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Sir Hans Sloane (1660–1753) was one of the greatest collectors of his age, and books formed the largest single category of his collections. For Sloane, books were both objects of value and curiosity in themselves, as well as aids for his successful practice as a physician, and tools for the study and management of his ever-expanding collections of specimens and objects. Sloane acquired his books through many different channels, but one of his regular methods was by means of the book auction. The present article, by using information on specific copies assembled by the Sloane Printed Books Project, investigates Sloane’s activities as a successful bidder at the auction of the library of another physician, Luke Rugeley, in early 1697.¹

Sloane, who had moved to London from his birthplace in Killyleagh in Ireland in 1680, qualified as a physician in 1684 after training in London and France. Following a formative journey to Jamaica in 1687 as physician to the Governor, the Duke of Albemarle, Sloane returned to London in 1688 and set up in medical practice. His marriage in 1695 to Elizabeth Rose, née Langley, widow of Fulke Rose, formerly of Jamaica, brought him considerable income; and this, together with the proceeds of his medical practice, gave him the resources to expand his collections significantly in the 1690s.² Sloane had been collecting books at least since 1680, principally to support his medical studies and to further his interest in botany and other areas of natural history. The degree and pattern of expansion of his library can be tracked from the evidence of the codes which Sloane used to record the date and price of his purchases from 1686 to about 1699. Not all the codes have survived subsequent rebinding and general wear and tear, but the figures now assembled by the Sloane Printed Books Project are nevertheless

¹ The Sloane Printed Books project is based at the British Library; further details are available online. More information on Sloane’s collections can be found in the list submitted to Sloane’s executors in 1753, reproduced by Arthur MacGregor, Sir Hans Sloane: Collector, Scientist, Antiquary, Founding Father of the British Museum (London: British Museum Press, 1994), pp. 28–29.

² The earliest dated acquisitions to Sloane’s library identified so far are from 1680, and by 1693 Sloane had acquired about 1,000 volumes (M. A. E. Nickson, ‘Books and Manuscripts’, in MacGregor, Sir Hans Sloane, pp. 263–77). At his death the library contained about 45,000 volumes.
suggestive. The Sloane Printed Books database (www.bl.uk/catalogues/sloane) records 379 books with an acquisition code of 1696, whereas there are only fifteen for 1694, sixty-nine for 1695 and 159 for 1697; it appears, therefore, that 1696 was a particularly active year.3

Between 1680 and 1700 Sloane took an active personal role in building his library, through the selection and cataloguing of books, though in later years he was less personally involved in the day-to-day business, using assistants to process acquisitions and to create and maintain his catalogue. Testimony to his active interest in developing his library is his very rich collection of early book-sale catalogues, many of which are annotated with potential or actual purchases. Some caution must be used in approaching this collection to track Sloane’s participation in sales, as he was also in the habit of buying both sale catalogues and booksellers’ catalogues long after the date of issue, either as tools for planning subsequent purchases or for bibliographical purposes.4 Additionally, some will have been marked for potential purchases by previous owners before reaching Sloane’s library. One catalogue, however, which was certainly acquired contemporaneously with the sale, and used by Sloane to select purchases, was that of the library of Luke Rugeley.5

Two twentieth-century accounts have claimed that Sloane bought the whole of Rugeley’s library when it was sold in early 1697.6 The first, a note by W. W. D. Thompson in the Ulster Medical Journal for January 1938, states that ‘Sloane purchased [Rugeley’s] books and manuscripts’, seeking among them a particular remedy for sore eyes.7 The second, in the British Museum Quarterly for March 1953, referring to Thompson’s article, says more categorically that ‘[i]t was, so it is said, a desire to obtain a very efficacious eye-ointment that led him to buy the whole library of Dr. Luke Rugeley’.8

3 Sloane followed old-style reckoning, as he used the code for 1696 in recording his purchases from the Rugeley sales, which took place in January and March 1696/7.

4 For example, the volume of catalogues now at BL 820.c.1, each of which bears the Sloane alphanumeric 11322, and the series of catalogues with Sloane alphanumeric d396 and N596, now at BL 11906.c.6,8,17,18,23,25,27,40, dated between 1678 and 1683. Two of the catalogues in 820.c.1 are of London sales of 1699 and 1700, and the others concern French sales, from 1646 to 1683. Giles Mandelbrote and T. A. Birrell describe a collection of catalogues of sales held by by Edward Millington acquired by Sloane probably in 1707, containing catalogues of sales from the 1690s, with buyers’ names and prices: Mandelbrote, ‘The Organization of Book Auctions in Late Seventeenth Century London’, and Birrell, ‘Books and Buyers in Seventeenth-Century Auction Sales’, in Under the Hammer: Book Auctions since the Seventeenth Century, ed. by Robin Myers, Michael Harris, and Giles Mandelbrote (London: British Library, 2001), pp. 15–50 (p. 33) and 51–64 (pp. 51–53).

5 Sloane MS 3972C, vol. 1, fol. 196 (p. 192) includes an entry for the sale catalogue immediately following entries for items from the sale. See fig. 7. Entries in this volume ceased in 1697. The prices are marked in Sloane’s hand, occasionally quite hurriedly, suggesting they were written at the sale or shortly after.

6 The sale took place on 9 January 1696/7 and the days following, with the sale of lots in the ‘Appendix’ on 9 March 1696/7 and the days following.


The acquisition of a substantial number of items from another library was not unusual for Sloane. One might compare these acquisitions with the 330 books from the library of Joseph Fenton bought mostly in 1686; or, later in Sloane's career, with the 150 from the sale of Jean-Baptiste Colbert's library in 1728, and the twenty-nine from the library of Jean-Baptiste Poirier de la Ramée, part of which was sold at London in 1727. However, Sloane was not an omnivorous collector at this relatively early stage in his collecting career, as can be seen from his habit of marking auction catalogues, indicating a selective approach rather than wholesale purchase. The notices cited above may have been influenced by Sloane's later acquisition of whole collections, primarily of natural history specimens, whether by legacy (Courten), or purchase (Petiver and Kaempfer). Sloane may also have acquired substantial parts of other libraries by private treaty. The manner of his acquisitions deserves further research, and would certainly be clarified by extensive examination of both his sale catalogues and his correspondence in tandem. In the case of Rugeley's library, Sloane's acquisitions are shown from his marks in the sale catalogue to be quite selective, and the story of how material passed from Rugeley's library into Sloane's illustrates some of the complexities, the joys, and the frustrations attending the study of provenance.

