

GOOD DUKE HUMFREY: BOUNDER, CAD AND BIBLIOPHILE

DAVID RUNDLE

The text that follows is closely based on the 2013 Christmas Lecture to the Volunteer Guides of the Bodleian Library, with the addition of references and an Appendix listing the extant manuscripts from Humfrey's collection as we presently know them. The author would like to thank Marilyn Tresias for the invitation to speak, and Felice Vermeulen for her skilful organisation of the enjoyable event.¹

When I was invited to talk to you about Humfrey, duke of Gloucester, on whose library I have worked intermittently for over a decade, I accepted with alacrity. Standing here now, I wonder whether I should have tread with more angelic steps. Sitting at the back of your business meeting a moment ago, it struck me that I was about to lecture to people all of whom are themselves expert in being the speaker, rather than the passive listener. Not only that but you are the guides to this institution, Thomas Bodley's successor foundation to that endowed by the Good Duke, by Bodley's own calculation the fourth Library of the University of Oxford – the third being Humfrey's, the second that provided by Thomas Cobham, bishop of Worcester and the first (moving back beyond history into the mists of myth) that donated by King Alfred. What, I am wondering, can I tell you that you do not already know about the man largely responsible for the third library of the University of Oxford?

You certainly do not need me to remind you that Humfrey delighted in being described as the son, brother and uncle of kings. He was the youngest boy of Henry Bolingbroke who, when Humfrey was not yet ten, usurped the English throne from his cousin, Richard II, and was crowned Henry IV. Humfrey was brother to Henry V who, at Agincourt, saved his youngest sibling's life when Humfrey, thrown from his horse, lay prone on the ground, with Henry standing over him, fighting off assailants until the duke of Gloucester could be pulled to safety. And he was uncle to Henry VI who, it has been said, moved from the inanity of childhood to imbecility without the intermission of lucidity that usually occurs between those two states. He was, in his nephew's long minority, England's Protector – not its Regent, and that was an issue of some contention. Moreover, from 1435, following the death of his last surviving elder brother, John, duke of Bedford, Humfrey was heir apparent to the throne.²

The heir apparent who, as you also well know, ended his life on 23rd February 1447 at St Saviour's Hospital on the outskirts of Bury St Edmunds, arrested on an accusation of treason against his own nephew. The manner of his death was cause for him to be awarded posthumously the sobriquet of 'Good'. Those contemporaries who may have been in a position to know did not suggest any foul play was involved in the duke's death but the circumstances allowed those of a more suspicious bent to smell the scent of conspiracy and murder. In the sixteenth century, the most frequent explanation was that he had been smothered 'between two featherbeds', though others said he had been strangled – that is the version that appears in the Folio text of Shakespeare's *2 Henry VI* – while some suggested that the murder had been hidden by effecting it in the fashion perpetrated earlier upon his great-great-grandfather, Edward II: as the martyrologist John Foxe put it, 'a whole spit [was] privily forced into his body'.³ In the immediate wake of the duke's demise, his downfall was taken by those discontented with the regime as a symbol of the end of good statesmanship. There is something fitting that two of the battles of what we know of as the Wars of the

Roses should have been fought close by the chantry chapel erected for him in the Abbey of St Albans.

Yet, later political historians have not been so quick to find goodness in the Duke. Rather, the general opinion is that – saving his nephew – Humfrey was the runt of the Lancastrian pack: he lacked the political shrewdness of his father, Bolingbroke, the charisma of his eldest sibling, Henry V, or even the downright competence of his closest brother in age, John, duke of Bedford. Humfrey was, these historians say, hot-headed, cack-handed and tight-fisted – but, they go on, at least he liked books.⁴

About the books, of course, you, the volunteer guides of the Bodleian, can provide visitors with a wealth of information. You can tell them that he amassed a large collection, some presented to him by their authors, some sent to him from the Continent (from Lancastrian France and from the cities of Italy), some given to him (more or less willingly), and many bought by him.⁵ What is all the more striking is that, in his own lifetime, he gave away something in the region of three hundred of them in a series of donations to the University of Oxford, between the late 1430s and 1444; some – but not all – of those gifts were listed by volume in the University's Register.⁶ The University also believed it was the rightful inheritor of the rest of his collection but Oxford was to be thwarted in that aspiration. On his death, the crown claimed that the Duke had died intestate – a claim strongly challenged by the University but to no avail.⁷ The result was that Humfrey's possessions passed into the hands of the crown, and his books were dispersed, with some (but by no means all of them) suffering the sorry fate of ending up in Cambridge, at King's College, Henry VI's new foundation, the sister of the chantry school he founded at Eton. The Reformation saw significant deprivations to that college, so much so that only one of Humfrey's manuscripts now resides there and only another one is known.⁸ That said, the manuscripts he gave to the University of Oxford did not fare much better.

Humfrey's books had originally been stored in what we know of as the Old Library, the first-floor space in the semi-detached university accommodation adjoining the Church of St Mary the Virgin.⁹ As you know, the University authorities decided to revise the plans they had already made for the Divinity School, so that that building could house on its first floor a new library room, suitable for the donations of the Duke and of others.¹⁰ It opened in 1488 but its heyday was brief: by the very middle of the sixteenth century, it was closed and its books dispersed. How that came to happen is something to which I will return at the end of this talk.

