intellectual organization and topography, the expansion of the collections, the socio-economic status of its owners and their social networks.

I therefore suggest that the methodologies I have adopted to study the Bibliotheca Lindesiana, and its manuscript components in particular, may encourage others to undertake similar investigations of private libraries, large and small. This will enable informed comparisons to be made between collections, and trends to be delineated in the evolution of private libraries in the nineteenth century, positioning them within the wider issues of the socio-cultural transformation of Britain and the growth of empire, instead of treating collections in isolation. I have shown that the Bibliotheca Lindesiana can function as a lens through which to view various aspects of Victorian culture; it serves as a case study of how these large forces played out in one family’s library, albeit an exceptional one. It therefore demonstrates the potential for deploying private libraries to illuminate issues beyond the confines of bibliography and book history.

A further benefit of this cultural-theory approach will be to encourage the field of manuscript and bibliographical studies to slough off its fusty antiquarian and connoisseurial reputation and to accrue greater credibility within the academy, just as museology has been transformed by the infusion of postcolonial, feminist and cultural theories.7 Manuscript studies urgently require similar revitalization.

This research also has profound implications for me as a curator-researcher. I have acquired a much deeper understanding of the formation and development of the Bibliotheca Lindesiana, and of its manuscripts especially, thereby informing my professional curation of these collections and my support for other researchers studying them. Undertaking a PhD has both enhanced my appreciation of

researchers’ mentalités and methodologies – thus aiding my role within an academic library – and assisted me to develop a more acute research sensibility of my own, broadening my intellectual horizons to encompass nineteenth-century cultural and intellectual history. When I entered the archives profession thirty years ago, I was warned that the roles of archivist and researcher were incompatible and that I should forsake the latter. I have demonstrated that they are, in fact, complementary and I am determined to remain research-active following the completion of this PhD. In positioning myself on the threshold of the academy, I have differentiated myself from the traditional bibliographical approaches exemplified by the Roxburghe Club. My own journey therefore faintly echoes the nineteenth-century debates around the standing of gentlemen-scholars, like Lindsay, and the rise of the academy, which I outlined earlier.

6.3 Areas for Future Research

In order to conform to the requirements of a modern doctoral thesis, important aspects of the Bibliotheca Lindesiana and its context have necessarily been excluded from this study. I have briefly considered the economic underpinnings of the library – the family’s income from the Wigan Coal and Iron Company – but further work is required to analyse the potential correlation between the earls’ income and their expenditure on the library.

I have also omitted any analysis of Lindsay’s art collecting, although it was scarcely less important than his collecting of books and manuscripts. His complex ‘General Classification of Schools and Artists’, in Sketches of the History of Christian Art, was another significant manifestation of his ‘taxonomania’. While Brigstocke has previously elucidated Lindsay’s art-collecting practices, I believe that there is scope for re-evaluating this aspect of his career in conjunction with his bibliographical interests. Moreover, the profound influence that Christian beliefs and traditions had upon the development of the library warrants further exploration.

I am also conscious that this study has focused predominantly upon Lindsay’s contributions to the library and his concerns with classification and distinction, and

---

8 Lindsay, Sketches, i, pp. ccix–ccxlvii.
that Ludovic may therefore appear as a secondary figure, standing in his father’s shadow. Of course, Ludovic has not left us the equivalent of the Library Report which provides such rich evidence of his father’s philosophy of collecting; his motives and opinions are therefore more opaque. However, his collecting career reflected contemporary issues such as renewed interest in Egyptology and papyri. Other aspects of his collecting, such as French revolutionary material, autograph letters and proclamations, merit further investigation. Towards the end of his life, Ludovic developed a passion for philately, creating one of the finest stamp collections in the world.° Classification is intrinsic to the hobby, and it was perhaps here that ‘taxonomania’ manifested itself most in Ludovic’s career: he not only acquired three great groups of stamps, but arranged them ‘with astonishing skill and diligence’, according to his son.10

Ludovic was an enthusiastic photographer too, undertaking an ambitious project to photograph jewelled and metal bindings across Europe.11 While he did not cease to acquire such items himself, in switching his focus from purchasing originals to obtaining copies he was conforming to Benjamin’s thesis that the aura of an artwork diminishes in the ‘age of mechanical reproduction’.12 The infinite reproducibility of photography also collapsed the imperative to collect comprehensively; Ludovic was perhaps conscious that mechanical reproduction nullified his father’s ambition to build a universal library.

In view of these limitations, I propose to undertake three further research projects. First, I hope to publish a scholarly edition of the Library Report, the introduction to which is reproduced in Appendix 1; this important document remains largely unknown and deserves a much wider audience. Secondly, I wish to expand this thesis into a monograph-length study of the Bibliotheca Lindesiana, addressing

---

9 Barker, BL, pp. 342–3.


11 Barker, BL, p. 331.

some of the omissions outlined above. It will include more detailed treatment of the
economic aspects of the library; an analysis of Lindsay's application of classification
to art history and comparisons between his collecting of art and his acquisitions of
books and manuscripts; more intensive study of Ludovic's contributions to the
library and his interests in photography, documentary material and philately; and,
lastly, a discussion of the sale of the manuscripts to Enriqueta Rylands in 1901,
which was the culmination of some of the key trends that I have identified in the
history of the library. I also intend to contextualize the Bibliotheca Lindesiana
through fuller comparative studies of other collectors, including such neglected
figures as Bragge, Brooke, McClean and Tyssen-Amherst.

This could lead to a third, longer-term project: a major study of manuscript
collecting in the nineteenth century. As noted in Chapter 1, the most recent
monograph-length survey, Munby's *Connoisseurs*, was published forty-five years
ago and, notwithstanding Hindman and Rowe's subsequent examination of the
collecting and cultural reception of manuscript illuminations in the long nineteenth
century, a re-evaluation is long overdue. This study would amplify some of the
themes addressed in my thesis, examining the cultural and epistemological
functions of manuscripts in the period, formal and informal networks of collectors,
and comparisons between the collecting of manuscripts, rare books and artworks.
The phenomenon of manuscript collecting in the nineteenth century warrants a
major reassessment to expose its full socio-cultural ramifications.
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Appendices

Appendix 1: Transcription of Lord Lindsay’s Extended Letter to his Son Ludovic, Introducing the Library Report, February 1865

Editorial Introduction

While residing at the Villa Caprini in Florence, in February 1865, Lindsay composed a 12,000-word introduction to the Library Report, in the form of a letter addressed to his son Ludovic. The letter is a crucial piece of evidence for the present thesis, constituting a detailed explication and justification of Lindsay’s collecting principles and practices and averring the ennobling influence that possession of a choice and well-ordered library confers upon a family. The previously unpublished letter therefore merits transcription in full.

I have endeavoured to transcribe the introduction to the Library Report faithfully, exactly as Lindsay composed it. However, it is impossible adequately to represent the rich semiosis of a fluid hand-written text through the typographic rigidity of the printed page. Meaning is always lost or distorted in the editorial process. In this case, I decided to transcribe all the text, amendments, insertions and notes made in ink, including Ludovic’s later interventions, but largely to omit Lindsay’s numerous pencilled annotations (which were written in his minute, spidery drafting hand, heavily abbreviated and almost illegible), except where they appeared to me to be particularly significant.

The following editorial conventions have been employed in the transcription.

Additional text. Lindsay made frequent alterations and additions to the text, ranging from the amendment of a single word to the addition of entire paragraphs. Minor alterations were effected by writing over the original wording. Several words might be inserted in interlinear fashion, while more extensive additions were generally inserted in the generous left-hand margin of the page, usually with an insertion mark and line to indicate the point in the original text to which the addition relates.
Additional text is here enclosed within a pair of caret symbols, ^...^. Marginal insertions are indicated thus: ‘[marginal insertion: ...]’.

Deleted text. Likewise, numerous single words, phrases, lines and longer passages were deleted, either in the initial process of composition, or during subsequent revision. Lindsay’s normal practice was to strike out text with a single horizontal line at mid-height, and in most cases the deleted text remains reasonably legible. Deleted text is here signified by using the ‘strikethrough’ format. Where the text is no longer readable, this is indicated with an editorial comment, e.g. ‘[single word struck though, illegible]’.

Underlined text. Single and double underlining is shown exactly as it appears in the original text.

Punctuation. Lindsay used various marks of punctuation including the full point, semi-colon and comma. One of his favourite punctuation devices was the combination of a comma and en-dash (’, – ’), which is approximately equivalent to a semi-colon. Lindsay generally adopted the modern American practice of applying end quotation-marks after any other punctuation mark such as a comma or full point, rather than before, e.g. ‘Balcarres Papers,’. In some instances, however, it is not obvious whether the quotation-mark precedes or follows the comma or point. Therefore, I have transcribed all quotation-marks as following other punctuation, except in those cases where they unequivocally precede it. Occasionally Lindsay accidentally omitted end quotation-marks; I have noted such cases.

Footnotes. Lindsay’s normal practice was to place footnotes at the bottom of the page to which they refer, separated from the main text by a single horizontal line. He employed the traditional footnote symbols.

Accented characters. Lindsay was inconsistent in his treatment of accented characters: sometimes he omitted the accent; sometimes he used an acute accent when a grave was required, (‘é’ instead of ‘è’, for example), and vice versa; and on occasion he wrote the accent in an ambiguous or careless manner, making precise transcription difficult. Generally, I have endeavoured to follow Lindsay’s original
practice, except in cases of ambiguity where normal modern usage has been followed.

Ellipses. Lindsay often used a double point ‘..’ to indicate an ellipsis. For the avoidance of doubt, these have been replaced with a standard three-point ellipsis ‘…’.