The recipe for an eye-ointment apparently to be found amongst Rugeley's books was clearly an important issue for Sloane, and formed the subject of one of his rare published works, *An Account of a Most Efficacious Medicine for Soreness, Weakness and several other Distempers of the Eyes* (London: Printed for Dan. Browne, at the Black-Swan, without Temple Bar, 1745). Published after Sloane's effective retirement from medical practice, this pamphlet was reprinted in 1750 and 1767, and also published at Amsterdam in French in 1767. It gives the composition of his remedy, and an account of its provenance. Sloane had been impressed by cures for eye disease effected by Rugeley, and had tried without success to find how his remedy was made, through the agency of an apothecary used by himself and Rugeley. After Rugeley's death Sloane 'pursued [his] Enquiry, by searching into his printed books, and manuscript papers, and particularly into a very curious *Materia Medica* left by him', but still without success. He says that he finally acquired the recipe, written in Rugeley's own hand, from a former employee of Rugeley, 'for a pecuniary reward'. He recounts finding the same recipe in the papers of the famous Sir Theodore Turquet de Mayerne (1573–1655), physician to James I and Charles I, and thought it probable that Mayerne had passed it to Thomas Rugeley, Luke's father. The *Materia medica* mentioned may be one of the manuscripts which appeared in the Appendix to

---

9 These figures are conservative, being based on evidence surviving in the books themselves. Ownership evidence, like Sloane's own numbers and purchase codes, is vulnerable to the depredations of time, use, and rebinding.
the sale catalogue of Rugeley’s library, but unfortunately the descriptions
given there are very imprecise.¹⁰ It may alternatively be the copy of
Matthaeus Silvaticus, Pandectae medicinæ (Lyon: Iacobus Giunta, 1541),
which contains many annotations. Sloane does not mention buying the
whole, or indeed any, of Rugeley’s library, merely ‘searching into’ both books
and manuscripts, and there is no indication of whether the ‘search’ took
place before or after the dispersal of the library.

Luke Rugeley, like his father Thomas, was a chemical physician,
and inherited his father’s library. Thomas Rugely, Rugeley, Ridgley¹¹ (or even
Ritshley)¹² (c. 1576–1656), physician, was the only son of Simon Rugeley, of
Hawksyard near Rugeley in Staffordshire, taking his M.D. from St John’s
College, Cambridge, in 1608. From 1608 to 1616 he was a country physician
at Newark (Notts), and moved to London in 1617. A letter from the chief
royal physician, Theodore de Mayerne, to the president of the College of
Physicians recommended Ridgley, and the college elected him a candidate.
He was finally elected a member on 28 November 1622. Mayerne’s interest
in Ridgley may have been sparked by their common interest in chemical
medicine. Samuel Hartlib wrote of Ridgley in 1654: ‘Dr Ridgely an auncient
physitian of the colldeg the chiefest chymical doctor and preparing many
excellent medicines . . . He bought up all Glauberian furnaces especially the
2nd with a new head, which Mr Boyle also hath’.¹³ A ‘Dr Ridgely’ was also
among the ‘chemically given’ physicians, named by George Starkey in 1657,
who had repudiated Galenic medicine, although this may refer to Luke, who
shared the same chemical outlook.¹⁴ Thomas Ridgley died in London on 21
June 1656 and was conveyed in a procession of college fellows, by candle-
light, to the church of St Botolph’s, Aldersgate, where he was interred. It was
an honour that not even Mayerne had enjoyed. According to his will, his
money was to be divided into five equal parts, three fifths going to his eldest
son, Thomas, and two fifths to his second son, Luke, who was also to receive
‘all my books’ and household goods.

¹⁰ Some examples are lot 4 (p. 9), ‘A Book of medicinal receipts’; lot 7 (p. 10), ‘An old receipt book’;
and lot 10 (p. 9), ‘A Book of Chymical and Medicinal Processes, and Receipts’.
¹¹ Thus in the Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, the source of this brief biography.
¹² Otto Brunfels, Contrafayt Kreuterbuch (Strasbourg: Hans Schotten, 1532–7), BL 547.k.5, bears a
manuscript note which refers to ‘Doctor Ritshley in Sout hamtons Scoer Der vornambste u. erfahrendste
Doctor in England’, which must refer to Luke, who lived in Bloomsbury Square (formerly Southampton
Square), where he was a near neighbour of Sloane, rather than Thomas Rugeley, but demonstrates in
any case the variant spelling of their name.
¹³ The Hartlib Papers, 29/4/27A (Ephemeries, 1654) (online at http://bridgital.shef.ac.uk/hartlib),
quoted by Charles Webster, ‘English Medical Reformers of the Puritan Revolution: A Background to
the “Society of Chymical Physicians”’, Ambix, 14 (1967), 16–41 (p. 34). The ‘Glauberian furnaces’
presumably refers to Johann Rudolph Glauber, Furni novi Philosophici (Amsterdam: Johann Fabeln,
1646–49); an English translation was published as A Description of New Philosophical Furnaces
(London: Thomas Williams, 1651).
¹⁴ George Starkey, Natures Explication and Helmont’s Vindication (London: Thomas Alsop, 1657),
Munk’s Roll records Luke Rugeley thus: ‘Luke Rugeley, MD, of Christ’s college, Cambridge, AB 1634–5, AM 1638, MD 1646. He was admitted a Candidate of the College of Physicians 2nd November, 1649, and a Fellow 24 September, 1653.’

His death is thus recorded in the Flying Post of 5 September 1697: “Dr Luke Rugeley, a very eminent and famous physician, died at his house, in Bloomsbury-square, the beginning of this week, in the 81st year of his age, and has committed his choice secret of curing sore eyes to a surgeon of this city, for whom he had an entire affection.”