The result of the two dispersals of Humfrey's library – that immediately following his death and the other in the sixteenth century – leaves us, presently, with just under 50 manuscripts from a collection which probably comprised, at a necessarily rough estimate, between 500 and 600 manuscripts: an overall survival rate of under 10%.¹¹ This masks some variation because, in fact, the books given to the University of Oxford have suffered worse than those he did not donate. Of the 274 listed in the University Register, only 14 are presently identifiable: a survival rate of 5%. Of those, just three are in the Bodleian, with another two of Humfrey's books, not originally given to Oxford, now resident in the library; in the Oxford colleges, we can now count seven manuscripts, of which probably four come from those donated to the University.

How do we identify a manuscript as once having belonged to the Duke? As I have just mentioned, the relevant Register of the University of Oxford includes inventories of three of the gifts that Humfrey made and, on occasion, a manuscript can be matched with the

information that provides.¹² More often, though, the evidence for his ownership comes from the Duke's own hand, for Humfrey was one of those virtuous collectors (from a book-historian's point of view) who cannot resist writing in their books. In many of his volumes, Humfrey adds a formula announcing his ownership either at the front or at the final colophon – sometimes both and occasionally a few times in more places. In its basic usual form it reads: 'Cest livre est A moy homfrey duc de gloucestre'. On occasion, he is even more helpful, giving not just his name but details of how he came by a book – whether he was given it (and, if so, he sometimes mentions when) or he bought it (for instance, from a late acquaintance's executors).¹³ More rarely, but also significantly, he adds a motto to mark his ownership. I want to concentrate for a moment on one of those. At the very top of the first leaf of a copy of a medical treatise by Albucasis, which opens with an illumination of his coat-of-arms, he adds 'Loyale et belle A gloucestre' – 'loyal and beautiful to Gloucester', in the feminine.¹⁴ The gender of those adjectives has led to the suggestion that this was, in fact, a spousal gift – some say from Humfrey to his wife, others from her to him – but there is no reason to assume either scenario.¹⁵ The motto is definitely written in Humfrey's script and there are other signs of his interest in this manuscript: he notes a section on cures for baldness (and, in that, I have some empathy with him). The use by a husband of a phrase that might seem more relevant to his wife is not unknown in other manuscripts of the fifteenth century – there is a well-known example of such coupled mottoes in a codex that was owned by Humfrey's brother, John, duke of Bedford.¹⁶ We should perhaps take it as a display of uxoriousness, a symbol of his love for his wife. That wife was the ill-fated Eleanor Cobham, who would end her life in prison – a little like her husband, though her confinement lasted decades not days and was as a result of her attempts, in 1441, to use sorcery to predict when Humfrey would be king.¹⁷ Eleanor was a distant relative of the Cobham, bishop of Worcester, who founded the University's second library (on Bodley's counting); it was surely not, however, for that family association Humfrey came to marry her.¹⁸ Indeed, that he married her at all was, to some people's eyes a scandal, and this brings me to what you have been waiting for: Good Duke Humfrey as bounder and cad.

The reason Humfrey's interest in Eleanor Cobham raised both eyebrows and ire was that it involved abandoning his first wife, the woman known in English as Jacqueline of Hainault but named in other European languages as Jacqueline (or Jacoba) of Bavaria.¹⁹ She had come to England in Henry V's reign, seeking support for her claim to win her inheritance in the Low Countries which had been occupied by her uncle. The king's intention seems to have been to use his protection of Jacqueline as an opportunity to put pressure on his Burgundian allies. After Henry's death, Humfrey decided to continue that policy by marrying her – not recognising, his peers said, that, in the changed circumstances after the king's death, such strong-arm tactics were no longer sensible. The Duke attempted a military foray into the Low Countries in 1424-25 but with little success, leaving his wife imprisoned and Eleanor Cobham, a lady-in-waiting to Jacqueline, in her bed.

Yet, Humfrey's love-life was not as simple as such a summary suggests. Those contemporaries – including a delegation of the women of London – who were scandalised by the Duke's abandoning of Jacqueline would surely have been all the more shocked if they had known the full story, which we can piece together from the flyleaves of one manuscript. It is a copy of the poems of Jean Froissart, probably brought by the author himself to England in 1395.²⁰ In the early fifteenth century, it was owned by Richard Beauchamp, earl of Warwick, as showed by an inscription at the front of the book. Below that, and on the back flyleaf also, there are notes in another hand, that of Humfrey himself. In some he declares his affection for Jacqueline, writing 'Cest bien saison A Jaque de Bavarie', but others among the

notes reveal that he was not a model of constancy. On more than one occasion, he writes ‘plus laide nya Jaque de Bavarie’ – there is no one uglier than Jacqueline. Ungallant, indeed, but if we wonder why he wrote this, the explanation comes from the same page, for he also writes ‘plus belle nya my waryny’, identifying the new object of his affections not as Eleanor but as Warigny, that is Jeanne de Warigny, wife of one Jacqueline’s equerries. Clearly, hopping from Jacqueline’s bed to Eleanor’s involved a skip and maybe a jump as well.