The twenty-ninth earl of Crawford retains possession of the Library Report at Balcarres House and holds copyright in it. I am profoundly grateful to him for permitting me to photograph and transcribe the Report.

Transcription

[p. 1]

My dear Ludovic,

My present discourse is to be upon Books – a theme you have of late lent from time to time a patient ear to, – upon Books as constituting a Library, and upon the Library in particular which in the course of years you will inherit, and will view, I hope, in the light of a trust, to be transmitted, unimpaired, and perhaps in augmented value, to posterity. I now offer you a ‘Report upon the Present State and Future Prospects of the Crawford and Balcarres,’ or, what I please myself sometimes in calling the Lindesian (perhaps too presumptuously) the ‘Lindesian Library.’

Books are the better part, the quintessence, the immortal utterance of the loftiest minds of the past, lingering and voiceful among men to the latest generations. It was this belief and conviction and belief which animated the Ptolemies and the Attaluses, the Luculluses and Trajans, of Classic times – the \(^{\text{Abdul Hakim II King of Cordova in 963.}}\) and \(^{\text{Sahib ib Alud Vizir of Persia about 1000.}}\), collectors of the great Saracenic libraries of the middle ages – the Tai-tsous and Khien-loungs of distant China, and the De Thous and Colberts, the Medici and Barberini, the De Thotts and Van Hulthems, the Sczechynys, Telekis and Zaluskis, the Bodleys, Harleys, Grenvilles, and Spencers, of \(^{\text{modern}}\) Western Europe, in amassing the magnificent Libraries which have immortalised their memory. It is a
conviction and belief common to the mind and heart of man under all climes and in
gages. I have not a doubt but that the ships of Tarshish which brought to Solomon
the treasures of the East were charged specially to bring him books and manuscripts
from the sages of India and Iran, as well as the gold, and silver, and ivory which
were to adorn his palaces, and the apes and peacocks destined for his gardens and
menageries. The King who spoke ^uttered^ “three thousand proverbs” and sang
songs “a thousand and five” – who “spake of trees from the cedar-tree that is in
Lebanon even unto the hyssop that springeth out of the wall,” as “also of beasts and
of fowl, and of creeping things, and of fishes,” like an Oriental Aristotle – who
“passed all the kings of the earth” in riches and knowledge – whose “wisdom
excelled the wisdom of all the children of the East country, and all the wisdom of
Egypt” – and to whom God gave that diviner gift, “largeness of heart even as the
sand that is on the sea shore,” – this sage of sages, this ἀναξ ἀνδρων, to whom the
Kings of Arabia and Queens of Sheba brought offerings of whatever
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they thought most precious and acceptable – must have had a library – must I had
almost said, have been a ^B^bibliomaniac. Would that Solomon’s library could be
recovered from the past, even as the wisdom ^literature^ of Assyria is even now
being deciphered from the clay tablets of the library of Sardanapalus at Nineveh! —
I have stood with suppressed breath and beating heart within the walls of [marginal
insertion: which once enshrined] a Library earlier than any of these, the ‘Chamber of
Thoth’ in the Memnonium at Thebes, built by Rameses the Great fourteen hundred
years before ^the advent of^ Our Saviour.*

It were waste of time to expatiate on a fact so self-evident as the benefit conferred
on the human race at large, not only by the collectors of great Libraries, such as
those above mentioned, but also (I may add) by the bibliographers who have made
such collections their study, and thus furnished the key wherewith to unlock the
treasures they contained. What may be less open to observation is the fact (which
grows ever more and more on my own apprehension) that a choice and well
ordered ^private^ Library exercises a most ennobling influence upon the family
which possesses it, and through such families upon society. The like may be said of
pictures and works of art – indeed of any intellectual heritage, duly prized, – for it is seldom indeed that the mere possession of marginal insertion: and consequent daily familiarity with] such treasures fails to induce an intellectual interest in them, and, through that interest, an elevation and refinement of sentiment and character in the successive generations of the family thus distinguished. And as the great families of a nation – those that give it a history – do not rise and fall, generation after generation, like ripples of the sea, leaving no trace behind, but are each (as it were) immortal ^perennial^, rushing ever onward and pervading society like a flowing and Nile-like tide till the source that supplies their fount of being becomes exhausted; so it is easy to conceive of the extent and effect of that continuous stream of influence, (thus fed by the past and nourished in reverence for the great minds of yore), on the living world of which such families form a part, and which to a certain ^so great an^ extent reflects their light and image. It is for this reason that, while public libraries are the glory of nations and blessings to humanity, private libraries are, I venture to think, of equal value in the great account – provided only that a large and liberal heart^s^ presides over their ^collection^ custody, and communication.

* I cannot give up this “fond imagination” of Solomon’s library. It is true that the sacred records speak not of such a collection; but to the Hebrew the books of foreign lands would have been an abomination. My impression is that if Solomon’s Egyptian father-in-law, or his Phœnician friend Hiram, could be evoked from the dead and questioned on the subject, they would tell us wondrous tales concerning it. The decisive dictum, so consolatory to the dunce, that “of making many books there is no end,” and that “much study is a weariness to the flesh,” appears to me, almost of itself, to prove my position. The statement, I need hardly observe, is but a bold paranomasia introductory to the climax with which the Preacher winds up his immortal homily.
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Intentionally or instinctively our own house have always acted upon the conviction and the principle I have just attempted to express and vindicate. The Library now in question has been in existence – from small beginnings, now expanding, now contracting in extent and value, and with the usual ups and downs, breaks and
cataracts attendant upon all such collections – for nearly three hundred years – ever, in a word, since the restoration of letters in Scotland.

It was founded during the latter years of the sixteenth Century by the first of the Balcarres branch of the Crawford family, John Lindsay of Balcarres, Lord Menmuir, Lord Privy Seal and Secretary of State to James VI. – the second son of David ninth Earl of Crawford. Lord Menmuir had received his education as well in France and England, as in Scotland was a learned and accomplished man, skilled in Latin composition in verse and prose, and a profound and far-seeing statesman, the originator of many great measures which affected the destinies of Scotland, and indirectly those of Great Britain, for generations afterwards; and these varied yet kindred qualities must have been in the remembrance of a contemporary historian when he chronicled his early death as that of “a man of exquisite learning and of the greatest natural wit joined with that,” “the greatest light of the hail policie of Scotland.” It was not, however, books – although he had a fair collection of them – so much as historical manuscripts, especially the correspondence of the statesmen, warriors, sovereigns, and royal families of France and Scotland during the age immediately anterior to his own, that Lord Menmuir interested himself in collecting. These, or such of them as had been preserved through the civil wars, were presented by his great-grandson (along with other historical papers of later date) to the Library of the Faculty of Advocates’ Library, in Edinburgh, in 1712, and are now bound up in several ^seven^ folio volumes entitled the ‘Balcarres Papers,’ – a series of no great extent indeed, as compared with many such accumulations, but of which it might be said (as respects Lord Menmuir’s part of the collection) that, like the fringes of Minerva’s aegis, each separate leaf is worth a hecatomb, so precious are the letters and so celebrated the correspondents that figure therein. Of Lord Menmuir’s library proper but few of the volumes survive to us – the Plato of Serranus being the most interesting of them.

The founder of the Balcarres collection was, in fact, Lord Menmuir’s son, David, the first Lord Lindsay of Balcarres – a man resembling his father in learning and application, but who preferred the society of his books to that of camps and courts, and abjured a life of ambition for the quest of
wisdom in retreat. “He thought that day misspent,” says his daughter-in-law Anne of Seaforth, speaking of his library – “on which he knew not some thing new.” Such men [marginal insertion: isolated as they stand among those of their own rank and position] are not without their use – in one point of view, as originators of ideas which inform future generations – and as in another, ambassadors of intellect, representatives during their own time in one class of life of the characteristics belonging to another, and thus serving [marginal insertion: contributing as by a diplomatic intervention] to reconcile and harmonise society. If poets, painters, philosophers, and men of science formed distinct classes which never intermingled, we should be reduced to the condition of the castes of Egypt; but a Byron among peers, your uncle Coutts among soldiers, a Marcus Antoninus among emperors, a Bacon among lawyers – even, I will
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add, a Jacob Böhm among shoemakers – have a special value in the point of view thus suggested, independently altogether of their positive rank as men of genius – among whom I do not pretend to class our ancestor Lord Balcarres. It is as a book-collector that we are now dealing with him. I have printed in the ‘Lives of the Lindsays’ a letter from Sir John Scott, of Scotstarvet, the author of the ‘Staggering State of Scots Statesmen,’ in which Sir John applies to him for various works of the Scottish poets, existing in the Balcarres Library in manuscript, which he was anxious to print in the ‘Delicæ Poetarum Scotorum,’ (and which were duly sent him as by a marginal memorandum, “with divers others”) – and another from the poet Drummond of Hawthornden, the friend of rare Ben Jonson [marginal insertion: Date July 26, 1623.] (and who has recorded so many of Jonson’s recollections of Shakespeare), [(and... Shakespeare) struck through in pencil] in which Drummond thanks him for the sight of his library during a recent visit to Fife, and pleads the excellence of the collection and Lord Balcarres’s “good intelligence abroad” in apology for his sending for his acceptance a new and privately printed volume of his own, “not as yet to be found in any library,” and which he has therefore no fear would be found superfluous as a duplicate, – to wit, the ‘Flowers of Zion,’ which we thus learn was first issued in this restricted manner,
“for a few friends, of whom God knows” (he says) I have not many, whereof I have always accounted yourself one.”

[Written on a slip pasted into the margin alongside the above paragraph: I have been bold to present you with this of mine... onlye singular in this, that it is not to be found in any library I having caused print only^e^ some copies equaling the number of my friends and those to whom I am beholden, which are not the World knows many among which I have ever esteemed and found you.]

