

1. Tamara Atkin, “William Powell’s Books: A 1553 Inventory of a Printer’s Stock”

In an article dated 1915, Henry Plomer announced his discovery of a suit brought in Common Pleas against William and Humphrey Powell by ‘a certain William Towley’, in Michaelmas 1553, which lists the contents of a London house, and includes the entire stock of a bookseller.¹ This stocklist of books is the subject of my proposed talk. Containing at least 171 batches of books, of which as many as 73 were printed before the beginning of the Reformation, the list is dominated by books of law and religious works and contains no fewer than six items printed by one of England’s first female printers, Elizabeth Pickering.

In my other work on this stocklist, I have focused on the works of conservative vernacular theology that dominate the list, but in this paper, I am interested in three of its other features. First, in its inclusion of a significant number of old books – books printed twenty years earlier or more – the list offers an important corrective to critical ideas about ‘print popularity’, since the remaining copies of some listed items suggest that new editions were occasionally issued before the first had sold out. Secondly, the presence in the list of at least four entries for wastepaper affords some useful insights into the scale of paper waste produced by book trade in Tudor England. And finally, the language used to distinguish books available for sale and other items in the inventory (including single copies of printed and manuscript books that seem to have formed all or part of the private library of the dwelling house) can help to untangle the various meanings of the word ‘libros’ as used in the inventory, which in turn has wider ramifications for the way we conceive of the unit ‘book’ (as both material object and immaterial work) in the sixteenth-century book trade.

2. Ben Card, “Thomas Barlow’s Socinian Reading List”

Thomas Barlow, sometime Bishop of Lincoln and Provost of the Queen’s College, Oxford, died on October 8, 1691, leaving a formidable mess of papers from six decades of church and academic work. Peter Pett was the first to collect an edition of some of these manuscripts, which he had printed as *The Genuine Remains of that Learned Prelate Dr. Thomas Barlow* (1693). Leading “the Van in the following Collection,” as Pett puts it, is the *Directions to a Young Divine for his Study of Divinity*, a long list of books organized under theological topics designed for students on the Oxford M.A.²

Soon after the publication of the *Remains*, however, Barlow’s former domestic chaplain and Lincoln prebendary Henry Brougham scorched Pett as a dishonest hack out to make quick

¹ H. R. Plomer, ‘An Inventory of Wynkyn de Worde’s House, “The Sun in Fleet Street”’, *The Library*, 3rd ser., 6 (1915), 228–34 (p. 228). For a transcription see my ‘Reading Late-Medieval Piety in Early Modern England’, in Laura Ashe and Vincent Gillespie, eds, *Medieval and Early Modern Religious Cultures* (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2019), pp. 209–42.

² *The Genuine Remains of That Learned Prelate Dr. Thomas Barlow, Late Lord Bishop of Lincoln* (London, 1693), sig. A2 r.

money. In his *Reflections to a Late Book, Entitled, The Genuine Remains* (1694), Brougham takes particular umbrage at the editing of the *Directions*, the largest editorial error being the inclusion of the “Syllabus of Socinian Questions.” On this catalogue of the clearest proponents of the Socinian heresy, a catalogue clearly designed for refutation, Brougham demands, “*Why it was Printed at all? Why at such an unfashionable time? Why under a false and improper Head? And why so lame and imperfect?/ Why Printed at all?*”³ Brougham goes on to include a dubious second syllabus at the end of his *Reflections*, purportedly another manuscript of Barlow with a list of anti-Socinian writers.

Circulating in manuscript as instructions for young students in divinity since at least 1650, Barlow’s *Directions* attracted controversy and correction the moment Pett printed them. Studying the *Directions* controversy of the 1690s adds to our understanding of Barlow,⁴ to the Socinian controversy,⁵ and to the university reading list: instrumental for divinity students training in polemical theology, the wrong kind of reading list published to the wrong kind of public is, as Brougham puts it, a “*Poison without it’s Antidote.*”⁶