It is likely that this does not exhaust the list of Humfrey’s love conquests. There must have been at least one other mistress, though we cannot identify her by name. He acknowledged having two illegitimate children, Arthur, who was arrested with him at Bury St Edmunds, and Antigone (an unusual name but one not unknown in fifteenth-century England). The latter married and, in 1436, had her first child, suggesting that she must have been born at the latest at the time of Humfrey’s Burgundian escapade and perhaps a little earlier.²¹ Given all this activity, it is little wonder that the Duke’s surgeon, Gilbert Kymer, later to be Chancellor of this University, when writing medical guidance for Humfrey during his time in the Low Countries, suggested, as the text’s learned eighteenth-century editor put it, that his master may be too given to the ways of Venus. The burden of the advice is that sex is good for you, but not that much.²²

If we turn a few years later, though, when Humfrey had settled into married life with Eleanor – a union which was to have no issue – it seems that his attentions had shifted from female flesh to the flesh of animals that is parchment. This may be a double optical allusion: the evidence may understate the Duke’s continuing virility and it may be that he was busily collecting manuscripts in the 1420s, but most of the evidence we have for his bookish activities does come from the later part of his life. To those books I should finally return and consider the issue that I mentioned earlier: how come the collection so generously provided for the University of Oxford could perish little more than a century after it had been donated?

The story often told – you may have told it yourself to visitors to the Bodleian – talks of a catastrophe inspired by Reformation zeal. In campaigns to stamp out superstition, there were government Visitations of the University in 1535 and in 1549. Tales of books being thrown out from college libraries come from the first Visitation but it was in the wake of the second that the University decided to close its Library. It is sometimes claimed that the closure was preceded by a bonfire of the Library’s books and that only a tiny remnant of the collection remained in the University’s possession.²³

This, though, both understates and misdescribes the loss. It understates in as much as it is sometimes said that one manuscript did survive the destruction as the property of the University. It is a commentary on Valerius Maximus which has been in the Bodleian nearly all this ‘modern’ Library’s life and was included in its very first catalogue of 1602, but it was not originally intended to be held in the University Library: it was made on the orders of John Whethamstede, abbot of St Albans for Gloucester College (on the site of what is now, by a change of geographical affiliation, Worcester College).²⁴ In other words, there is no survivor from the third Library of the University that stayed in situ until Bodley’s founding of his fourth Library. The loss in the mid-sixteenth century was complete.

At the same time, for all the evocative tales of pages flying in the wind like butterflies, there is no contemporary evidence to prove that there was, in fact, any conflagration somewhere close to where we sit this evening that engulfed Humfrey’s tomes. The tales of that occurring are heard first in the seventeenth century and they may not reflect any accurate memory

stretching back to the 1540s. It is certainly the case in the second quarter of the sixteenth century that, in England, whole libraries were closed, their contents thrown out, often to be dismembered, individual pages to be used in wrapping gloves or binding books.²⁵ That practice was the result both of Reformation events – the Dissolution of the Monasteries as well as the rooting out of popish practices – and of new technology, the arrival of printed books pushing out of place old handwritten volumes that were now outdated and, for many, not yet so ‘retro’ they were fashionable. That something like this happened to part of the University Library is suggested by a note in one manuscript, now in Oxford’s Corpus Christi College. Beneath Humfrey’s ownership note, a later possessor, John Dee, the Elizabethan scholar and astrologer, records that he had bought the manuscript in 1557, when it was sold by weight.²⁶ It very much sounds as if this manuscript – and others – was on the market not for its content but for its residual value as scrap.

However, there were – I want to suggest to you today – other more specific reasons why the third University Library died. To demonstrate this, I want to introduce, finally, another manuscript, one which was not recognised as being either Humfrey’s or the University’s until I made the fortunate discovery ten years ago. It is a celebrated manuscript, produced in the late eleventh century for the Abbey of Thorney and is known as the Thorney Computus.²⁷ At the end of this heavy tome there is an inscription that has been erased and not previously deciphered but, under ultra-violet light, it is legible and explains that this book belongs to Humfrey, duke of Gloucester and was given to him by the Abbot of Thorney in 1431. One wonders whether one or more of the monks had a tear in his eye when he saw the monastery’s most precious manuscript being carried off in the Duke’s entourage. Humfrey himself did not enjoy ownership of it for very long, since, in 1439, it was to be part of his first large donation to the University, and is recorded as such in the Register. What is relevant for us now, though, is not how it arrived in Oxford but how it departed – and that was in the saddle-bags of an alumnus, antiquary and, yes, book-thief called Robert Talbot (1505/6-1558).²⁸ This man had form as a remover of volumes from libraries: there is a letter from 1531 noting that a book wanted by Thomas Cromwell was not in place in New College Library and it was conjectured that it was in Talbot’s hands, for someone had seen him with it, with its chain still dangling from it.²⁹ Significantly, Talbot had left Oxford in or by that same year of 1531, putting the loss of the Thorney Computus to at least four years before the first Reformation Visitation of the University. This is a loss that cannot be put down to the impact of the government imposition of religious change.

I take this manuscript as emblematic of a wider phenomenon. We know that, in the early sixteenth century, there were difficulties with the Library keeping to its stated opening hours – perhaps the chaplain who was supposed to climb the turret to unlock the door did not want to cross over from his base in the University Church in the rain. We also know that borrowing, quite against the rules of the Library, was in some cases happening.³⁰ And we know that the result was that when the scholar John Leland came to Oxford in the later 1530s to study the manuscripts in the Library, he had access to a catalogue and had to record that some of the books he wanted to see had been stolen.

This is not to deny that a decision must have been made at some point, probably in the aftermath of the 1549 Visitation, to close the Library, dispense with the remaining books, sell off the furniture and use the now-empty space for storage. That decision was taken in a context of confessional conflict, certainly, but before that decision had taken place there had been, I would suggest, decades of decline. This was not a death by a single catastrophe or deluge, it was a death drip by drip, made possible by a lack of attention that inspired others to

pay the Library disrespect. Someone like Talbot, in a situation when he entered the cold Library room and saw some books already removed, may have reasoned to himself that the beautiful volume he had before him would be safer in his hands than on that dusty shelf – and he may have been right.