Lord Balcarres’s correspondence with his brother-in-law the good and accomplished John Earl of Lauderdale abounds with classical allusion, but the studies of his predilection were scientific – in astronomy, mathematics, and chemistry – with a strong bias, as of a Rosicrucian, towards the occult walks of alchemy. He collected all the books accounted valuable in these branches of science, and in numerous cases, when very rare and not to be purchased, transcribed them with his own hand. Many of his books bear the indication in his handwriting of having been bought out of Scotland ^abroad^, while on visits to France and England. He was curious, like many other collectors, in ^book-^binding, and had his arms, surrounded with the inscription ‘David Dominus Lyndesay de Balcarres,’ stamped on the larger volumes, and his crest, a pavilion ^azure,^ semée of stars, ^or^ with the motto ‘Astra Castra,’ on the smaller. A few leaves of the Library Catalogue, written in Lord Balcarres’s own hand, have been preserved among our family papers. Robert Lindsay, a ^his^ younger brother of Lord Balcarres, had also a small library, and, dying without children, his collection merged in that at Balcarres, ^and of these too some volumes survive to us.^ The ‘Kingdom of Fife’,^ during the latter years of the sixteenth and the first half of the seventeenth century, was a sort of sanctuary of the Muses in Scotland, partly through the ^its^ neighbourhood to the capital, but more especially through the ^its^ isolated position as a peninsula, and through there being few or none of the greater [marginal insertion: more powerful] feudal barons resident there, at least in the Eastern portion of the county. While David Lord Balcarres and his father Lord Menmuir “cultivated literature” on the “little oatmeal” of their Fifeshire acres,
the chiefs of the family in Forfarshire were occupied in continual private warfare with hereditary

and personal enemies.

Lord Balcarres’s successor was Alexander, created Earl of Balcarres by Charles II. on the occasion of his coronation in Scotland in 1651. Long before this, and before the outbreak of the civil wars, he was in frequent correspondence with his cousin-german Lord Maitland, afterwards the celebrated and oppressive Duke of Lauderdale, on matters touching their books and libraries. After a brief and active life spent between the tented field and the council-chamber of his exiled sovereign, where he held the post of Secretary of State for Scotland, he died at the early age of forty-one, worn out with the effects of exposure on the Highland hills, and with anxiety and sorrow. “His delight was in his books,” as by the testimony of his biographer; but he had not the opportunity of adding many to the Library, his difficulty latterly having been to find bread for his wife and children to eat while in exile after the sequestration of his estates by Cromwell, and in the foreign land where he died. His learning is celebrated by his contemporaries especially [two words struck through] Richard Baxter, the author of the ‘Saint’s Rest,’ “none being praised equally with him” (he writes) “for learning and judgment in all Scotland;” and Cowley says of him, in an elegy to his memory,

“His wisdom, and his lady too,

“Were things celestial.”

[Written on a slip pasted onto the facing page intended to replace the first line of the following paragraph: At one moment in Earl Alexanders life, there was great risk of risk of the Library being dispersed. His wife had given her personal personal ornaments, “her woving furniture”, as a contribution to their common necessity, & Lord Balcarres executed a Codicil to his Will bequeathing to her the Library, which he had previously made an heirloom, fixing its redeemable value at 6000 Scottish
marks. She probably never claimed it, and the Library like a bark weathering the storm emerged pretty safely from...]

The Library at Balcarres seems to have escaped pretty safely from the deluge of rain which overwhelmed most of the old houses of Scotland during the Great Rebellion. Lord ^The Duke of^ Lauderdale’s family papers were less fortunate, – they had been buried in chests in the court-yard of Balcarres, and were found on being dug up at the Restoration to have been almost entirely destroyed by damp; but such was the reputation which the preceding Lord Lauderdale, David Lord Balcarres’s brother-in-law and the Duke’s father had borne for accuracy and integrity that an inventory of them drawn up in his handwriting was declared by Act of Parliament sufficient to replace them ^Supply their Deficiencies^ in matters of law and property. The Duke of Lauderdale, I may add, Earl Alexander’s early friend and correspondent, long survived him, and collected a very fine library, which was after his death sold in London, in several portions, between the years 1616 and 1617. The sale-catalogues of this library are among the rarest existing, and are still desiderata to our own collection of such records.

Earl Colin, the son of Alexander, and who succeeded an elder brother who died a child, received through the care of his mother – Anne of Seaforth, an anxious trustee of his father’s wishes – the foundation of an excellent education; and although his career was that of activity and public life as a soldier and statesman during the reigns of Charles II. and James II., and his character exhibited a full sufficiency of the buoyant gaiety popularly attributed to the ‘lightsome Lindsays,’ he still merited the character given of him by Mr. Chambers of the “learned” as well as the “elegant Balcarres.” His mother, in a letter of advice to him on entering life, of which I have quoted some passages in the ‘Lives,’ speaks of his “closet” or library in a manner indicating that it still contained stores for the mind whether in the way of improvement or recreation; and on a later occasion, when he had incurred the displeasure of Charles by a marriage contrary to the royal wishes, he spent six years in retirement at Balcarres and study [p. 6]
at Balcarres, seeking, as his tells us, to repair the deficiencies of an education too early interrupted, – years which he often afterwards told that son were “the happiest time of his life whole life.” It was in this “closet” or library, moreover, that long afterwards, – the Revolution of 1688 and ^eight^ years of exile having intervened – ^&^ after joining in the unsuccessful insurrection of 1715, and receiving a pardon through the interest of his friend Churchill, Duke of Marlborough – ^Earl Colin^ finished his days, an aged man, in 1722, – passing a second period of six, or nearer seven years, in that same retreat, in his nightgown and slippers – a dress of ease and lettered indolence which his granddaughter tells us ^perhaps with some exaggeration^ he never, after this last return home, laid aside. It was while concerting with his friend the Earl of Mar the insurrection of 1715, and in apprehension possibly of the effects of confiscation and devastation in case the revolt should be unsuccessful, that Earl Colin presented, as I previously mentioned, the series of autograph correspondence collected by his ancestor Lord Menmuir, together with other papers of public interest, many of which related to the defence of the Highlands against Cromwell under his father ^and the Earl of^ Glencairn in 1653, to the Library of the Faculty of Advocates, in Edinburgh, in 1712. The learned antiquary Sir Robert Sibbald in his ‘History of Fife,’ published in 16 , speaks, in describing Balcarres, of Earl Colin’s great plantations and of his “great Bibliothec” in terms of admiration.

The life of Earl Colin’s eldest son and successor, Alexander ^fourth^ Earl of Balcarres, was that of a soldier fighting in the campaigns of Marlborough in company with Corporal Trim and my uncle Toby; and, although a gallant and chivalric gentleman, I should not think he added a volume to the family collection. But his younger brother and heir Earl James, who succeeded him – your great-great-grandfather – was a great reader ^and an accomplished,^ although not a learned man, having entered the navy when a mere boy. He was fortunate however in the Captain under whom he served, who took a paternal interest in him for several years, encouraging and guiding his studies so far as they could be pursued on shipboard and elsewhere; and ^thus^ filling the young sailor’s heart with a fervent gratitude ^to his memory^ which years and experience only served to intensify. The result was fortunate. During a long service – till 1715 as a sailor, till Dettingen and
Fontenoy in 1743 & 1745 as a soldier – the Earl James passed much of his leisure hours, I cannot say in the old Library, for he was seldom at home; but in the company of the wise and learned, a chosen few, "whose published thoughts have benefited mankind," – he cultivated the friendship of such men as Bolingbroke in his youth and Hume in his old age; and during those latter years, and especially after he had become afflicted with the infirmity of deafness, "books," says his daughter, Lady Anne Barnard, "were," next to the society of his contemplation of his children and his genealogical studies, "his constant resource" and comfort. I cannot describe him as a collector; but he amply appreciated the stores laid up by his father and other predecessors. His favourite author was Montaigne, – and his humour, of which many traditions are still current in Fife, was somewhat akin to that of the quaint but chivalrous Gascon.

After Earl James's death (in 1768), and during the minority of his son, his widow, with her eleven children, lived for many years in retirement at Balcarres; and Lady Anne Barnard has des-
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ccribed in her Memoirs the early ventures of herself and her sister Lady Margaret – wandering at will through the sea of books in the old Library, without rudder and without pilot – books "whose learned dust," she says, "had made philosophers and chemists of all the moths in the castle." But the hour was at hand which was to make a rude disturbance in these ancient precincts, – not indeed absolutely to annihilate the Library, but to reduce it to the lowest point of attenuation, short of absolutely breaking its continuity. Lord Balcarres, my Grandfather, although a man of broad views and wise counsel, and a terse and powerful writer, was not a learned man or a student; – his early entry into the army at the age of sixteen, and a life of constant and active military duty in the American war and, afterwards, as Governor of Jersey and Jamaica during the wars of the French Revolution, left little time for literary pursuits. Some, however, of the works on military science of the days of 'Henri Quatre' and the Fronde had attracted his attention in the Balcarres Library, and these he took with him to Jersey, whence (having been left behind there) they were sent to my father as a present
rightful owner\textsuperscript{a} many years afterwards. But Few \textsuperscript{however}, I apprehend, after Earl James’s death – or, at least, after the youthful and bright sunbeam of Lady Anne’s and Lady Margaret’s presence had vanished from the scene – disturbed “the ancient solitary reign” of the moths and spiders in Lord David’s sanctuary under the old crow-trees at Balcarres; and, I grieve to say \textsuperscript{confess} it, on my grandmother Lady Balcarres leaving Fife and settling in Edinburgh for the education of her children while her husband was in the West Indies, the greater portion of the library was literally thrown away and dispersed – torn up, I believe, for grocers, as useless trash, by her orders or by her permission, – the \textbf{accumulation}\[?] \textsuperscript{inheritance} of generations thus going down to the dust, under a Pharaoh that knew not Joseph, in dishonour. The late Lord Hardwicke, my great-uncle, \textsuperscript{by marriage} who was a judge of such matters, told my father that it was one of the most curious old libraries he ever saw, and \textsuperscript{he} deeply regretted its destruction. A few volumes \textsuperscript{indeed} escaped the fate of their brethren and found their way to Haigh; others, distinguished by family signatures, and the arms or crest stamped on the sides, have been presented to me, or I have picked them up at different times when offered for sale. The continuity of the collection has never (as I said) been absolutely broken, but the shock \textsuperscript{it then sustained}, it cannot be denied, was a rude one.