Upon his death, his library was sold at his former house, by the auctioneer John Bullord, commencing on 19 January 1696/7, and the Appendix, containing books missed out from the previous catalogue, manuscripts and paintings, was sold starting on 9 March.

Tantalizingly, we see that the announcement of Rugeley’s death mentions the famous eye-remedy, though what we should make of this, and how we might identify the surgeon mentioned, is not clear.

The catalogue of Rugeley’s library is in two parts, the first entitled, A Catalogue of Theological, Philosophical, Historical, Philological, medicinal and Chymical Books, in the Greek, Latin, French, Italian, German and English languages, being the Library of Dr. Luke Rugeley, lately deceased, will be sold at auction at his Late Dwelling-House, near Southampton-house; . . . by John Bullord; and the second, An Appendix to Dr. Rugeley’s Library, or a Collection containing Besides the Remainder of the Books, the Medicinal, Chymical and other manuscripts, in several Languages; And about 150 Pictures. Particularly all Postellus’s Works already printed, and those not yet Publish’d, in MSS in five large volumes. Will be sold . . . by John Bullord, etc. The Catalogue lists 2,378 lots of books; the Appendix 220 lots of books, 89 of manuscripts and 135 of paintings and prints. These are divided, as usual, by subject and size. In the Catalogue there are ‘Libri theologici, historici, Miscellan. &c’ in folio (146 lots), quarto (183 lots) and octavo (378 lots); ‘Libri Medici, Philosophici, & Mathematici, in Folio, Gr.


16 Munk erroneously quotes The Flying Post, 5 September 1697 for the announcement of his death: it actually appeared in the issue of 3 September 1696, referring to Rugeley’s death as having taken place at ‘the beginning of this week’, so he probably died on 31 August or 1 September 1696.

17 Announced in the London Gazette, 7 January 1696/7.

18 Announced in the London Gazette, 1 March and 8 March 1696/7.

One might speculate that the eye remedy was given by Rugeley to Francis Bernard. Margaret Nickson, “Hans Sloane, Book Collector and Cataloguer, 1682–1698”, British Library Journal, 14 (1988), 52–89 (p. 80), suggests that Sloane’s copy of Hieronymus Braunschweig, New Vollkomen Distillerbuch (Frankfurt: Christian Egenolffs Erben, 1597), had come from the library of Francis Bernard, sold in 1698. Sloane’s copy of Bernard’s catalogue, BL 820.c.3, which includes prices for most lots, lists this work but does not give a price for it. Sloane’s copy of Braunschweig bears his purchase code of 1698, and price code of 3s 6d. Silvaticus, Pandectae medicinae (Lyon: Iacobus Giunta, 1541) may also have come to Sloane from Bernard’s sale, where it went for 3s 10d. Sloane’s copy has the purchase date 1698 and price 3s. However, Bernard was not a surgeon (he was an apothecary and physician) and neither book contains specific reference to remedies for eye disease.
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Lat. German Gal. & Ang.’ (91 lots), quarto (262 lots) and octavo (464 lots); ‘Libri Germanici, Gallici & Italici’ in folio (15 lots), quarto (17 lots), and octavo (55 lots); ‘Divinity, History, Geography and Poetry’ in folio (116 lots), ‘English Divinity, History and Geography’ quarto (116 lots) and octavo (539 lots). In the Appendix are ‘Latin & English Books omitted’ in folio (25 lots), quarto (79 lots), and octavo (101 lots); Postellus’s printed works (15 lots) and his manuscripts (41 lots); other manuscripts in folio (14 lots), quarto (27 lots), and octavo (7 lots), together with the paintings and prints.

Rugeley’s library is a general scholarly, professional and gentlemanly collection with a particular emphasis, as we should expect, on medicine, alchemy and natural philosophy, and strong representation of material in certain European vernaculars. It is perhaps not very different from Sloane’s own library at this time, yet the two libraries are distinguishable notably by Sloane’s early and continuing emphasis on botany and zoology, whereas Rugeley owned a substantial number of books of divinity, an area which, although not absent from Sloane’s library, seems not to have been a major collecting interest, particularly at this period.

Sloane marked a significant number of items in his copy of the catalogue employing a variety of different marks. He uses a simple dash, a cross (possibly a dash with a second vertical line), and a dash with an oval, somewhat like a Greek letter theta, but written in two separate movements, which may indicate a dash, later amended with an oval, or possibly a zero, or could be a single symbol. Prices are marked on a number of items, the great majority of which are also marked with a dash with vertical line, or cross. It seems most likely that the marks were made in sequence: a dash marking an item which might be of interest, amended with a vertical line to indicate that it was worth bidding for, and a price if he succeeded in acquiring it, marked with an oval/zero if he did not succeed in purchasing the item, or left unamended if it was not to be bid for.

Thus, far from Sloane intending to acquire the entire library, he in fact marked only a selection of items for potential or actual purchase, and these focus particularly on medicine, especially chemical medicine, and alchemy. One must make allowance for the occasional aberrant mark, but of the 2,378 lots of printed books in the Catalogue, approximately 213 are marked, showing that Sloane had some interest in them. Sloane shows interest in

20 BL S.C. 886.
21 The same pattern appears in other of Sloane’s marked sale catalogues, for example dashes, vertical lines and circular or more emphatic deletions in BL S.C.253 (12); and in S.C.162, red crayon dashes, with a vertical line or circle/oval in pencil crossing the dash.
22 The catalogue is very similar in size to that of Robert Hooke, which listed 2,440 lots (about 2,500 titles in all), of which Sloane marked 345. See Giles Mandelbrote, ‘Sloane’s Purchases at the Sale of Robert Hooke’s Library’, in Libraries within the Library: The Origins of the British Library’s Printed Collections, ed. by Giles Mandelbrote and Barry Taylor (London: British Library, 2009), pp. 98–145 (pp. 103–5).
books on geography, biography, philology, and the works of Postellus (Guillaume Postel, the French linguist, reformer, and cabbalist) and Boehme (Jakob Böhme, the German mystic),\textsuperscript{23} but the great majority of the items marked are on medicine, botany and chemistry, and all the priced books are on these three subjects. In the \textit{Appendix} Sloane has marked some portraits of scientists and other prints, and several manuscripts,\textsuperscript{24} but no items in the \textit{Appendix} are priced, even though some of the manuscripts were indeed acquired. The two parts of the catalogue seem to have been marked differently, the dashes against manuscripts in the Appendix, for example, being much more emphatic than those against books in the main catalogue, and

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{catalogue.jpg}
\caption{The sale catalogue of Rugeley's library, BL S.C. 886, p. 19, showing Sloane's marks: a cross or dash with vertical line, dash with oval, and price. (Courtesy of The Trustees of the British Library.)}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{23} Ariel Hessayon, ‘Gold tried in the fire’: The Prophet Theaurau, John Tany and the English Revolution (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007), pp. 306–11, discusses the interest among chemists and physicians of this period in the works of Böhme.