Why, though, should that decline have begun in the first place? Why did the university's authorities not appreciate that this Library was one of their major assets? The answer probably has several elements. The arrangements for the librarian, as I have suggested, may have been less than fit for purpose. Moreover, in a town where several colleges had their own libraries, the need for a central collection might have seemed to some an otiose addition, and one which would be a drain on resources. This was a library rich in books but not in financial endowment; in such a situation, its long-term viability would have been open to question in any situation but in one when the change of technology made the Library look yet more old-fashioned, not to say, redundant, the arguments against its retention were likely to have been yet more persuasive.

We, of course, are living through a second information technology revolution, when the Bodleian itself faces new challenges. We might wonder whether it can survive or whether it will suffer the fate of the third Library. Will this present incarnation prove, as boasted in the founder's motto, *Quarta perennis*, to be perennial, to live forever? That, of course, is a question to which we hope we will not be able to respond with certainty: it is only if it fails that we will be in a position to give a categorical answer. But, at the very least, though, I have some faith that it will last some years longer. What allows me to have such confidence? Because of you sitting in front me. You, the Volunteer Guides, are a demonstration of how cherished and respected the institution is. You are the loyal guardians of its history and, thus, of its future. For that, Volunteer Guides, I salute you.

APPENDIX

MANUSCRIPTS ONCE OWNED (OR OTHERWISE) BY HUMFREY, DUKE OF GLOUCESTER

The late twentieth century saw two scholarly listings of books surviving from the collection of Humfrey, duke of Gloucester: the first was compiled by Berthold Ullman, first published in 1955 and revised in 1973; shortly after the later version, in 1980, the Maltese scholar, Alfonso Sammut, provided a slightly expanded catalogue. The purpose of this appendix is to update and, where necessary, to correct Sammut's listing. It includes eight manuscripts identified since 1980, and one case where an identification had been forgotten; information that has come to light since the publication of Sammut's work is marked below in bold. At the same time, the present listing excludes two manuscripts listed by Sammut that were not in fact owned by the duke; they are mentioned in a separate table along with those now known not to be Humfrey's but listed as such by Ullman.

In both tables, the details provided are intentionally brief. In the listing of identified extant manuscripts, the arrangement is thus:

1. a running numbering of the list
2. the next column provides the present shelfmark, with a previous shelfmark, in brackets, following the term *olim* noted when that was used in twentieth-century scholarship. In this column, the following standard abbreviations for libraries are used:

BL British Library

BNF Bibliothèque nationale de France

3. the third column gives a record of the contents, as well as, in brackets, the place and date of publication; when a manuscript is undated and not datable, Ker's system of dating is employed (with, for instance, s. xv¹ signifying the first half of the fifteenth century).
4. in the fourth column, an explanation of the evidence linking the book with Humfrey is noted. By 'short ex libris' is meant Humfrey's ownership note which usually takes the form of 'Cest livre est A moy homfrey duc de gloucestre' (slight variants exist). By 'long' is meant the same formula followed by a further phrase, usually explaining how the duke came to own the manuscript. Some later owners

attempted to remove the signs of his possession of the book and the removal could take several forms – most commonly, either erasure or rewashing – all of which methods are covered below by the term ‘effaced’. For those manuscripts known to be in the duke’s donations to the University of Oxford, the manuscript is identifiable by the *verba probatoria*, signified below by ‘2^o fo.’, followed by, in brackets, the date of the donation.

5. The last column provides a reference to the first printed notice of a manuscript’s provenance as being from Humfrey’s library. Only for the discoveries made since the mid-twentieth century is there any attempt to note who first announced the association between a volume and the duke. For the most part, the information below concentrates on the various listings of the duke’s books made since Thomas Warton’s impressive reconstruction in the 1770s. For those listings, the following abbreviations are used:

<i>DHL</i>	[Bodleian Library, Oxford exhibition catalogue] <i>Duke Humfrey’s Library and the Divinity School 1488 – 1988</i> (Oxford, 1988).
Macray	W. D. Macray, <i>Annals of the Bodleian Library Oxford</i> [2 nd ed] (Oxford, 1890 [reprint 1984]), pp. 6 – 11.
Madden	F. Madden ed., <i>Matthaei Parisiensis ... Historia Anglorum</i> , 3 vols [Rolls Series, 44], i (London, 1866), p. xxxix.
<i>Pietas Oxoniensis</i>	<i>Pietas Oxoniensis in Memory of Sir Thomas Bodley, Knt. and the Foundation of the Bodleian Library</i> (Oxford, 1902), p. 11n.
Sammut	A. Sammut, <i>Unfredo e gli umanisti italiani</i> (Padua, 1980), pp. 98 – 126.
Thomson, <i>Corpus</i>	R. M. Thomson, <i>A Descriptive Catalogue of the Medieval Manuscripts of Corpus Christi College, Oxford</i> (Cambridge, 2011).
Ullman	B. L. Ullman, ‘Manuscripts of Duke Humfrey of Gloucester’ in id., <i>Studies in the Italian Renaissance</i> , 2 nd ed. (Rome, 1973), pp. 345 – 56.
Vickers	K. Vickers, <i>Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester</i> (London, 1907), pp. 426 – 38.
Warton	T. Warton, <i>The History of English Poetry</i> , 3 vol.s (London, 1774 – 1781), ii (1778), pp. 44 – 50.

Keeping with the brevity of presentation, citation of an article in that column is by journal, without article title.