During these many generations, \textbf{which have come} \textsuperscript{coming} like shadows and so departed\textsuperscript{edging} across the scene of our ancient Library, all the Earls \textsuperscript{Lords} of Balcarres, with one exception, were men of enterprise \textsuperscript{the world (in the best sense of the term)}\textsuperscript{as well as of letters; they \textbf{combined} \textsuperscript{united}, as you have seen, the active with a fair share of the contemplative and studious life; and this happy combination I believe to have been the consequence in great measure of their library, as it was undoubtedly a secret cause of the love they attracted, I had almost said, the fascination they exercised upon their contemporaries, and of which the tradition has descended to modern times. Learning \textbf{in them was} \textsuperscript{and accomplishment was in them}\textsuperscript{^a} no let to patriotism, no plea against grace and elegance. The exception I have spoken of was that of David Lord Balcarres [\textit{marginal insertion: although even he threw off his toga for the cuirasse & broadsword when the civil wars broke out}], – it is the example of his father and of his successors that I would recommend to your admiration and emulation.
Let me add here that, after the removal of our immediate family to Haigh, and the arrangements by which my great-uncle and your maternal great-grandfather, Mr Robert Lindsay ^of Leuchars^ became the Laird, or in old Scottish parlance, Baron of Balcarres, a new library, [three words struck through, illegible] ^in emulation^ of the old one, speedily took root within the old precincts, and under the fosterage of your grandfather General Lindsay and your grandmother became a most charming and graceful collection of everything best and most delightful in every English, French, German, and Italian literature. This, it will probably ^library I presume, it will^ be your uncle Sir Coutts’s, pleasure and your aunt Blanche’s pleasure in after times to amplify – in the direction probably of Art and the Belles Lettres, the scene ^field^ of his own mastery, just as I expect that the department of astronomy, ^of music^ and perhaps others in the realm of science in our own Library may become the object of your own especial protection and predilection.

It was by the same Lord Balcarres during whose absence from Europe the catastrophe above spoken of took place – your (paternal) great-grandfather – that, I am happy to say, the first step was taken, about twenty years afterwards, towards the reparation of this misfortune, and the resuscitation of the library of his ancestors. On the death of John Lord Muncaster (whose only surviving child had married my father), Lord Balcarres, by ^at^ my father’s advice ^instance^, purchased the Muncaster library, a collection of about five thousand ? volumes – which contained many good and useful books in all classes of literature, although few volumes of rarity (unless imperfect) or of high pecuniary value. This, therefore, with the remnant of the old Balcarres library, and a small collection bequeathed to myself by Lady Mary Lindsay Crawford, sister and heiress of George twenty-second Earl of Crawford, (and which had been the library of the usurping line of the Lindsays of the Byres, Earls of Crawford and Lindsay since our own ^the^ elder branch was dispossessed during the Civil Wars), – these three collections – the first of the greater extent, the second little more then than a “magni nominis umbra” – and the third interesting to me chiefly from the source from whence it came –
formed the basis or platform I had myself to start from as a collector – in the
endeavour to build up once more, and on a larger scale, the “great Bibliotheck”
recorded by Sir Robert Sibbald.

I had, in fact, in my earliest youth determined to gather together the wisest and best authors of all countries, ages, and pursuits, as agreeable companions, instructive teachers, and honoured guests, under the symbolic pavilion of the Lindsays, who, with their friends, might thus converse hereafter, as in the School of Athens, with congenial associates in whatever branches of literature, art, or science, their genius or taste should severally direct them to, – in other words, I proposed to myself as an object the development of our library into one worthy of our family – not a mere bibliomaniacal congeries of undigested accumulation, but a library of intrinsic excellence, to contain the most useful and interesting books, old and new, in all walks of literature – although including the chief bibliographical treasures which lend grace and value to such collections. I gradually extended my view to the collection of pictures and works of art of every description, few but choice, with the object of forming and fostering useful and graceful tastes among the successive generations of our house, – I have done something in this latter direction, having had an excellent foundation to

work upon in the collection of pictures inherited from our ancestors, from my grandfather and from my great-aunt Lady Anne Barnard. But I shall expiate on this matter in a distinct Report, – my present subject is the Library.

I began collecting in a small way in 1826, shortly after going to Eton, and at the same time endeavoured to prepare myself for the work of future years by the study of the science of Bibliography in such books as I could afford to buy or could get access to. [marginal insertion: Dr Clarke’s Bibliographical Dictionary was my constant companion] Dibdin’s writings, in particular, made me for the time a thorough bibliomaniac. I met him once at a friend’s house, and although he discoursed on matters very foreign to the subject of libraries [marginal
insertion: it was at the time of the Reform Bill of 1832, & he was a Rabid Radical], I remember the sight I had of him with pleasure. I had distant glimpses of other collectors, and frequent opportunities of gazing on books of beauty and value, in the great room of Messrs Payne and Foss in Pall Mall, a literary Rialto, where the Spencers, Hebers, and Grenvilles of the day were wont to congregate, and where, while collating, in particular, by permission of those courteous Messrs Payne & Foss, the poems of Simonides, which it was my ambition to edit, in the Anthologia of 1495, I watched them from the corner come and go, like ghosts and phantoms, who might have noticed me had I taken the initiative and ventured to speak to them. I also at this time, in 1826 and 1827, frequented the sale-room at Christie's, especially when the rich libraries of Mr. Dent and the Revd Theodore Williams were dispersed – watching the biddings and entering the prices on the margin of my Catalogue. But, although I occasionally bought a classic from Messrs Payne and Foss (whose kind allowance of me was quite independent of interest), my purchases at this time were for the most part confined to the cheaper second-hand shops of Holborn. I collected in this way as many books (chiefly classical and philological) as sufficed to cover an entire wall of my room at Eton; and among them were a few volumes not unworthy to hold their place even in our present library. I pursued the same course, and acquired a few various choice books in the ‘Quartier Latin’ and elsewhere at Paris, and in Italy when travelling there with my tutor, in 1828, 1829, and 1830.

I could do but little, however, towards my object – having nothing but a schoolboy’s and collegian’s allowance – till the year 1834, when the bequest above alluded to from kindness of the Lady Mary Lindsay Crawford above alluded to, who left made me her residuary legatee and put thereby a large sum of money at my disposal, enabled me to make a proper commencement. Being still under the influence of the Bibliomania and conscious of the fact – and much impressed too with the ruinous effects of it as exemplified in the case of M’ Theodore Williams and others, I determined, from a sense of self-distrust, to confine myself rigidly in the first instance to the acquisition of the more useful and substantial backbones of a library – only purchasing such of the rarer books as should be absolutely essential to its completeness. The sale of Mr. Heber’s collection was then going on, and a few
of his books which I obtained at that time, chiefly works of history, such as Castanheda's history of the Portuguese conquests in India, Brito's 'Monarquia Lusitana,' Baldensel's Pilgrimage to Palestine, Schiltberger's travels in Tartary, and ^not a few^ others, I have never seen in the market since. Other rare books, less immediately important to my scheme, I let go in pursuance of the
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resolution above mentioned, expecting to have later opportunities of acquiring them, – many of these works have never since presented themselves – some have occurred for the first time during the last six or seven years, and these, with few exceptions, I have secured. I believe now that for the interest of the Library I was wrong, and that it would have been good economy if I had spent the whole ^or the greater part^ of the sum at my command on the rarities then procurable, leaving the purchase of articles ^of^ comparatively common occurrence to futurity. There are opportunities which only occur once in a lifetime, and which, if lost, never again present themselves. On the other hand, it is possible that if I had indulged my wishes, I might have lost myself in the bibliomaniacal rut, and never afterwards escaped from it. At all events I acted for the best, and I have reaped infinite profit in respect of my studies and writings from the books which I did get at the time. They consisted of such works as the great old Fathers, critics, and divines of Christendom – the collections of original chronicles and contemporary documents, the fountains of history, by Muratori, Bouguet and his continuators, Langebek, &c. – the antiquarian Thesauruses of Graevius and Gronovius, Ugolini, and others, treasure-houses indeed of research and knowledge – the more important recent historians – the series of travellers, ancient and modern, who have explored the earth and bequeathed their narratives of adventure and observation to posterity – some of the best editions of the ancient and modern classical writers – and works of reference of different descriptions, – besides the few rarities above spoken of. I am now sailing on a tack directly contrary to what which [sic] I then pursued. I am endeavouring to secure the rare indispensable essential to my scheme, neglecting books which may be got at any time, leaving the acquisition of such to my old age, or to – yourself.
The result of the operations above described, extending over the years 1834, 1835, and 1836, was the acquisition of a very large number of works of first-rate importance and usefulness – and of not a few very scarce and precious volumes – but all combining utility with rarity. My chief purchases in history, travels and general literature were at this time and long afterwards from Mr Thorpe, Mr John Bohn, Mr. James Bohm, and Mr Henry G. Bohn; and in theology and Oriental literature from Messrs Straker. Mr Lilly too, and Messrs Willis and Sotheran, has supplied me from time to time with many very valuable books from during the last thirty years. [marginal insertion: almost the whole period that I have been a collector. Most of the bibliopoles I looked up to with reverence in those early days are now no more; and my contemporaries are, like myself, grey-haired men. A cordiality and almost affection subsists between a bookseller and his client such as hardly exists in any other similar relationship.]