3. Dennis Duncan, “The Map and the Territory: The Index in the First Centuries of Print”

‘Read, dear reader, the following table, / And soon under its guidance you will hold the entire work in your mind’. So runs the verse that heads up the index to a 1511 edition of Florus’s *Roman History*. It is a striking suggestion: we are not used to really *reading* indexes. We *use* them, *refer* to them, plunder them for our immediate needs, but that is not what is being proposed here. No wonder others were alarmed. In 1532, Erasmus wrote a whole book, the *Brevissima scholia*, in the form of an index, quipping in the preface that he had to write it this way because these days ‘many people read only them’. And a decade later we find Conrad Gessner expressing the same anxiety in more plaintive terms, worrying that indexes were being ‘misused by ignorant or dishonest men’. The printed index was only just coming into its own, and already alarums were being sounded that indexes were taking the place of the books they served.

This paper will look at the tension in the first two centuries of print between the index as *aide memoire* for the learned and as cribsheet for the lazy; as faithful timesaver, ‘the baby figure of the giant mass’ as Nestor puts it in *Troilus and Cressida*, and as something less reliable, a map on which only some features of the landscape appear.

³ Henry Brougham, *Reflections To a Late Book, Entitled, The Genuine Remains of Dr. Tho. Barlow, Late Bishop of Lincoln, Falsly pretended to be Published from His Lordship's Original Papers* (London, 1694), p. 11.

⁴ See William Poole, “Barlow’s Books: Prolegomena for the study of the library of Thomas Barlow (1608/9-91),” *Bodleian Library Record* (2017), pp. 13-46.

⁵ Cf. Sarah Mortimer’s work on the origins of Socinianism in England in *Reason and Religion in the English Revolution: The Challenge of Socinianism* (Cambridge: CUP, 2010).

⁶ Brougham, *Reflections*, p. 12.

4. Sharon J. Harris, “Masque Music in John Playford’s *English Dancing Master*”

This paper explores the convergence of a few lists: the Stationers’ Register, the table of contents in John Playford’s *The English Dancing Master* (1651), and lists of entries in a handful of early-to-mid-seventeenth-century manuscript songbooks. As part of a larger project tracing the impact of masques and masque music on English drama across the seventeenth century, this essay explores the possibility that Playford’s music publishing boom beginning in the 1650s began with music cribbed from Stuart masques and repurposed for domestic and recreational use.

The inclusion of ballad tunes in *The English Dancing Master* is well-known, but in 1999 Keith Whitlock speculated that Playford’s publication drew on music from masques as well. Whitlock overlaid these conjectures with tenuous connections drawn from Playford’s professional networks. He noted that Playford was apprenticed to John Benson, the stationer who registered a number of Ben Jonson’s poems and masques, and wondered if this gave Playford access to someone who had the music from Jonson’s masques, possibly Richard Brome. Over two decades later, we can now flesh out these possibilities with more details. As Colin Burrow notes, Benson’s source seems to have been associated with the court if not with the royal family itself, and Stacey Jocoy demonstrates how thoroughly royalist sensibilities infused Playford’s music publications in general. I test this hypothesis against lists of songs in a group of songbook manuscripts that indicate Playford’s larger musical network, which included former court and theatrical musicians. These songbook manuscripts include Bodleian MS Don. c. 57 and Paris Bibliothèque MS Res 2489. Reading these lists of music, I look for overlap that signals how court and theatrical music was reconceived and reused as part of an overarching trend to democratize English masques.

5. Eve Houghton, “Henrietta Bartlett and the 1916 *Census of Shakespeare Quartos*”

We know that the path-breaking *Census of Shakespeare Quartos* (1916) was the result of the collaborative labor of A.W. Pollard and Henrietta Bartlett, an early woman bibliographer whose life and scholarship has recently received more critical attention in the work of Adam Hooks, Zachary Lesser, and Molly G. Yarn, among others. But the 1916 *Census* was also collaborative in the sense that it was an early exercise in large-scale humanities data gathering. It was a project that required tact, goodwill, and diplomacy, because it involved the compilation of voluntary information from a large community of bibliographic stakeholders across the Atlantic. That community was not exclusively or even primarily composed of other Shakespeare scholars and academic bibliographers. Rather, Bartlett worked closely with private collectors and booksellers at major firms, a story that I argue has been under-told in histories of the bibliographic census. This paper asks questions about the sometimes fraught relationship between scholars and collectors through a reading of Bartlett’s self-described sometimes “antagonistic” relationship with collectors like Henry Folger. Building on recent work on the social construction of knowledge and the collaborative formation of bibliographic lists, this paper also asks how

Bartlett's gender framed her performance of scholarly sociability in a genteel bibliophilic world still almost entirely dominated by wealthy male collectors.