The first table numbers each of the manuscripts. In the second table, listing those erroneously attributed to Humfrey, each entry is signified by a majuscule letter. In that listing, the first two columns of information follow the same conventions as the first table. The third column explains the source of the attribution, using the abbreviations as listed above. In the final column, a few words are given explaining why the attribution is to be rejected.

I. EXTANT MANUSCRIPTS ONCE OWNED BY HUMFREY, DUKE OF GLOUCESTER

Number	Shelfmark	Contents	Proof of Ownership	First bibliographical Reference
[1].	BRUXELLES: BIBLIOTHÈQUE ROYALE, MS. 9627 - 8	French romances (Flanders, s. xiii ²)	short ex libris	Ullman, no. 32.
[2].	CAMBRIDGE: GONVILLE & CAIUS COLLEGE, MS. 183 / 216	Seneca, <i>Epistolae</i> (Italy, s. xv¹)	effaced long ex libris	Rundle in this journal, xvi (1998), pp. 299 – 313.
[3].	CAMBRIDGE: KING'S COLLEGE, MS. 27	Athanasius, trans. Beccaria (Greenwich, early 1440s)	Beccaria's autograph	Vickers, p. 435.
[4].	CAMBRIDGE: ST JOHN'S COLLEGE, MS. C. 10	Frulovisi, <i>Comedies</i> (Greenwich, 1436 x 1438)	effaced short ex libris	Sammut, p. 100.
[5].	CAMBRIDGE: UNIVERSITY LIBRARY, MS. Ee. ii. 17	Giles of Rome and Vegetius in French trans. (France, s. xv ^{in?})	long ex libris	P. Meyer, <i>Romania</i> , xv (1886), pp. 265.
[6].	CAMBRIDGE: UNIVERSITY LIBRARY, MS. Gg. i. 34 (i)	Poggio, Guarino and del Monte, Scipio / Caesar Controversy (London?, 1440)	effaced ex libris	Rundle in this journal, xvi (1998), pp. 211 – 224.
[7].	CLITHEROE: STONYHURST COLLEGE, MS. XXIV	Henry, duke of Lancaster, <i>Le Livre de Seyntz Medicines</i> (England, 1354)	long ex libris	Ullman, no. 30.
[8].	LEIDEN: UNIVERSITEITSBIBLIOTHEEK, MS. Hebr. Scaliger 8 (MS. Or. 4725)	Hebrew Psalter (England, s. xii ²)	identified as volume 'in manibus ducis	G. I. Lieftinck, <i>Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society</i> , ii

			glocestrie perditur’ from St. Augustine’s Canterbury	(1955), pp. 97 – 104.
[9].	LONDON: BL, MS. Cotton Nero E. v	<i>Acta of the Council of Constance</i> (England?, s. xv ^{2/4})	long ex libris; 2° fo. (1444)	Madden.
[10].	LONDON: BL, MS. Harl. 33	William of Ockham, <i>Dialogue</i> (France, s. xv ⁱⁿ)	2° fo. (1444)	Vickers, pp. 429 – 30.
[11].	LONDON: BL, MS. Harl. 1705	Plato, <i>Republic</i> , I – V (trans. Decembrio)	long ex libris	Warton, p. 48.
[12].	LONDON: BL, MS. Harl. 3426	Plutarch et al. (trans. Bruni)	effaced long ex libris; 2° fo. (1444)	Identified by A. C. de la Mare: DHL, no. 37.
[13].	LONDON: BL, MS. Royal 2 B. i	Psalter (London?, 1420s)	partially effaced ex libris	Vickers, p. 432.
[14].	LONDON: BL, MS. Royal 5 F. ii	Athanasius (trans. Beccaria) (Greenwich, 1438 – 1444)	repeated ex libris; 2° fo. (1444)	Warton, p. 49.
[15].	LONDON: BL, MS. Royal 14 C. vii	Matthew Paris, <i>Historia Anglorum</i> (St Albans, s. xiii ^{med})	effaced short ex libris	Madden.
[16].	LONDON: BL, MS. Royal 16 G. vi	<i>Chronique de France</i> (France, s. xiv ¹)	long ex libris	Warton, p. 49.
[17].	LONDON: BL, MS. Royal 19 A. xx	<i>Le livre de linformacion des princes</i> (France,	partially effaced motto and long ex libris	Sammut, p. 107, on basis of G. F. Warner & J. P. Gilson, <i>Catalogue of Western Manuscripts in the Old Royal</i>