From the first very first, as already stated (I mean from 1834) I endeavoured to steer clear of bibliomania. I acted then, and have always acted, on a clearly defined principle in developing the library. I began by compiling, from special bibliographies, catalogues, works of criticism and literary history, and otherwise, an ideal Catalogue – of a library such as might serve, not myself individually, but a whole family of varying pursuits and tastes, – I have revised this Catalogue from time to time, but always endeavouring to preserve its proportions, and in adherence to the same principle, viz., not to include books which are merely precious on bibliomaniacal grounds, but to make utility and interest, liberally construed, the test and ticket of admission. On this principle I have, as a general rule, rejected ‘Large Paper’ copies, and copies printed in an unusual manner, except when the superiority of the impressions of the plates, or of the colouring in the case of books of Natural History, or the fact of the armorial bearings being emblazoned in the case of works of genealogy and heraldry, rendered them desirable. Books printed on vellum I have put away from me (except in a very few instances) as seducing damsels, temptresses like those who assailed the virtue of the anchorites in the Thebaid. [marginal
I had but a certain sum to spend & had to calculate accordingly. The original editions of the classical writers, ancient and modern – those in which immortal ideas first met the eyes of mortal men – editions or books which have in a manner become as it were historical documents – works which illustrate the progress of thought as steppingstones in the march of human progress, although now long superseded – and books which reflect as in a mirror the age that produced them, and enable us to recall, sympathise, and identify ourselves by an immortal charity with the generations of the past – these I have considered fair game. A few specimens of the early presses, for the purpose of exhibiting the progress of typography, and a few well-chosen Manuscripts, selected in order to shew the progress of writing and illumination in Europe and the form and character of books, or what serve for such, among the Eastern nations, likewise formed and form part of my scheme. I have thus, you will perceive, a clear and distinct conception of what I want – there are well-defined limits to my design – and that design is fairly within the compass of attainment. I do not seek, for example, to possess the whole series of first editions of the Classics, and like the late Lord Spencer, but a few of them only, and if possible, the choicest and most valuable of the group. I do not aim at obtaining the seven folio editions of Cranmer’s Bible, and the entire series of successive editions of the Scriptures in English, like Mr. Lea Wilson; nor a collection of all the editions of all Bibles published in all languages, like Lorck in the last century and the Duke of Sussex in this, – I am satisfied with one copy of Cranmer’s and, if possible, the editio princeps, or mother text, of each of the successive versions or recensions, from that of Tyndal to that of James I. in English, and one (if possible, the first) edition of each of the more important translations in foreign languages. I do not, in like manner, care to possess the entire series of the Romances of Chivalry, good, bad, and indifferent, like the Prince of Essling, but the best of them only, – and so in similar instances. I am far from undervaluing the interest or depreciating the importance and value of special accumulations such as those I have just mentioned, but my object is, I repeat, not special but general or catholic collection – I wish to have, not everything, but the best in each department, and thus to form a broad and sufficient basis on which any one of my successors hereafter may build towers or wings of special development according to his prevailing pursuit or taste. Some
departments in the Library connected with my own pursuits have thus actually already outgrown the general proportion which I have wished theoretically to maintain; but this has been through the necessity of providing myself with the tools necessary for my personal use in those departments; and the increase consists for the most part, not in rarities, but in books of ordinary occurrence. Such superfluities, either in my own case or that of others, can easily be got ready rid of in future days if found to occupy too much space; and I shall will hereafter indicate the principle on which I should recommend such clearances to be carried into effect.

I have steadily pursued the development of the Library on the preceding principles during the last thirty years that have elapsed since 1834, – with intervals indeed of comparative inaction during my various residences abroad (although even then I have seldom returned without a cargo of purchases), but with increased activity during the last ten years or twelve years.

While gradually picking up the rarer articles of my scheme, I have established a connection with various agents, principally booksellers, at home and abroad, which gives me a knowledge of such books as are for sale, not only in England but in Germany, Hungary, Poland, the Low Countries, France, and Italy, and even in Spain and Portugal. I have communication with Denmark, and hope soon to have such with Austria – and China and Japan have also opened their arms to me. In illustration of the advantages of this connection I may mention that I telegraphed not long ago for a rare little book, probably unique, advertised for a few shillings in a catalogue published in the recesses of Germany, and received it in due course by post a few days afterwards. I similarly obtained the original edition of Marco Polo, of which only three or four copies are known, by telegraph, from Vienna, five or six years ago. While other customers are bargaining or hesitating, a speedy and decisive order has over and over again secured me treasures of this description. I have also frequently carried off rarities of great interest in public competition at sales, through local agency, at Brussels, Munich, Augsburg, Paris, and Rome. Mr. Molini
and Mr. Nutt were for many years my principal assistants in these foreign campaigns, and likewise, and more especially since the death of those two gentlemen, Mr Bernard Quaritch, who has acted for me on occasions innumerable, and at home as well as abroad, with admirable judgment. I have always (let me add) kept short accounts and dealt liberally with my professional agents, and hence they have generally given me the first or an early offer when rare articles, such as they knew or thought I must be on the look-out for, came before them. I have found it a very effective plan to furnish particular persons with lists of desiderata – of the books I want. I have had one of these lists circulated from time to time on the Continent by means of Mr. Quaritch. A great many valuable books which are seldom or never met with in sales or catalogues have thus found their way to me. But I have always been checked in the exercise of this plan by a fear of the fish coming to my net (as they are occasionally apt to do) in inconvenient numbers at once.

All my acquisitions have been from my own resources, – from Lady Mary Lindsay Crawford’s legacy till it was exhausted, and from my allowance since. The Report, to which this Letter is introductory, will indicate the degree of progress made in accomplishing my object. I am not however satisfied with the progress hitherto achieved; and various considerations concur to render a point that is at present, and has for some time past been dwelling on my mind, is this. We no longer live to the days of Methuselah, – although I have done much, there is still much to do, – it is not as if I was only twenty-five years old – I am now considerably past fifty, no longer young; and ere many years be past, the vigour and energy of life will sensibly abate. Books of great rarity, included in my scheme, are constantly occurring for sale, but I can only hitherto I have only been able to secure a certain number of them for lack of funds, – when a very rare and precious one has occurs ed for which I have had to pay a large sum, the acquisition has to a certain extent cripples d me for the time. For example, the purchase of the Mazarine Bible at Bishop Daly’s sale five or six years ago – that of the beautiful vellum Catholicon of
Guttenberg at the sale of the Munich duplicates – and that of the York Missal at the Savile sale (the only copy, not only of the edition but of all the five known editions which is not in a public library), and which I was obliged to buy against the British Museum – purchases of this nature, of objects which form the glory of the Library, could only be effected by me through the forgoing of other articles almost, if not equally necessary – as, for example, that of the black-letter Chaucer in the same sale in which I bought the Missal – the only perfect copy of the edition known, and which I fear I shall never have another opportunity of acquiring, – the three or four other black-letter editions only existing, moreover, in the case of a single copy of each of them, all of which are in libraries either public or not likely to be dispersed. Again, my plan has been, when a special collection of great interest occurred for sale, to pick (as it were) the plums out of the pudding – to buy out of it its rarest and most precious volumes in as great number as I could afford – thus availing myself of the search and labour of men who had devoted themselves to those particular branches of collection, and multiplying (so to speak) my own life by that of others theirs’. In the instances in which I have done this, it has been comparatively easy for me to fill up the lacunae, or vacant spaces, after these ready-hewn blocks of literature had been placed on my shelves. But for each opportunity which I have been able thus to improve, numbers have slipped away – my life will be too short to remedy it – and even supposing that you or others should carry on my plans, much greater expense will be incurred (for reasons which I will presently mention) than would have been the case had I been in a position to act energetically and promptly in the interest (as I conceive it) of the family, as I wished to do. It is likewise that I am afraid (as I already said) of circulating my lists of desiderata too extensively, or including in them all that I want, lest I should embarrass myself through the very success which might attend the process. –

You must not for a moment imagine that I complain of all this, in the least degree, – I have had, in the legacy from Lady Mary, and in a liberal allowance from my father, the means of doing very much more than falls to the lot
of most men, similarly circumstanced. I merely mention the fact as a fact as explanatory of what is above stated. and justificatory of what I propose to do, viz. to request my father to put at my disposal a sum of money to be set apart expressly as a reserve-fund, for the purpose of supplementing my usual means and enabling me to act vigorously towards the completion of the family Library in accordance with the principle upon which its restoration and development has been schemed and planned. [marginal insertion: Under the circumstances, and with the view to the more energetic action thus suggested, I had determined to request my father to place at my disposal a sum of money to be set apart expressly as a reserve-fund, for the purpose of supplementing my usual means and enabling me to act vigorously towards the completion of the family library, in accordance with the principle upon which its restoration has been schemed and thus far execut [struck through in pencil] carried out; and I have not a doubt but that he would have consented to this, – but I am happy to say that I have now a prospect, through new family arrangements, of ample independence, such as will enable me to carry out with energy the scheme so long in petto, and at present, after more than thirty years, not so very far from consummation.]