6. Alan H. Nelson, "Catalogues for Three 17th-Century Private Libraries: Procedures and Problems"

In the course of this paper I will consider three dispersed private libraries from the seventeenth century, which I will denominate Bradshawe, Dyson, and Smith. Reconstruction of these libraries means, in essence, creating lists of books or manuscripts for each library. For Smith, the catalogue is compiled from pre-existing printed or manuscript lists; for Bradshawe, the catalogue is compiled by searching for relevant books, pamphlets, and manuscripts, creating lists which didn't exist before; for Dyson, the catalogue is made from pre-existing manuscript lists, but supplemented by the discovery of books, broadsides, and manuscripts not included in the pre-existing manuscript lists. The choice of method is not arbitrary, but rather dictated by the nature of the surviving evidence. Nevertheless, each method has its problems, and its implications for understanding the nature of the now dispersed library.

7. Vimala C. Pasupathi, "ALL THAT I READ IS IN THE MUSTER-BOOKE"

My paper is about muster books, objects that are a different kind of book list than what we might typically mean in a seminar like this. Sometimes called a "roll" or "file" in addition to a book, muster books are themselves lists, or rather, sets of lists that are compiled like sediment over time.

In addition to framing how we should understand these as historical records, I will consider them as Patricia Cahill has rightly described them in her 2008 study, *Unto the Breach: Martial Formations, Historical Trauma, and the Early Modern Stage* (Oxford University Press): as a "key stage property" in early modern drama that is "intimately bound up with" the "projects" of an emergent centralized state (72). Excerpted from a long chapter in my book manuscript, my paper builds on Cahill's work to offer a fuller consideration of these documents in English drama and on English soil across the country. It will describe the labor behind these lists' production as both a form of historiography and a socially productive enterprise, one that did not only work to "reduce discrete particulars to abstraction" and subordinate local concerns to national ones as Cahill argues, but that could also establish alternative networks of authority rooted in regional affective experience and communal memory.

8. Elizabeth Rivlin, "(En)Listing Shakespeare in the Great Books"

I argue in this paper that Shakespeare's ubiquity in twentieth-century book lists associated with the Great Books program had two reciprocal effects: Shakespeare helped define the concept of the "great book" that took hold in the public imagination, and the lists shaped the public reception of Shakespeare in ways that still resonate today.

Mortimer Adler, co-founder of the Great Books program and the figure most intimately connected to it, observed in his autobiography that "I keep on making book lists without end."

Indeed, Adler's archives contain a series of meticulous typed great books lists that span some thirty years, beginning with John Erskine's list of 52 authors taught in the General Honors Course in the 1920s at Columbia, in which Adler was first a student and then an instructor, and eventually resulting in a list of 74 authors whose works would comprise the Great Books of the Western World, published in 54 volumes by Encyclopedia Britannica in 1952. Through many iterations and variations, Shakespeare remained a constant. He was one of only 19 authors from Erskine's original list who received unanimous approval from a committee tasked with revising the General Honors list during the 20s, and one of only 29 who appeared on every great books list that Adler had a hand in and kept in his files.

In the deliberations over these lists, Shakespeare's greatness was assumed rather than argued for, which meant that his works could be summoned to measure the questionable worthiness of other books and invoked as definitional to criteria of greatness on the basis of his alleged atemporality, permanence, and exceptionality. At the same time, Shakespeare was surrounded in these lists by classical Greek and Roman writers, philosophers, theologians, and continental Europeans. These contexts helped consolidate Shakespeare's status as a "classic" on par with Plato and Aristotle, two other mainstays of great books lists; made him representative of European and "western" traditions; and implied that his works were philosophical in nature and participated in "the history of ideas" that Adler and his associates believed structured the relationships between the great books. Above all, Shakespeare's inevitable presence in great books reading lists enlisted him as a key player in Adler's grand ambition to achieve the self-education of a democratic public, suggesting that for ordinary Americans, reading Shakespeare was not only a means of self-improvement but also a matter of civic and national duty.