		1395)		... <i>Collection</i> , 2 vols (London, 1921).
[18].	LONDON: BL, MS. Royal 19 C. iv	Philippe de Mézières, <i>Le songe du Vergier</i> (Paris, 1378)	effaced short ex libris	Vickers, p. 432.
[19].	LONDON: BL, MS. Sloane 248	Albucasis, <i>Antidotarium</i> (England?, s. xv ¹)	short ex libris; mottoes	Madden.
[20].	LONDON: BL, MS. Yates Thompson 14 (<i>olim</i> MS. Add. 39810)	Psalter (England, s. xiv ^{2/4} / s. xv ^{1/4})	extended short ex libris	Vickers, p. 434.
[21].	LONDON: COLLEGE OF ARMS, MS. Arundel 12	Frulovisi, <i>Vita Henrici Quinti</i> (Greenwich?, 1438?)	author's presentation copy, with duke's coat of arms	Ullman, no. 31.
[22].	LOS ANGELES: GETTY MUSEUM, MS. Ludwig XV 4 (<i>olim</i> London: Sion College, MS. Arc. L. 40. 2 / L. 28)	Bestiary (France, s. xiii ^{ex})	short ex libris	Identified by Christopher de Hamel in Sotheby's sale catalogue, 13 June 1977, lot 72.
[23].	MANCHESTER: CHETHAM'S, MS. Mun. A. 3. 131	Salutati, <i>opera</i> (Florence, s. xv ⁱⁿ)	effaced short ex libris and mottoes	First noticed by Neil Ker in this journal, v (1954 – 56), p. 180.
[24].	OXFORD: BODLEIAN, MS. Bodl. 294	Gower, <i>Confessio Amantis</i> etc (England, s. xv ¹)	effaced short ex libris and motto	Identified in the late 1970s by Ian Doyle: Sammut, pp. 112 – 13.
[25].	OXFORD: BODLEIAN, MS. Hatton 36	Nicolas de Clamanges (France, s. xv ^{2/4})	long ex libris and motto, on one occasion effaced	<i>Pietas Oxoniensis</i> .
[26].	OXFORD: BODLEIAN, MS. Duke Humfrey b. 1	Capgrave, <i>In Exodum</i> (King's Lynn, c. 1440)	2 ^o fo. (1444)	<i>Pietas Oxoniensis</i> .
[27].	OXFORD: BODLEIAN, MS. Duke Humfrey	Pliny, <i>Epistolae</i>	short ex libris; 2 ^o fo.	Known to Thomas Hearne; Macray

	d. 1	(Milan, c. 1440)	(1444)	(with shelfmark MS. Auct. F. ii. 23).
[28].	OXFORD: BODLEIAN, MS. Duke Humfrey d. 2 (<i>olim</i> Wentworth-Woodhouse, MS. Z. i. 32)	Palladius in English translation (England, 1440 x 1447)	dedication copy to the duke	Macray.
[29].	OXFORD: CORPUS CHRISTI COLLEGE, MS. 1	Bible (Oxford, s. xiii ²)	short ex libris	Rodney Thomson in this journal, xxii (2009), pp. 234-37; see <i>id.</i> , <i>Corpus</i> , p. 3.
[30].	OXFORD: CORPUS CHRISTI COLLEGE, MS. 243	Philosophical miscellany (Oxford, 1423)	long ex libris	Macray.
[31].	OXFORD: CORPUS CHRISTI COLLEGE, MS. 290	Avicenna, <i>Metaphysica</i> , trans. Gundissalinus (England, s. xv ¹)	2 ^o fo. (1439)	Identified by Rundle, with the assistance of Daniel Williman, in 2003: Thomson, <i>Corpus</i> , p. 149.
[32].	OXFORD: MAGDALEN COLLEGE, MS. 37 (A)	Plutarch & Gregory of Nazianus, trans. Antonio Pacini (Florence, 1439)	effaced long ex libris	Vickers, p. 429.
[33].	OXFORD: MAGDALEN COLLEGE, MS. 37 (B)	Ptolomey, <i>Cosmographia</i> , trans. da Scarperia (Milan, c. 1442)	effaced short ex libris; 2 ^o fo. (1444)	Vickers, p. 428.
[34].	OXFORD: ORIEL COLLEGE, MS. 32	Capgrave, <i>In Genesim</i> (King's Lynn, 1438)	long ex libris; 2 ^o fo. (1444)	Warton, p. 46.
[35].	OXFORD: ST JOHN'S COLLEGE, MS. 17	Thorney Computus	effaced long ex libris; 2 ^o fo. (1439)	Identified by Rundle in 2003 (see n. ++ above).

[36].	PARIS: BNF, MS. fr. 2	<i>Bible historiée</i> (France, s. xv ^{3/4})	inscription recording donation	Macray.
[37].	PARIS: BNF, MS. fr. 831	Froissart, <i>Poems</i> (France, 1394)	Humfrey's autograph notes	A. Scheler ed., <i>Oeuvres de Froissart. Poésies</i> , i (Brussels, 1870), p. xvi, but overlooked by Ullman and Sammut (see n. ++ above).
[38].	PARIS: BNF, MS. fr. 10153	Christine de Pisan, <i>Le Livre du Charles V</i> (France, s. xvⁱⁿ)	effaced short ex libris	Identified by Hanno Wijsman in 2004: see his <i>Luxury Bound</i> (Turhout, 2010), p. 230.
[39].	PARIS: BNF, MS. fr. 12421	Boccaccio, <i>Decameron</i> , trans. Premierfait (France, 1414)	long ex libris	Macray.
[40].	PARIS: BNF, MS. fr. 12583	<i>Le roman de Renart</i> (France?, s. xiii)	short ex libris (but not autograph)	Macray.
[41].	PARIS: BNF, MS. lat. 7805	<i>Panegyrici latini</i> (Milan, c. 1439 x 1440)	short ex libris; 2 ^o fo (1444)	Macray.
[42].	PARIS: BNF, MS. lat. 8537	Cicero, <i>Epistolae</i> (Florence, 1415)	long ex libris; 2 ^o fo (1439)	Macray.
[43].	PARIS: BNF, MS. lat. 10209	Petrarch, <i>De Remediis</i> (Italy, s. xv ⁱⁿ)	effaced long ex libris	Ullman, no. 25.
[44].	PARIS: BIBLIOTHÈQUE MAZARINE, MS. 1729	Jacques de Voraigne, <i>Legende dorée</i> , trans. Jean de Vignay (France, s. xiv ²)	effaced short ex libris	Sammut, pp. 122 – 23.