Sloane’s interest in Rugeley’s books seems to have been exhausted by his selection from the main catalogue.\(^{25}\)

The natural starting-point for the identification of what Sloane actually acquired at this auction is an examination of the lots marked with a price. Inevitably, as in many book sale catalogues of the period, identification of the works and editions listed is hampered by occasional uncertainties and ambiguities due to the typesetter’s attempts at non-English titles. In addition, the prices are sometimes marked quite roughly, and may occasionally be next to the wrong book. Examination of the items marked with prices nevertheless brings into focus a number of acquisitions which can be traced in Sloane’s own library catalogues.

These catalogues take the form of manuscript accession registers, supplemented by an interleaved and annotated copy of G. A. Mercklin’s 1686 edition of J. A. van der Linden’s medical bibliography, *Lindenius renovatus*, which was used to record medical books in Latin.\(^{26}\) (It is hereafter referred to as ‘Lindenius’.) Most of Sloane’s acquisitions from Rugeley’s library appear in Sloane MS 3972C, the eight volumes of which comprise the catalogue of his library, starting in 1692 and continuing to record accessions up to his death in 1753. Sloane MS 3972D is a two-volume index to the catalogue. Sloane normally marked his books with a letter and a number, the letter indicating size and the number a running sequence, which between them appear to have made up a shelf-number. Upper-case letters were used for folio and some quarto works, and lower-case for quarto, octavo, or duodecimo. These marks are referred to here as Sloane alphanumerics.\(^{27}\)

Sloane’s practice in cataloguing new acquisitions seems to have been to group works by size and enter them in the register in batches. This assumption certainly works for his Rugeley books, though there is not such a close grouping of books acquired by Sloane from, for example, the experimental philosopher Robert Hooke’s library,\(^{28}\) and even in the sequence of Sloane alphanumerics used for the books from Rugeley’s library there are interspersed a few titles from other sources. The majority of Rugeley’s books

\(^{25}\) In the Rugeley sale catalogue, Sloane has marked about 213 items, as follows (a few of the marks are ambiguous). The number of items marked: with a dash only is thirty-five; with a dash/vertical line, or cross is 118, of which forty-four also have a price; with a dash/oval is fifty-nine; with price only is one. In the Appendix, the number of: dashes for books is five; dashes on Postellus manuscripts is nine; on other manuscripts is sixteen; dash/vertical with double vertical on manuscripts is eight; dash/vertical is one. On paintings and prints there are ten dashes (four are portraits of physicians, one is of the Duke of Albemarle).


\(^{27}\) Sloane alphanumerics are described and illustrated in the introduction to the Sloane Printed Books database http://www.bl.uk/catalogues/sloane/Identifiers.aspx

\(^{28}\) Mandelbrote, ‘Sloane’s Purchases at the Sale of Robert Hooke’s Library’.
appear in two groups. Sloane MS 3972C, vol. 1, fol. 196r (p. 192)\(^{29}\) lists a number of quarto volumes which match items in the ‘Libri Med. Gr. Lat. Germ. Angl. &c, in quarto’ of the Rugeley catalogue, with Sloane alphaneumeric between d 474 and d 483. A similar group of octavo items numbered between g 449 and g 508 is entered on fols. 194r–195r (pp. 190–191).\(^{30}\) About thirty of the items Sloane has marked with the sale price are listed in these two groups. Sloane's coded purchase date of 1696 appears on seven of them. The majority of the books in these two groups were published in Germany, in the German language, on various aspects of chemical medicine.

Sloane clearly had particular interests when selecting items from Rugeley’s catalogue. The focus on German medical, chemical and alchemical material is very evident, but his interest in these books would have been intensified by the fact that almost half of them bear manuscript notes.\(^{31}\) As noted above, Sloane had ‘searched into’ Rugeley’s books and manuscripts, either before or after selecting and purchasing from them. The search for the marvellous eye-ointment may indeed have been the impetus behind Sloane’s purchases, since the annotations include many remedies, and Sloane may have hoped to find the composition of the ointment here. If so, he was to be disappointed, though he would certainly have found the content professionally relevant, and it would be complementary to other printed and manuscript material in his library.

The nature and the source of this heavily annotated collection is of some interest even now, representing as it does part of a library which has survived successive mergers of collections. The sales from Rugeley’s library are not the only evidence for its content, as the process of searching for Sloane’s books in the older areas of the British Library collections which include chemistry, alchemy and medicine has revealed several more books annotated in this same distinctive hand, with both extensive notes and minor jottings. In all, over fifty items can now be associated with this collection, by virtue of entry in the sale catalogue or by the presence of manuscript notes in this hand, many of which were certainly in Sloane’s library, and the remainder very probably so (see appendix 2 below). The majority are listed in Rugeley’s sale catalogue, but others are not; some bear Sloane’s acquisition dates of 1696, but two, for example, bear the date 1686, and two 1698.\(^{32}\) It seems, therefore, that these annotated books may have taken different routes to

\(^{29}\) Entries in the catalogue are referred to here by both the British Museum’s foliation, which is the normal form of reference, and Sloane’s pagination, since the index, Sloane MS 3972D, refers to page numbers.

\(^{30}\) See appendix 1 below; d 472, d 480, g 449 and g 497 are in Lindenius, as they are Latin works.

\(^{31}\) Ten of the books numbered between d 473 and d 488 were published in Germany and in the German language. Of these, eight have manuscript notes and other annotations in the same hand. Fifteen of those numbered between g 450 and g 508 were published in Germany, in German, and six of these have manuscript notes in the same hand.