9. Jessica Rosenberg, "Doing Lists: Recipe, Experiment, Scheme"

This paper will look at the form and function of the instructional list, focusing on the related cases of printed and manuscript recipes, books of secrets, and other direction-giving genres. How do such instructions use the form of the list to register the sequence of action and the order of method? I'll take special interest in the visual, grammatical, and verbal punctuation of action: mise-en-page (like line breaks), grammatical pointing, and verbal units of sequential division (when, then, after, take, etc). These formulae provide one link between the styles of recipe, secret, and, eventually, experiment (and they comprise one dimension of the "recipe-like format" that Peter Dear has noted in early communications among the Royal Society.) Like scientific experiment, and like theatre, such serialized methods turn on the delicacy of timing and the potential for repetition. The paper concludes by asking how an understanding of such methodical listing might help us understand the form and operation of schemes in Shakespeare's comedies, which likewise turn on the giving of direction and the segmentation of action. How might the punctuation of method that we witness in books of secrets and recipes shed light on the role of such schemes as closed parcels of action within comic narratives (for example, Oberon's directions to Puck in 2.1, the Lord's stage-management in *Shrew's* Induction)? I am especially curious here about which directions follow a strict sequence and which do not, which are finite and which open-ended, which possess the closure of method and which the looseness of mood, or style.

10. Scott Schofield, “Reading the Lists in Accession Book 1: John Davis Barnett’s Shakespeare Collection”

In 1918, the Stratford Ontario Grand Trunk Railway Engineer, public intellectual, and avid book collector, John Davis Barnett, donated his private library of more than 42,000 books to the University of Western Ontario. While Barnett collected a wide range of subject matter, he was especially proud of his more than 1500 books and pamphlets of Shakespeareana. Indeed, Barnett’s Shakespeare holdings are conveniently captured in his Accession Book 1, a handwritten list he first created in 1899 and then added to in subsequent years. In addition, a high percentage of Barnett’s library still survives and can be found in Western Library’s special collections, open stacks and storage facilities.

This paper will focus on Barnett’s Accession Book 1, particularly the long list of entries which are subdivided over more than twenty headings. I will situate Barnett’s collecting and classification of titles within his particular historical moment. The period in which Barnett collected Shakespeare, ca. 1870-1920, is famous. One instantly thinks of the American collections amassed by Henry Clay Folger, Horace Howard Furness, Joseph Crosby and others. To what extent does Barnett’s collection, and in particular its organization, reflect the collecting protocols of other American, Canadian and British collectors? Are the headings of “Bibliography - Book lists etc.,” “Forgeries and Discussions of Authorship,” “Falstaff,” etc. in his Accession Book used in other collections of the time, or are they unique to Barnett? What might a closer look at specific titles in the list, and the accompanying books that survive, teach us about where and how Barnett acquired his Shakespeare titles? Finally: how might we best record and capture Barnett’s Shakespeare library in an accessible digital form?

11. Mary Erica Zimmer, “Retail at Scale?: Rookes, Rhetoric, and Reading Lists”

This paper places into multiple contexts the 1666-67 post-Fire inventory of the London stationer Thomas Rookes, as represented in his published catalogue of the same (Wing R1917B). How might this inventory’s size, framing, and scope shed light on circumstances under which Rookes engaged in the trade, as well as his relative success within it and the scale and locations of his work? Constructing further lists of Rookes’s known publications provides a lens through which one may begin to comprehend the massive catalogue’s implications, including its likely rationale of organization and potential connections that may exist between shop and store. Developing a sense of Rookes’s more diverse commercial interests—as suggested by recurring emphases in his publications’ imprint lines, as well as in his various other forms of self-promotion—also brings forward further potential models for understanding the distinctive case his work presents.