[45].	PARIS: BIBLIOTHÈQUE DE SAINTE GENEVIÈVE, MS. fr. 777	Livy, trans. Bersuire (France, s. xiv ²)	inscription recording donation	Macray.
[46].	REIMS: BIBLIOTHÈQUE MUNICIPALE, MS. 570	Frère Laurent, <i>La somme du roi Philippe</i> (France, s. xv)	Humfrey's coat of arms	Sammut, p. 123.
[47].	CITTÀ DEL VATICANO: BAV, MS. Urb lat 694	Salutati, <i>De Laboribus Herculis</i> (Florence, c. 1406)	effaced long ex libris	Ullman, no. 34.

II. MANUSCRIPTS MISATTRIBUTED TO THE COLLECTION OF HUMFREY, DUKE OF GLOUCESTER

Over the generations, there have been several overly optimistic attributions of manuscripts to the duke's collection. The following list cites only those mentioned by either Ullman or Sammut as coming from Humfrey's library.

	Shelfmark	Contents	Source of misattribution	Reason rejected
[A].	CAMBRIDGE: CORPUS CHRISTI COLLEGE, MS. 285 (i)	Frulovisi, <i>Vita Henrici Quinti</i> (Greenwich?, 1438?)	Sammut, pp. 98 – 99	Author's dedication copy for Henry VI.
[B].	LONDON: BL, MSS. Egerton 617 & 618	Wycliffite Bible (England, 1390s)	Ullman, no. 16: 'ownership doubtful'	Coat of arms presumably signify Thomas of Woodstock.
[C].	LONDON: SION COLLEGE, MS. Arc. L. 40 . 2 / L. 26 (deposited at Lambeth Palace Library)	Giles of Rome, <i>De Regimine Principum</i> (England, s. xv)	Ullman, no. 19: 'doubtful'	Probably owned by Richard, duke of Gloucester: see A. Sutton & L. Visser-Fuchs, <i>Richard III's Books</i> (Stroud, 1997), pp. 283-85.
[D].	OXFORD: BODLEIAN, MS. Auct. F. 5. 27	Aristotle, <i>Politics</i> (Oxford, s. xv ^{med})	Ullman, no. 4: 'slightly doubtful'	Copy from the lost presentation manuscript to Humfrey.
[E].	CITTÀ DEL VATICANO: BAV, MS. Vat. lat. 10669	Plato, <i>Republic</i> , trans. Decembrio	Sammut, pp. 124 – 25 (expressing as definite the possibility proposed in [Bodleian Library exhibition catalogue], <i>Duke Humfrey and English Humanism</i> (Oxford, 1970), no. 10); cf. <i>DHL</i> , no. 39.	See M. Zaggia, <i>Interpres</i> , xiii (1993), pp. 7 – 55.

¹ Earlier versions of the text and the Appendix have appeared on my website, *Bonae Litterae*. I would like to thank Prof. James Carley for his comments on a draft of this article.

² The most detailed biography of Humfrey remains K. Vickers, *Humphrey, duke of Gloucester* (London, 1907) [hereafter Vickers].

³ J. Foxe, *The First Volume of the Ecclesiastical History, containyng the Actes and Monumentes...* (London, 1576) pp. 678 – 680. On the slightly complicated issue of the depiction of Humfrey's death in *2 Henry VI*, see C. Saunders, "'Dead in his Bed': Shakespeare's Staging of the Death of the Duke of Gloucester in *2 Henry VI*", *Review of English Studies*, xxxvi (1985), pp. 19-34. On Humfrey in Shakespeare more generally, see A. Petrina, 'An Epitaph for the House of Lancaster' in S. Bassi and R. Cimarosti ed., *Paper Bullets of the Brain. Experiments with Shakespeare* (Venice, 2006), pp. 125-43.

⁴ For a witness to this tradition, you need do no more than turn to an earlier volume of this journal: G. Harriss, 'Good Duke Humfrey', *Bodleian Library Record*, xv (1995), pp. 119-23.

⁵ On his library, as well as those items cited in the Appendix, see A. Petrina, *Cultural Politics in Fifteenth-Century England. The Case of Humphrey, duke of Gloucester* (Leiden, 2004).

⁶ We await the critical edition which will be provided by R. Thomson ed., *University and College Libraries of Oxford* [Corpus of British Medieval Library Catalogues] (London, in preparation), UO1-UO3. For the time being, the most accessible edition is A. Sammut, *Unfredo duca di Gloucester e gli umanisti italiani* (Padua, 1980), pp. 60-84.

⁷ I tell this story in outline in D. Rundle, 'Two Unnoticed Manuscripts from the Collection of Humfrey, duke of Gloucester: Part II', *Bodleian Library Record*, xvi (1998), pp. 299 – 313 at pp. 305-309.

⁸ [3] and [11] in the Appendix.

⁹ The evidence will be reviewed in the headnote to the entry for the University of Oxford in Thomson, *Oxford*.

¹⁰ The story is well told in S. Gillam, *The Divinity School and Duke Humfrey's Library at Oxford* (Oxford, 1988), pp. 3-27, with important material also in [Bodleian exhibition catalogue], *Duke Humfrey's Library* (Oxford, 1988) [hereafter *DHL*].

¹¹ The manuscripts are listed in the Appendix.

¹² So, for instance, with [31].

¹³ Those which have this type of revealing ownership note are marked in the Appendix as having a long *ex libris*. For Humfrey's purchases from the estates of deceased acquaintances, see D. Rundle, 'Habits of manuscript-collecting and the dispersals of the library of Humfrey, Duke of Gloucester' in J. Raven ed., *Lost Libraries* (London, 2004), pp. 106 – 124.