\(^{32}\) See note 19 above.
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Fig. 2 (a and b) From BL 1033.1.10. (Courtesy of the Trustees of the British Library.)
arrive in Sloane’s library, the majority coming through Rugeley’s sale, others having been on the book market at other times.

The annotator remains unidentified at present. The present article is therefore restricted to an examination of Sloane’s approach to this collection, and outlines his attempts to identify the author of these notes. It is hoped that future research will reveal his identity, and in due course a fuller description of the material will be justified. Meanwhile, a sample page of these annotations is illustrated here as fig. 2.

As a collector, Sloane was not averse to acquiring annotated copies; indeed, he may have sought them out if the notes were significant or written by someone of his acquaintance. Many such books were catalogued by Sloane as manuscripts rather than printed items. Although he often knew who had written the notes, in this case he seems to have been uncertain, but did make attempts to identify the writer. In his annotated copy (mentioned above) of Matthaeus Silvaticus, *Pandectae Medicinae*, Sloane’s note, ‘Silvatici pandectae medicinae cum notis MSS forte Dni. Rugely patris Lucae Rugely M D.’, indicates that he suspected they were probably by Thomas Rugeley himself. However, his copy of Hieronymus Braunschweig, *New Vollkomen Distillerbuch* (Frankfurt: Christian Egenolfs Erben, 1597), annotated by the same hand, is marked by Sloane merely as ‘with the mss notes of a learned physitian’. To this, Sloane’s assistant Thomas Stack, who was working on the library between 1729 and 1741, has added ‘Sr Theod. Mayerne?’ With some apparent confidence, an unknown hand has attributed similar annotations in Johann Hartmann, *Praxis Chymiatrica* (Leipzig: Godofredus Grossi, 1633), to the prominent Oxford academic and physician Jonathan Goddard. In other cases, for example, Fidejustus Reinneccerus, *Thesaurus chymicus* (Leipzig: Thomas Schürer, 1609), Sloane has not

---

33 Research to identify the annotator continues. The hand suggests a German or Dutch origin or education, and the writer was apparently working in London in the 1640s and 1650s. References in the notes strengthen the possibility of a connection with the Netherlands. A number of physicians and apothecaries with continental connections have been considered and rejected either because they were not working during this period, or because their extant manuscripts cannot be identified with this hand. Among these are John Webster, Theodore Gravius, Francis Glisson, Gerard Boate, Arnold Boate, Ahasuerus Regemorter, Theodore Diodati, Peter Stahl, Fredrick Clodius, Albert Otto Faber, John French, and Johannes Banfi Huynaydes. Others remain possible candidates pending discovery of holograph documents, for example George Ent, Nathaniel Henshaw, and Johannes Kuffeler.

34 Thus his copy of Silvaticus (note 36 below) was numbered as MS A 246.


36 BL 544.h.5.

37 BL 717.l.38.(1.)

38 BL 1033.l.10. ‘Notae sunt script. manu propria Johnathanis Goddardia.’ The same wording, in the same hand, appears on Sloane MS 1139, *Collectanea de historia naturali*.
attempted an identification, simply noting ‘Reinecceri thesaurus cum notis mssstis’. None of the identifications above appears to be correct, but they are worth examining in some detail as examples of Sloane’s working practices. Although Luke Rugeley himself might be seen as a possible candidate, neither Sloane nor any of his amanuenses suggest him, and no manuscripts or correspondence of Luke Rugeley have yet been found to compare with the annotations in his books. One might assume that Sloane would have been familiar with the hand of his contemporary and fellow physician and could have made the identification, had it been correct.

What of the other attributions? First, Thomas Rugeley. Two books with his signature are held by the library of the Royal College of Physicians. A copy of Ptolemy, *Megale syntaxis* (Basel: Johannes Walderus, 1538) is inscribed ‘Thomas Rugeley’ in an elegant italic hand, and has a few pencil manuscript notes in a small, clear hand. Simon Stevin, *Hypomnemata mathematica* (Leiden: Jan Paets, 1608), is inscribed ‘Thomas Ridgley’, recognisably in the same hand as on the Ptolemy, but has no other manuscript notes. But the hand in these books is not at all like that in fig. 2, which does not in any case look like the hand of a person born in 1576.

39 BL 1033.K.5.
Secondly, there is the ascription to Mayerne. At first glance this seems a more likely identification, given Mayerne’s European connections and his interest in chemical medicine. Sloane owned many of Mayerne’s manuscripts, and they feature headings and comments in red ink, with the text mostly in black ink, as do the annotated works. However, these similarities are not great enough to convince that the annotations are in Mayerne’s hand. Indeed, the reference in BL 1165.c.9. to a remedy of Mayerne’s passed to the annotator by Samuel Stringer rather rules out identification of Mayerne as the annotator.

Thirdly, there is Jonathan Goddard (1617–1675), physician, chemist and anatomist, Gresham Professor of Physic, and a founder Fellow of the Royal Society. The British Library catalogue attributes manuscript notes to Goddard in BL 1033.l.10, 1174.b.7 (formerly Sloane MS 1054), Sloane MS 1139
Sir Hans Sloane and the Library of Dr Luke Rugeley

and Sloane MS 1159. The hand in 1033.l.10, 1174.b.7 and Sloane MS 1159 is certainly that of the ‘Rugeley’ books. That in Sloane MS 1139 is a little more doubtful, being a looser, more hurried hand, but in parts very similar.

Goddard certainly had a library, and had apparently intended to bequeath it to the Royal Society, but he died intestate, of apoplexy, on the way home after a dinner on 24 March 1675, and ‘his curious library of books, well and richly bound’, with an iron chest containing 1,000 guineas and 300 broad pieces, passed to his sister’s son, then a scholar at Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge. It seems that John Richards, who also became a physician, duly inherited his uncle’s library, and that it was sold after his death, probably in 1698, to benefit his children. There does not seem to have been a printed catalogue of the sale.