Independently of my advance in years, there is another reason why time should not be lost if the object in view is to be effected. Rare and valuable books are fast disappearing from the market, and their price is higher now when they do occur than at any previous period. Ours will probably be one of the last great private libraries formed in England and even in Europe, of the class of which the Harleian, La Vallière, Georgian, Roxburghe, Spencer, and Grenville collections and that, I believe, of the Duke of Aumale, have been, or are the most noble examples, – such libraries have ceased in France – and various causes will probably prevent their frequent formation in this country. At the time when Sir Mark M. Sykes, Mr Heber, Mr. Grenville, Lord Spencer, the Duke of Roxburghe, and George the Third (to say nothing of earlier virtuosi), formed their collections, the interest in old books was confined to private individuals, and the public libraries were in great measure indifferent, – the British Museum and the Bodleian did nothing in that way at home, nor the ‘Bibliothéque du Roi’ at Paris. The
consequence was, that a large number of rare books, not to be found in public libraries, appeared periodically in the market, passing from the [Maffeo] Pinelli to the Roxburghe, from the Roxburghe to the Sykes, and from the Sykes (for example) to the Heber collection – then again to be dispersed – many of them being of course absorbed into the great and enduring libraries of Lord Spencer, Mr Grenville, and others – but still a large proportion remaining open to the acquisition of private collectors at each of these successive epochs. But for some years past the public libraries both at home and abroad have been endeavouring to fill up their gaps by competition at public sales and otherwise, giving large prices – against which I have myself had frequently to contend, sometimes succumbing, sometimes successful. Once so absorbed, a book of first-rate rarity is lost to private collectors for ever. Many private collections have also been presented to public libraries, like those of George III. and Mr Grenville to the British Museum, – this has, of course, to a certain extent disarmed competition in the case of the national libraries thus enriched, but on the other hand it has lessened the number of purchaseable books and removed many unique or excessively rare volumes altogether from the market, rendering their acquisition a simple matter of impossibility. In many cases three or four copies of a very precious book have thus accumulated in the British Museum; and unless it should sell such duplicates, as has been done at Munich (although the circumstances of the two cases would be different), or
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exchange them for books of equal value, there is scarce a chance of obtaining any of them. Amateurs again, especially in Paris, and of the generally of the nouveaux-riches class, have devoted themselves to the formation of small and special collections, cabinets instead of libraries, suitable to their restricted dwelling-places, – competing fiercely for the possession of the rarities peculiar to their respective specialities – thus raising the pecuniary value of such books much above that which they bore in times when collection was of a more general and liberal character. The interest, for example, newly awakened (rather too late) in the ancient genealogical history of France, and which is not confined to the ‘noblesse,’ has had the effect of increasing the mercantile value of the more important works in that branch of French historical literature to such a degree that I constantly see
book see books which I bought fifteen, twenty, or twenty-five years ago for a comparative trifle either advertised at five, eight, or ten times the sum I then gave for them, or left open to the highest bidder in private competition. [marginal insertion: The old French Romances of Chivalry also sell for four times what they used to even in the time of the sale of the Prince D'Essling.] So too the older books on American history and antiquities have, through trans-Atlantic competition (for the new public libraries and private collections in New York, Boston, &c.), become quadrupled or quintupled in value of late years, – some[?], in fact, [one word struck though, illegible] and it is fortunate for me that (as in the case of French genealogy) I acquired many years ^long^ ago the greater number of the works I wanted of this description. The consequence of all this is, as I said, that the number of purchaseable books ^rarities^ has been diminishing and the price of books (^especially^ in good library condition) has been rising for some years past. And there is every prospect of this continuing. Even therefore if I was^ere^ only twenty-five, it would be good economy at present to [The follow passage is crossed through: do as much as I possibly could at once. Unless a change should take place in the public taste, of which there is no apparent ^likelihood^, ten thousand pounds would probably effect as much during the next five years as fifteen or eighteen thousand would, scattered over the ensuing ten. Had I, in short, the means, I would at once set to work and purchase the books required, rare and unrare, in all the departments, convinced on the grounds just stated that this would be true economy and wisdom. But as this cannot be, I fall back on the expedient just suggested, of a reserve-fund, on which I may draw in supplement of my allowance when necessary, in order to secure books which I have no reasonable prospect of obtaining if I miss current opportunities. I should in that case have no scruple in circulating much fuller lists of Desiderata.

There is one object of collection, indeed, which I scarcely venture to hint at, but which some day or other I may endeavour to realise, – at present it would be far beyond my means. I have always (as you have already perceived) proceeded on the principle that a family library should be catholic in character – should include the best and most valuable books, landmarks of thought and progress, in all cultivated languages, Oriental as well as European. What one member of the family cannot,
another may be able to read and appreciate. Nor ought such a library to be limited
to a family only; the friends of the family, and those whose friendship would do
them honour, ought equally to have access to it; and in our own case the motto on
its]
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do as much as I possibly could at once. It is not to be supposed that money, even
lavishly expended, is omnipotent to procure the desiderata wished for, and still less
at a moment’s notice; but the moral of my argument is that it would be wise to set to work as soon as possible, and purchase the
books required, rare and even unrare, in all departments of the library, under the
conviction, on the grounds just stated, that this would be true economy and
wisdom in the long run. I shall henceforward, at all events, have no scruple in
circulating much fuller lists of my desiderata.

There is one subject of collection, rather out of the usual scope of private libraries,
which has occupied much of my attention, and upon which I would say a few words
in these introductory pages. I have always (as you have already perceived)
proceeded on the principle that a family library should be catholic in character –
should include the best and most valuable books, landmarks of thought and
progress, in all cultivated languages, Oriental as well as European. What one
member of the family cannot, another may be able to read and appreciate. Nor
 ought such a library to be limited to a family only; the friends of the family, and
those whose friendship would do them honour, ought equally to have access to it;
and in our own case the motto on its every volume should virtually be, like that on
the books of Grolier and Maioli,

LINDESIORUM PRINCIPI,

COMITIS CRAFORDIAE,

ET AMICORUM.

On this principle of literary catholicity you will be prepared, I think (I cannot
answer for your mother’s or your grandmother’s sentiments in this respect) to
recognise and acquiesce in the frequent occurrence in this Report of books in languages – as, for example, Arabic, Turkish, Armenian, Persian, Sanscrit, Chinese, Japanese, and others – very foreign to our European ears. Among these exotic growths the Arabic, and especially the Persian, departments are well, the latter even richly provided, – we have a good number of valuable Turkish books, chiefly historical, – and a small but interesting collection of Japanese works; while the collection of Chinese literature is unusually complete, although I am still in search of many desiderata. I fear that the Chinese department of Chinese library must always occupy a larger amount of room than that of the other Oriental nations, – partly because literature has been cultivated in China for more than two thousand years, and its productions consequently surpass in number those of any other Eastern people, and partly because the art of printing from engraved blocks of wood, or what we style in Europe 'by xylography,' has been practised there for above half that period, rendering the acquisition of good editions of standard Chinese works tolerably easy; while, with the exception of a few Hindoo, Turkish, Persian, and Arabic books printed or lithographed during the last century by the English, Hindoos, and Mahometans in India, by the Turks at Constantinople, by the Persians at Tabriz and Teheran, and by Mehemet Ali and his successors at Boulac, (the suburb of Cairo), the great works of thought in these various languages must be sought for in manuscript, and such MSS., especially in complete condition, seldom nowadays appear in the European market. The question therefore arises, with respect to
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this MS. literature, whether it would be the wiser course to collect Oriental MSS. by agents specially commissioned for the purpose in those distant lands – where many such relics of the most precious description, both for literary value and artistic illumination might, I am convinced, be still obtained, – or, in lieu of this, to purchase the libraries of deceased Oriental scholars or collectors entire, retain the MSS. which may be considered desirable, and dispose of the remainder. Against the former and in favour of the latter course it may be urged that rare and valuable MSS. have to be waited for and watched for as desiderata in the East, as much as the corresponding rarities of European literature have to be waited and watched for in
the West; while each private collection bought entire represents, as it were, and concentrates into the moment of such sale and purchase a lifetime of watchful success and accumulation. The latter course appears to me therefore to be at once the most economical and surest, although the former may be worth adoption in particular cases, – and, in fact, I have already tried both expedients experiments with success. Meanwhile I have for some time past, as in the cases previously alluded to, carefully watched the sales of the libraries of the great Oriental scholars of Europe, with the view of securing such of their books or MSS. as fall within my scheme, – grieving in each instance for the loss to science of the scholars in question, but remembering that in almost all such cases the dispersion or disposal of libraries of a special description is a gain to the surviving children or relations of the defunct savant. [marginal asterisk: see below] Under any circumstances, and one way or the other, no delay should now take place in developing our Arabic, Persian, and other Oriental collections; for in the damp and uncared for book-rooms ^libraries^ of the East the MSS are perishing every day through neglect, partly in consequence of the development of printing and lithography in the countries where those arts have been established, superseding their use and value ^of MSS^; [single word struck though, illegible] ^and^ there are, on the other hand, indications in the not infrequent purchase of Oriental MSS. by Greeks, Turks, and Arabs in London, for retransport to the East, that a spirit of conservatism and appreciation – shall I even say, of bibliomania? – is awakening even under the noontime sun Oriental noontide sun, which has thus its effect in raising the price of such commodities in England and transporting them gradually back beyond our grasp to the soil of their nativity, – either way, consequently, pointing the moral that we should make our Oriental hay while the ^sun^ still shines upon us. I am half afraid that you will grudge the space upon our shelves (although not so very great after all) devoted to these Oriental literatures, but any such prejudice will soon dissipate itself in the purer air of liberal appreciation for which I plead. We of the Western world sin grievously against modesty

* Note on purchase of Bland Hamilton Forbes &c.
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in asserting ^assuming^, as we commonly do, like the Greeks but without their excuse, that all science, art, and literature not European must needs be inferior and uninteresting, in a word, barbarous. This is very far from being the case.