¹⁴ The manuscript is [19], with images available on-line at the British Library Catalogue of Illuminated Manuscripts.

¹⁵ Vickers, p. 434 suggests this manuscript was given by Humfrey to his wife (noted also by S. Cavanaugh, 'A Study of Books privately owned in England, 1300 – 1450' (unpublished PhD thesis, University of Pennsylvania, 1980), p. 466); Petrina, *Cultural Politics*, p. 184 (expanding on R. Weiss, 'Portrait of a Bibliophile XI: Humfrey, duke of Gloucester, d. 1447', *The Book Collector*, xiii (1964), pp. 161-70 at p. 163) assumes that it was given to the duke by his wife (with inclarity over which one).

¹⁶ The Bedford manuscript with the coupled mottoes is PARIS: BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE DE FRANCE, MS. fr. 24246 (Martin de Saint-Gille, *Aphorismes d'Hipocrate*). On coupled mottoes generally, see A. Sutton & L. Visser-Fuchs, *Richard III's Books* (Stroud, 1997), p. 271.

¹⁷ The classic account is R. A. Griffiths, 'The Trial of Eleanor Cobham: an episode in the fall of Duke Humphrey of Gloucester', *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, li (1968–9), pp. 381–99 [reprinted in id., *King and Country: England and Wales in the fifteenth century* (London, 1991)]; see also H. Carey, *Courting Disaster. Astrology at the English Court and University in the Later Middle Ages* (London, 1992), pp. 138-49.

¹⁸ On Thomas Cobham, bishop of Worcester and his library, we await the discussion in Thomson, *Oxford*.

¹⁹ On her, the most recent work is R. Honings and O. van Marion ed., *Vrouw van het Vaderland. Jacoba van Beieren in literatuur en kunst* ([Harlem], 2011).

²⁰ It is [37], on which see now G. Croenen, K. M. Figg and A. Taylor, 'Authorship, Patronage, and Literary Gifts: the books Froissart brought to England in 1395', *Journal of the Early Book Society*, xi (2008), pp. 1 – 42.

-
- ²¹ Vickers, p. 335, muses that Antigone, as well as Arthur, may have been the daughter of Eleanor Cobham, but he takes 1437 as the year of Antigone's marriage to Henry Grey, count of Tancarville / Tankerville; in fact, the accepted date of the birth of their first son, Richard, is 5th November 1436.
- ²² Kymer's text is partially edited in T. Hearne ed., *Liber niger scaccarii*, 2 vols (Oxford, 1728), ii, pp. 550-59.
- ²³ The traditional narrative was presented by Antony Wood in his *Historia et Antiquitates Universitatis Oxoniensis* (Oxford, 1674), ii, pp. 49 – 50, and repeated and refined by later historians. For late twentieth-century assessments of the events of the mid-sixteenth century, see N. R. Ker, 'The Provision of Books' in J. McConica ed., *The Collegiate University* [History of the University of Oxford, iii] (Oxford, 1986), pp. 441 – 519, esp. pp. 465 – 66 and *DHL*, pp. 118 – 125.
- ²⁴ The manuscript is Oxford: Bodleian, MS. Auct. F. inf. 1. 1; the claim that it was a survivor from Humfrey's gift was made by Wood in the passage cited in the previous footnote, from where it was repeated by scholars like Thomas Warton: *The History of English Poetry* [3 vol.s, 1774 – 1781], ii (London, 1778), pp. 44 – 50. The last time it was cited as Humfrey's was in P. Meyer, 'Les Manuscrits français de Cambridge. II – Bibliothèque de l'Université', *Romania*, xv (1886), pp. 236-357 at p. 265.
- ²⁵ On this wider phenomenon, important articles include: C. E. Wright, 'The Dispersal of the Libraries in the Sixteenth Century' in F. Wormald & C. E. Wright ed., *The English Library before 1700* (London, 1958), pp. 148 – 175; N. Ramsay, "'The Manuscripts flew about like Butterflies': the Break-Up of English Libraries in the Sixteenth Century" in Raven, *Lost Libraries*, pp. 125 – 144; J. Carley, 'The Dispersal of the Monastic Libraries and the Salvaging of the Spoils' in E. Leedham-Green and T. Webber ed., *The Cambridge History of Libraries in Britain and Ireland. Volume I. To 1640* (Cambridge, 2006), pp. 265-91.
- ²⁶ [30], discussed by *DHL*, no. 27.
- ²⁷ [35], on which the best work is Faith Wallis's website, 'The Calendar and the Cloister': <http://digital.library.mcgill.ca/ms-17/index.htm> [last accessed 14th March 2014]. The argument discussed briefly in this and the following two paragraphs I intend to explicate more fully and with detailed references elsewhere.
- ²⁸ The fullest discussion of Talbot is T. Graham, 'Robert Talbot's "Old Saxonice Bede": Cambridge University Library, MS Kk.3.18 and the "Alphabetum Norwagicum" of British Library, Cotton MSS, Domitian A. IX' in J. P. Carley and C. G. C. Tite ed., *Books and collectors 1200–1700: essays presented to Andrew Watson* (London, 1997), pp. 295–316.
- ²⁹ *Letters & Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII*, 21 vols (London, 1864-1920), v, ed. J. Gardiner (1880), p. 289 [no. 630].
- ³⁰ The problems are outlined in *DHL*, no. 123 & 124.