However, the attribution to Goddard is shaky. Sloane’s own catalogue entry describes Sloane MS 1059 as ‘processus chymici etc. D. Goddard’, Sloane MS 1139 is described as ‘Collectanea de itineraribus, de insectis, avibus etc. vid.an D Goddard’, though 1033.l.10 is simply described as being ‘cum notis msstis’. Sloane therefore appears to have been uncertain about the authorship of the manuscript notes, but subsequent cataloguers have assumed his tentative identification was certain. The identification of the annotator with Goddard is uncertain for a number of further reasons. There is Sloane’s own doubt over the identification; the connection with Europe and the Netherlands in particular is characteristic of the annotations, but lacking in Goddard’s biography; there is a specific reference to ‘my wife … miscarrying’, whereas Goddard was unmarried; and there is no evident provenance trail to Rugeley. Additionally, the Royal Society holds manuscript copies of papers presented at meetings, including two by Goddard. Such papers are

40 Sloane MS 1159, fol. 1033.l.10, 1174.b.7 and Sloane MS 1159 is certainly that of the ‘Rugeley’ books. That in Sloane MS 1139 is a little more doubtful, being a looser, more hurried hand, but in parts very similar.
42 Goddard’s sister Abigail (b. 1627) had married Solomon Richards (1619–1691), Governor of Wexford from 1659: their children included John, born in 1655. Venn in the Alumni Cantabrigienses records a John Richards, admitted at Gonville and Caius College, 23 July 1675, son of Solomon, gent., of Clonmel, Co. Tipperary, schooled at Wexford. He proceeded scholar 1674–80, M.B. 1680/1, Fellow 1680–90, and M.D. 1696. Curiously, he is said by both Venn and in Burke’s Landed Gentry to have been disinherited, and to have died without issue overseas. This may be the result of a confusion with Major General John Richards, who became Governor of Alicante and died there in 1710. A more likely identification is with John Richards, who was buried at St Luke’s, Chelsea, on 16 March 1697, and described as ‘Doctor of Physick’. Richards does not appear to have been a member of the College of Physicians. His will, proved 18 April 1698 (The National Archives, PRO, PROB/11/145), directs that ‘my books to be sold and the proceeds equally among my children’.
43 Sloane MS 3972B, fol. 1033.l.10, 1174.b.7 and Sloane MS 1159 is certainly that of the ‘Rugeley’ books. That in Sloane MS 1139 is a little more doubtful, being a looser, more hurried hand, but in parts very similar.
44 Sloane MS 3972B, fol. 1033.l.10, 1174.b.7 and Sloane MS 1159 is certainly that of the ‘Rugeley’ books. That in Sloane MS 1139 is a little more doubtful, being a looser, more hurried hand, but in parts very similar.
45 Sloane MS 3972B, fol. 1033.l.10, 1174.b.7 and Sloane MS 1159 is certainly that of the ‘Rugeley’ books. That in Sloane MS 1139 is a little more doubtful, being a looser, more hurried hand, but in parts very similar.
46 Sloane MS 3972B, fol. 1033.l.10, 1174.b.7 and Sloane MS 1159 is certainly that of the ‘Rugeley’ books. That in Sloane MS 1139 is a little more doubtful, being a looser, more hurried hand, but in parts very similar.
47 BL 544.f.17, fol. Clxxix’.
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often holograph, but these papers are not in the hand of the annotated books (fig. 3). Goddard’s tenure as Warden of Merton College, Oxford, seems to have left no holograph evidence. 48

Thus we see that Sloane clearly took considerable interest in the library of Luke Rugeley, marking the sale catalogue with a selection of potential purchases, probably attending the sale himself, and acquiring about a fifth of those volumes in which he had interest. A high proportion of his purchases had manuscript notes, of whose authorship he was uncertain, but he nevertheless made some suggestions. This uncertainty was still troubling Thomas Stack when he undertook his overhaul of the library in the 1730s, at which stage he often added bibliographical and biographical information to the documentation of the collection. The reason for Sloane’s interest in Rugeley’s library may have been professional rivalry, and one which lingered, since the story of the eye remedy is recounted in such detail some forty-five years after Rugeley’s death. Sloane’s interest in chemical and alchemical

48 I am grateful to Julia Walworth, Research Fellow and Librarian of Merton College, Oxford, for this information.
literature continued: even in the 1740s he was still acquiring both contemporary and older material of this nature. It is not surprising that a few more books heavily annotated in the same hand which do not appear in Rugeley’s catalogue (see appendix 4 below) should have reached him, and suggests also a continuing interest in the content of these annotations.

The study of provenance regularly uncovers vestiges of other bodies of material owned by former and often unidentified collectors and practitioners, and the traces of earlier transactions leading to these collections. In this case the vestiges are those of a collection built up and annotated in the middle of the seventeenth century, for the most part merged into the library auctioned in 1696, and strongly representative of a particular strand of seventeenth-century medicine, namely chemical medicine. Sloane’s acquisitions offer us physical evidence of a London-based practice in chemical medicine, evidence which, despite the continuing uncertainty of its source, Sloane clearly valued, and incorporated into his own body of knowledge. Just as importantly, though, the story illustrates Sloane’s ambitions and methods as a collector at a period when he was personally involved in the expansion and enhancement of his library. The particular search for the source of a remedy for eye disease, a field in which he was later renowned, shows him searching for books and manuscripts as knowledge, and not merely as bibliographical trophies. The reputation for omnivorous collecting which Sloane acquired later in life is not evident here; rather, he made a quite distinctive selection with a focus on German chemical and alchemical works—drawing on the particular strengths of Rugeley’s own library.
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APPENDIX 1
BOOKS FROM RUGELEY’S LIBRARY ACQUIRED BY SLOANE IN 1696

This table lists two groups of books from Rugeley’s library catalogued in Sloane MS 3972C, vol. i, fols. 194–98, which represent Sloane’s principal acquisitions at the 1696 sale. Numbers are enclosed by square brackets when they do not appear in the volumes but have been identified from Sloane’s manuscript catalogues, and when the volumes bear the octagonal black British Museum stamp that was used on Sloane’s books. The prices given in the marked-up sale catalogue sometimes differ from Sloane’s coded prices. There may be a number of reasons for this, but it is possible that a delay between the sale and the cataloguing process had led to uncertainty about the purchase prices.