I have written this ^you^ this letter ^my dear Ludovic^ - not from Haigh or Dun Echt, but from our villa at San Domenico below Etruscan Fiesole, where I hope ere many days to hail your advent from England. The sky is clear, the sun is shining, the air is delicate and perfumed with the early violet, while the scent of the nespolo, so fragrant during the winter, is loath to leave us – and birds are beginning to sing, although the snow lies still on the Vallombrosa mountains, – the bells of Florence come in musical chorus across the slopes, rising and falling with the cadence of the breeze, – the vale of the Arno, glittering with villas, while in the sunshine, and bounded by grey rec receding hills, lies before me, expanding to the eye as I gaze down the gentle valley, the ‘Vale of Fair Women’ (as by its traditional name), which domesticates ^secludes^ our own domain, watered by the Africo, ^and^ clad everlastingly in olive green, and diversified with cypresses, pointing ^that point^ to the blue heavens with a finger more perennial and more eloquent than the obelisks of Thebes. All is as Gray painted it in one of his Latin poems, a farewell to Fiesole, a hundred years ago. And yet this scene and valley, so peaceful and secure, was once the refuge of the young and gay of Florence when the ‘Black Death’ reigned there and over all Italy in the fourteenth century, and when the conviti of Boccaccio passed the latter half of their ‘Decameron’ in a villa within these precincts, which some believe to be the one we now inhabit. But what is just now more specially present in my thoughts is another and yet still a literary memory. Turning Northwards, I see from our garden, above us, and below the towers[?] ^brow^ of Fiesole, the long line of the terraced gardens and villa of the Medici, ^the work of Michelozzo,^ where Cosimo and Lorenzo and their less worthy successors lived and died, and where the Platonic Academy held its meetings immortalised by Landino. I little thought in my boyhood when Cosimo and Lorenzo were the object of my worship at Eton, that I should one day dwell beside their favourite San Domenico, look up to their villa, ^the work of Michelozzo,^ and point to my son a parallel and a moral from their history. The parallel is this : – What commerce did, directly, for
the Medici in the fifteenth century, commerce has done indirectly for ourselves
^our own family^ in the nineteenth. In the days of Cosimo, with above thirty
baronies at our back and thousands of vassals ready to ride at our command, even
against the royal banners, our revenues in actual coin (even including those
received from the customs of sea-ports) were comparatively small, and would not
have availed for the collection of books or pictures, even had the taste for such gear
existed in those days in ^feudal^ Scotland. But now, when those thirty baronies are
to ourselves as things of the past, and we have, as a Spaniard would say, but one
‘hat’ to boast of, at least in Scotland, the growth of trade
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and commerce has, by a strange recompense, afforded us, through the possession of
col^fields^ in England, the means of doing that which our more powerful
ancestors, the contemporaries of Cosimo, could not have compassed — of building
up our old Library after the example of the Medici, and in the mode they would
themselves have acted upon had they been now living. The moral, on the other
hand, to be derived from the parallel is this : – It is the peculiarity of Britain that,
within ^under beneath the shadow of^ her time-honoured constitution, land and
commerce, aristocracy and democracy, authority and liberty, are reconciled and
balanced under the mild control of a Constitutional ^Limited^ Monarchy, crescent
through a thousand years – to the effect of bestowing on her, through the harmony
of this composition, a strength, vitality, and influence which no other land can
boast of. It is the privilege of certain of her families specially to represent this
harmony and reconciliation through their peculiar position as belonging on the one
hand by birth, rank, and landed-proprietorship, to the former, and through the
possession of mineral property, the sinews of manufactures and commerce, to the
latter of these antagonist yet friendly interests. Such is our own case; and from this
privilege there are arise duties, which I trust you will recognize and carry out in
active life more fully than I – seeking out these truths, and truth in general, in the
cloisters of retreat – have been able to do. Such families are the cardines, the hinges
of a society like ours in England, and, as such, are peculiarly bound to practise the
cardinal virtues — of Justice, in weighing and deciding between contending claims
and interests – of Prudence, in conciliating them – of Temperance, in political
judgment and action, generally – and of Fortitude, in resisting every temptation to swerve from the steady and unselfish path of patriotism. The representatives of Families of this stamp, belonging by the past to feudal, by the present to modern times, are bound by their position to be statesmen of a catholic, not a mere party type, friends at once to Order and to Progress, but to Progress tempered by Order — in the conviction that it is at all times true statesmanship and patriotism to support the weaker side where either party is worthy of esteem and honour — but especially so now, in this nineteenth century, for the purpose of maintaining that the balance of parties in the English constitution so long as it may be possible, and postponing that downward political prolapse which commences from the moment when either scale of the balance becomes permanently overweighted. These are views, in their extent, beyond any which the Medici were ripe for in the fifteenth century, — but what they did recognise and practise was that breadth and catholicity of taste and interest from which, as from their fount, the views I have just expressed derive and flow — and which may express itself with ourselves, as it did with Cosimo and Lorenzo, even in the peculiar and limited yet suggestive sphere of a library — of the Library, be it understood, which is the subject of this Report — and which I have sought to form, not as a bibliomaniac — for such were not the Medici — but by laying its broad foundations deep in utility usefulness, and bringing the spoils of many a distant land, through the compulsion of peace, towards its subsequent edification.

There is only now one final remark that I should wish to make before closing these introductory pages, – or, rather, it will be the reiteration and enforcement of one already made.

The Library which I thus bequeathe [sic], restored and amplified, to the Lindsays has not been purchased at a sacrifice of objects which some of them may perhaps think more important than the acquisition of books or pictures, whether old or new, – on the contrary, everything has gone on, so far as I have been concerned, in
the usual course, according to my father’s plans for the development of his property, without a single let or hindrance on my account; nor have the interests of my[?] brothers in the way of advances or assistance ever been sacrificed to claims of a similar nature promoted by myself. I have never advanced any such claims – I have had no debts paid for me – whatever has been done has been, one way or the other, from my own means – my allowance (although ample) has not exceeded that of the eldest sons of men of incomes much less than that of my father, – the sole difference is that, instead of spending my money in gambling and racing and other such toys that perish in the using, I have invested it to a great extent in collections which, in a merely pecuniary sense, will continually increase in value as years roll on, as public libraries multiply in the old and newly newer worlds, and as the wear and tear of time tells on both books in common with all other destructible objects. I count myself therefore ‘sackless’ in this matter. It is true that circumstances may change – the breeze of prosperity may desert our sails, as has been the case with us more than once in past centuries – and the bark of our fortunes may have to struggle with a “sour blast” of ruin and suffering; but in that contingency the Library will have its market value, and (unless it be exile or confiscation that oppresses us) my present investment may prove a future blessing, a purse in hand wherewith to start afresh in the battle with fortune. And even then, if this should take place, I feel confident (from the family instinct within me) that some future Earl or Master of Crawford – yourself or your successors – will in course of time build up again the ancestral ^‘Lindesian^ Library,’ as I have done.

That you may live long to appreciate and enjoy it, and may serve your Queen and country more effectually in many ways than I have done, is, like Hector’s prayer, that of,

My dearest Ludovic,

Your loving Father,

Lindsay

Florence, Feb. 1865
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<td>Liturgie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councils</td>
<td>Conciles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works of the Fathers</td>
<td>SS. Pères</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theologians</td>
<td>Théologiens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opinions singulières</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Religion Judaïque</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Religion des peuples orientaux</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appendice a la théologie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurisprudence (‘but meagrely represented’)</td>
<td>Jurisprudence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Droit de la nature et des gens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Droit politique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Droit civil et criminel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Droit canonique ou ecclésiastique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science and arts</td>
<td>Sciences et arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Sciences philosophiques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>Sciences physiques et chimiques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical and chemical sciences</td>
<td>Sciences naturelles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural sciences</td>
<td>Sciences médicales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical sciences</td>
<td>Sciences mathématiques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematical, pure and applied</td>
<td>Appendice aux sciences:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix, including occult philosophy (magic, sorcery, exorcism, divination, etc.); alchemy; and astrology</td>
<td>philosophie occulte; alchimie; astrologie; prédictions astrologiques et autres pronostications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The arts, fine and mechanical Arts mécaniques et métiers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gymnastic exercises Exercices gymnastiques</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Games Jeux divers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belles-lettres Belles-lettres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science of language and comparative grammar Linguistique</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhetoric (combined with Poetry under the heading 'Poetry, the Classics') Rhétorique</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poetry (see above) Poésie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prose fiction Fictions en prose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philology, or criticism Philologie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogues Dialogues et entretiens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epistles Épistolaires</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collected works of individual writers Polygraphes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collections of works of different authors on miscellaneous subjects Collections d’ouvrages et d’extraits de différents auteurs; recueils de pièces; mélanges</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History Histoire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography Prolégomènes historiques: Traités sur la manière d’écrire et d’étudier l’histoire, etc.; géographie; voyages; chronologie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universal history Histoire universelle, ancienne et moderne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of religion and superstition, mythology Histoire des religions et superstitions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancient history (treated under ‘Poetry, the Classics’ above) Histoire ancienne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern history Histoire modern</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplementary section of historical paralipomena including: history of chivalry and noblesse; archaeology; literary history; biography; bibliography Paralipomènes historiques: histoire de la chevalerie et de la noblesse; histoire des solennités, etc.; archéologie; histoire littéraire; biographie; bibliographie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 3: Lord Lindsay’s Annual Expenditure on the Bibliotheca Lindesiana, 1850–80