Fig. 6  Sloane MS 3972C, vol. i, fol. 194v (p. 190).

Fig. 7  Sloane MS 3972C, vol. i, fol. 196v (p. 192).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sloane alphanumeric</th>
<th>Page and lot number in Rugeley sale catalogue</th>
<th>Bibliographical details</th>
<th>BL shelfmark</th>
<th>Annotations in the hand illustrated in fig. 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>d 472</td>
<td>p. 22, lot 227</td>
<td>THEODORUS, Jacob [Tabernaemontanus]. <em>Eicones plantarum</em>. Frankfurt, 1590. Lindenius, p. 498b v and p. 830b r.</td>
<td>Neither of the BL copies is from Sloane’s library, nor is the copy in the Botany Library, Natural History Museum, London.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d 474–5</td>
<td>p. 19, lot 99</td>
<td>GAEBELKHOVER, Oswald. <em>Artzneybuch</em>. Tubingen, 1596.</td>
<td>777-g.5</td>
<td>MS notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[d 476]</td>
<td>p. 19, lot 83</td>
<td>WITTICH, Johann. <em>Sylva Experimentorum</em>. Leipzig, 1607.</td>
<td>777-g.32</td>
<td>MS notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[d 479, 481]</td>
<td>p. 20, lots 131, 132</td>
<td>KIRSTEN, Georg. <em>Adversaria ... Und G. Dethardinges ... Chymischer Probir-Ofen</em>. Stettin, 1648.</td>
<td>1033.h.16 (1,2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sloane alphanumeric</td>
<td>Page and lot number in Rugeley sale catalogue</td>
<td>Bibliographical details</td>
<td>BL shelfmark</td>
<td>Annotations in the hand illustrated in fig. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d 483</td>
<td>p. 19, lot 76. Price 0.1.6. Sloane's purchase code for 1696, is 6d.</td>
<td>HELBACH, Friedrich. <em>Olivetum</em>. Frankfurt, 1605.</td>
<td>1033.h.31</td>
<td>MS notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[d 483]</td>
<td>These two items were bound with HELBACH, according to Sloane MS 3972 C, fol. 196 v (p. 192).</td>
<td>BAPST, Michael. <em>Juniperetum</em>. Eisleben, 1605. BAPST, Michael. <em>Wunderbarliches Lieb und Wund Arzneybuch</em>. Eisleben, 1596.</td>
<td>1033.h.30</td>
<td>MS notes and underscores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d 484</td>
<td>p. 20, lot 147. Price 0.1.0.</td>
<td>CLODIUS, Balduinus. <em>Officina Chymica</em>. Frankfurt, 1633.</td>
<td>1033.i.9</td>
<td>A few marks and underscores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d 489</td>
<td>A Catalogue of ... Books ... being the Library of Dr. Rugeley, [1686]. The Rugeley sale catalogue itself is BL S.C.886, and the Appendix is S.C. 881(2). The alphanumeric d 489 was also used for a large number of other sale catalogues and dissertations.</td>
<td></td>
<td>S.C. 886 and S.C. 881 (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sloane alphanumeric</td>
<td>Page and lot number in Rugeley sale catalogue</td>
<td>Bibliographical details</td>
<td>BL shelfmark</td>
<td>Annotations in the hand illustrated in Fig. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g 451</td>
<td>p. 27, lot 222. Sloane’s purchase code for 1696, price 6d.</td>
<td>ROETENBECK, Joannes. <em>Speculum scorbuticum</em>. Nuremberg, 1633.</td>
<td>1187.b.7 (1)</td>
<td>MS notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g 451</td>
<td>p. 27, lot 223. Price 0.0.6.</td>
<td>HORNUNG, Joannes. <em>Notwendiger chirurgischer Unterricht</em>. Nuremberg, 1622.</td>
<td>1187.b.7 (2)</td>
<td>MS notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g 457</td>
<td>p. 27, lot 225. Sloane’s purchase code for 1696, price 6d.</td>
<td>SINICKER, Emanuel. <em>Spagyrische Hausz und Raysz Apotheca</em>. Zurich, 1628.</td>
<td>1034.b.7</td>
<td>MS notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g 458</td>
<td>p. 25, lot 98. Price 0.0.6.</td>
<td>FORSTERUS, Martinus. <em>Tartarus Hypochondriorum</em>. Gera, 1614.</td>
<td>1167.a.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g 462</td>
<td>p. 25, lot 138. Price 0.0.6.</td>
<td>RYFF, Walther. <em>Ehstands artzneibuch</em>. Frankfurt, 1534.</td>
<td>1175.f.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sloane alphanumeric number</td>
<td>Page and lot number in Rugeley sale catalogue</td>
<td>Bibliographical details</td>
<td>BL shelfmark</td>
<td>Annotations in the hand illustrated in fig. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[g 463]</td>
<td>These two items were bound with the previous, according to Sloane MS 3972C vol.1, fol.194r (p. 190), but not identified in Rugeley’s catalogue.</td>
<td>DRYANDER, Johann. <em>Practicierbüchlin Ausserlesener Arzeneystück</em>. Frankfurt, 1589. ZAPATA, Giovanni Battista. <em>Schlüssel der Arztney</em>. Frankfurt, 1605.</td>
<td>C. 125. b. 19 (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[g 466]</td>
<td>p. 28, lot 287. Price 6.</td>
<td>POPP, Johann. <em>Kräuter Buch</em>. Leipzig, 1625.</td>
<td>g 466 in Sloane MS 3972C, vol. 1 fol. 194r (p. 190). This copy is no longer in the British Library. The copy at 968.h.4 (1) has Sloane alphanumeric a 747; 988.a.6 is from the library of Sir Joseph Banks.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g 467</td>
<td>p 28, lot 278. Price 6. This volume contains five tracts by Glauber.</td>
<td>GLAUBER, Johann. <em>Glauberus concentratus</em>. Amsterdam, 1668.</td>
<td>1033.b.20 (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[g 468]</td>
<td>p. 28, lot 253. Price 0.6.</td>
<td>Wasserstein der Weysen, Frankfurt, 1619.</td>
<td>1033.c.6 (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[g 485]</td>
<td>p. 29, lot 298. Price 0.0.6.</td>
<td>RHUMEL, Johann Pharamund. <em>Medicina Spagyrica</em>. Frankfurt, 1648.</td>
<td>1034.b.14</td>
<td>MS notes and underscores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sloane alphanumeric</td>
<td>Page and lot number in Rugeley sale catalogue</td>
<td>Bibliographical details</td>
<td>BL shelfmark</td>
<td>Annotations in the hand illustrated in Fig. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g 496</td>
<td>p. 29, lot 315. Price 0.4.</td>
<td>AGRICOLA, Johann. <em>Institutiones chirurgicae</em>. Frankfurt, 1638.</td>
<td>548.a.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[g 497]</td>
<td>p. 29, lot 345. Price 0.10.</td>
<td><em>Physica Hebraea Rabbi Aben Tybbon</em>. Cologne, 1555.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The BL has two copies, one from the Old Royal Library, one a 19th-century accession. This copy, which is listed in Lindenius p. [c]a v, may have been sold as a duplicate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[g 503]</td>
<td>p. 29, lot 330. Price 0.4.</td>
<td>MINDERER, Raymund. <em>Medicina militaris</em>. Nuremberg, 1634.</td>
<td>1170.a.10</td>
<td>Few MS notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[g 507]</td>
<td>p. 29, lot 327. Price 0.8.</td>
<td>POLEMANN, Joachimus. <em>Novum Lumen Medicum</em>. Amsterdam, 1659.</td>
<td>1033.c.25</td>
<td>Underscores in black and red ink.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g 508</td>
<td>p. 29, lot 338. Price 0.8.</td>
<td>RHUMEL, Johann. <em>Pharamund. Compendium</em></td>
<td>1036.a.9 (t)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX 2