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Annual Expenditure (£ s. d.)</th>
<th>Expenditure with Quaritch (£ s. d.)</th>
<th>Quaritch’s Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>98 6 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>77 7 3</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1852</td>
<td>51 12 6</td>
<td>34 12 6</td>
<td>67.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1853</td>
<td>215 9 7</td>
<td>94 13 0</td>
<td>43.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1854</td>
<td>719 1 7</td>
<td>74 17 6</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1855</td>
<td>1,005 18 7</td>
<td>206 1 0</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1856</td>
<td>292 19 6</td>
<td>128 1 0</td>
<td>43.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1857</td>
<td>2,263 8 10</td>
<td>450 15 0</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1858</td>
<td>2,566 6 8</td>
<td>1,265 6 10</td>
<td>49.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1859</td>
<td>2,177 2 5</td>
<td>1,447 12 10</td>
<td>66.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>2,537 6 8</td>
<td>1,422 16 2</td>
<td>56.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861</td>
<td>3,134 3 8</td>
<td>1,441 13 3</td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1862</td>
<td>2,852 9 8</td>
<td>1,296 17 6</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1863</td>
<td>4,167 17 4</td>
<td>2,618 13 8</td>
<td>62.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1864</td>
<td>3,095 0 7</td>
<td>2,627 0 5</td>
<td>84.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1865</td>
<td>1,018 4 1</td>
<td>754 19 7</td>
<td>74.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1866</td>
<td>4,313 1 9</td>
<td>2,666 14 10</td>
<td>61.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1867</td>
<td>3,428 8 10</td>
<td>2,261 4 2</td>
<td>66.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1868</td>
<td>5,645 11 8</td>
<td>3,076 19 9</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1869</td>
<td>2,558 3 3</td>
<td>1,828 14 7</td>
<td>71.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>1,814 10 11</td>
<td>1,387 0 6</td>
<td>76.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>2,958 14 3</td>
<td>2,539 13 8</td>
<td>85.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1872</td>
<td>4,015 4 4</td>
<td>2,582 14 1</td>
<td>64.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1873</td>
<td>4,553 0 0</td>
<td>4,472 2 6</td>
<td>98.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1874</td>
<td>2,059 10 4</td>
<td>1,486 16 3</td>
<td>72.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Quaritch</td>
<td>Other booksellers</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875</td>
<td>3,296</td>
<td>18 5</td>
<td>2,947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>1,907</td>
<td>13 10</td>
<td>989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877</td>
<td>902</td>
<td>17 6</td>
<td>751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td>1,552</td>
<td>2 4</td>
<td>1,399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>3 3</td>
<td>361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>2 11</td>
<td>401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>66,415</td>
<td>18 6</td>
<td>43,015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix 4: Principal Suppliers to the Bibliotheca Lindesiana, 1850–79

The tables below record the total payments made by Lindsay to the top ten suppliers of the Bibliotheca Lindesiana during consecutive five-year periods, from 1850 to 1879.

1850–1854

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supplier</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Lilly, London</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry George Bohn, London</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernard Quaritch, London</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrews &amp; Co., London</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Frederick Molini, London</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upham &amp; Beet, London</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Wyllie &amp; Son, Aberdeen</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Straker, London</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas George Stevenson, Edinburgh</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Collins, London</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other suppliers</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>1,161</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 1855–1859

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supplier</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bernard Quaritch, London</td>
<td>3,497</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Lilly, London</td>
<td>2,095</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry George Bohn, London</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Frederick Molini, London</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Nutt, London</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upham &amp; Beet, London</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Willis/Willis &amp; Sotheran, London</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Fry, Cotham, Bristol</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrews &amp; Co., London</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Gancia, Brighton</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other suppliers</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,305</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1860–1864

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supplier</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bernard Quaritch, London</td>
<td>9,407</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>59.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Lilly, London</td>
<td>1,211</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Toovey, London</td>
<td>968</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willis &amp; Sotheran, London</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas &amp; William Boone, London</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Dix, Bristol</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Nutt, London</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick S. Ellis, London</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Fry, Cotham, Bristol</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles J. Stewart, London</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other suppliers</td>
<td>1,199</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>15,786</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 1865–1869

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supplier</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bernard Quaritch, London</td>
<td>10,588</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>62.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas &amp; William Boone, London</td>
<td>2,032</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick S. Ellis, London</td>
<td>976</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List &amp; Francke, Leipzig</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col. G. W. Hamilton’s exors, London</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William H. Allen &amp; Co., London</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asher &amp; Co., London</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Lilly, London</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry George Bohn, London</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willis &amp; Sotheran, London</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other suppliers</td>
<td>935</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,963</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1870–1874

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supplier</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bernard Quaritch, London</td>
<td>12,468</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>81.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Sotheran &amp; Co., London</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles J. Stewart, London</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. S. Ellis / Ellis &amp; Green / Ellis &amp; White</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Mozley Stark, London</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Boone &amp; Son, London</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molini &amp; Green, London</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dulau &amp; Co., London</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Lilly’s executors, London</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nattali &amp; Bond, London</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other suppliers</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>15,400</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 1875–1879

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supplier</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bernard Quaritch, London</td>
<td>6,448</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>78.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellis &amp; White, London</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles J. Stewart, London</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trübner &amp; Co., London</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert Cohn, Berlin</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Maidment, Edinburgh</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Mozley Stark, London</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Sotheran &amp; Co., London</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Paterson, Edinburgh</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Coleman, London</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other suppliers</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,195</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix 5: Schedule of Manuscripts Purchased by Enriqueta Rylands
in 1901

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>No. in Sotheran’s Schedule</th>
<th>Received at Longford Hall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>European</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek (besides papyri, ‘number unknown’)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungarian</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Icelandic</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slavonic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>663</strong></td>
<td><strong>475</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oriental</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic (besides papyri, ‘number unknown’)</td>
<td>795</td>
<td>794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persian</td>
<td>938</td>
<td>914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egyptian (hieroglyphic, hieratic, demotic, besides fragments)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coptic (besides papyri, ‘number unknown’)</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopian</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syriac</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samaritan</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenian</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Column1</td>
<td>Column2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parsi</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pashto</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanskrit</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pali</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindustani</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punjabi</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marathi</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinhalese</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kannada</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamil</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burmese</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siamese</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tibetan</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mongolian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Drawings</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Drawings</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achinese</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balinese</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batak</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buginese</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Javanese</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kawi</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madurese</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makasarese</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malay</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total           | 2,425   | 2,403   |
| Chinese Books and Manuscripts (about 8,000 běn) | 464 | 464 |
| Japanese Books and Manuscripts | 231 | 226 |
| TOTAL | 3,783 | 3,568 |

Sources: List of European and Oriental manuscripts compiled by A. B. Railton of Sotheran’s, July 1901; UML, Railton Papers, ABR/2/2. Lists of items received from Haigh Hall, 1901; UML, JRL Archive, JRL/6/1/6/1/5. Guardbook recording manuscripts and books received by the John Rylands Library from Longford Hall, 1904–06; UML, JRL Archive, JRL/6/1/7/14.

Sotheran’s schedule appears to have been compiled hastily, in order to facilitate the sale, and their totals were derived from the highest manuscript number in each series, overlooking the fact that some numbers were never used, and in the case of the Coptic manuscripts there were three extra volumes (2a, 20a and 23a). There were several deductions from the numbers in Sotheran’s list, including items which were retained at Haigh Hall as family manuscripts (heirlooms), were reclassified as printed books, or were not sold for some other reason; in a few cases, items could not be found at Haigh.

13 Latin manuscripts were left at Haigh as family manuscripts and 1 was transferred to printed books; 93 English manuscripts were left at Haigh, 6 were transferred to printed books, 34 were not sold (mainly autographs), 15 numbers were not used; 15 French manuscripts were left at Haigh as family manuscripts, 16 were not sold (mainly autographs); 1 Italian manuscript was not found, 1 was retained as a family manuscript, 1 was not sold; 1 Dutch manuscript was transferred to printed books; 2 German manuscripts were transferred to printed books and 1 was left at Haigh as a family manuscript; 1 Arabic number and 28 Persian numbers were not used; 6 Japanese books were not found, 1 was left at Haigh.
# Appendix 6: Index of Manuscripts Cited

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Manuscript Details</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum</td>
<td><strong>MS 37–1950</strong></td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester, John Rylands Library</td>
<td><strong>Coptic MS 17</strong></td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>English MS 1</strong></td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>French MS 5</strong></td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Greek Papyrus 53</strong></td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Italian MS 1</strong></td>
<td>232, 233, 246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Italian MS 2</strong></td>
<td>232, 234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Japanese 2</strong></td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Javanese MS 7</strong></td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Kawi MS 2</strong></td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Latin MS 1</strong></td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Latin MS 11</strong></td>
<td>56, 138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Latin MS 16</strong></td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Latin MS 24</strong></td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Latin MSS 29–31</strong></td>
<td>232, 233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Latin MS 32</strong></td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Latin MSS 32–37</strong></td>
<td>232, 234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Latin MS 41</strong></td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Latin MS 43</strong></td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Latin MS 44</strong></td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Latin MS 46</strong></td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Latin MS 47</strong></td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Latin MS 49</strong></td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Latin MS 55</strong></td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Latin MSS 56–64</strong></td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Latin MS 65</strong></td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Latin MS 74</strong></td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Latin MS 76</strong></td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Latin MS 81</strong></td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Latin MS 89</strong></td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Latin MS 100</strong></td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Latin MS 104</strong></td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Persian MS 308</strong></td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Persian MS 932</strong></td>
<td>170, 181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Punjabi MS 5</strong></td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Turkish MS 3</strong></td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York, Morgan Library &amp; Museum</td>
<td><strong>MS M.118</strong></td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>MS M.244</strong></td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>MS M.479</strong></td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>MS M.1134</strong></td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>