OTHER BOOKS IN SLOANE’S COLLECTION WHICH PROBABLY DERIVED FROM RUGELEY’S

The following table lists books which probably derive from Rugeley’s library but which were placed in other parts of Sloane’s library. Some may have been acquired after the sale or from other sources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sloane alphanumeric</th>
<th>Page and lot number in Rugeley sale catalogue</th>
<th>Bibliographical details</th>
<th>BL shelfmark</th>
<th>Annotations in the hand illustrated in fig. 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1822</td>
<td>p. 26, lot 188. No price.</td>
<td>KESSLER, Thomas. <em>Vierhundert Ausserlesene Chymische Process.</em> Strasbourg, 1632.</td>
<td>1034.g.8 Sloane MS 3972C, vol. 1, fol. 131v (p. CXXV)</td>
<td>MS notes and underscores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[s 110]</td>
<td>p. 26, lots 161 and 162, each priced at 4d.</td>
<td>KIESER, Franz. <em>Cabala chymica.</em> Mulhouse, 1606. Lot 161, <em>Colloquia Chymica germania,</em> [s.d.], is described by Sloane as incomplete, and may be part of Kieser’s work.</td>
<td>1033.f.11 Sloane MS 3972C, vol. 1, fol. 192r (p. 188)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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x 28  p. 23, lot 20. Sloane's purchase code for 1696, price 9d. No price is marked Rugeley's catalogue.

[x 186]  p. 28, lot 252. Marked with a cross, but no price.

N 1134  p. 19, lot 82. No mark or price.

MS 445: MS B 820  p. 27, lot 202. No mark or price.

MS 2035: MS B 678  p. 22, lot 256. No mark or price.

p. 24, lot 92. Marked with a cross.


Vier ausserlesene Teutsche chemische Büchlein. Kassel, 1649. 1053.c.10 Sloane MS 3972C, vol. 8, fol. 200r (p. 3503), but this may refer to another copy, as it suggests an acquisition date between 1732 and 1753.

WEICKARD, Arnold. Pharmacia domestica, dass ist: Hauss Apotheck. Frankfurt, 1628. 546.f.7(1,2,3) Sloane MS 3972C, vol. 4, f. 93v (p. 1083).

REINNECCERUS, Fidejustus. Thesaurus chymicus. Leipzig, 1609. 1053.k.5 Lindenius p. 274 gives the Sloane alphanumeric h 47.

HARTMANN, Johann. Praxis Chymiatrica. Leipzig, 1633. 1033.1.10 Sloane MS 3972B, fol. 166v 'cum notis msstis'.

SERENUS SAMMONICUS, Quintus. De Medicina praecepta saluberrima. Amsterdam, 1662. Possibly 540.c.27, Sloane alphanumeric h 267, Lindenius p. 298, which bears Sloane’s purchase code for 1697, price 1s 6d.
OTHER BOOKS PRICED IN THE RUGELEY SALE CATALOGUE
BUT WHICH CANNOT BE FIRMLY IDENTIFIED WITH
SLOANE’S COPIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Lot</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Edition</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p. 25</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>DIGBY, Kenelm</td>
<td><em>Choice and Experimented Receipts in Physick and Chirurgery</em></td>
<td>1651/14</td>
<td>This copy was formerly in the Patent Office Library.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 26</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>WIGANDUS, Joachimus Vitus</td>
<td><em>De philiatrorum Germanorum itineribus</em></td>
<td>Possibly 1715</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 32</td>
<td>456</td>
<td></td>
<td>Described as <em>Purlings Universal medicin or Liquor of Life</em> [s.d.]</td>
<td>Possibly an edition in English of Erasmus Purling, <em>Le Cabinet de la nature ouvert à toute sorte de personnes, soit gentilshommes, artisans ou autres qui sont amateurs des arts et des sciences inventées pour avancer le bien public, publié par le major Erasmus Purling</em>, Paris 1657. A copy of the French edition is at the Bibliothèque Nationale de France, but no English edition has been traced.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 4
OTHER BOOKS ANNOTATED IN THE HAND SHOWN IN FIG. 2
BUT NOT LOCATED IN RUGELEY’S SALE CATALOGUE

| a 1207 | HERMANNI, Philippus. *Een Constich Distilleerboeck*.
|        | Amsterdam, 1622. | Sloane MS 3972C, vol 5, fol. 279v (p. 1909). | The Sloane alphanumeric suggests an acquisition date between 1712 and 1723. |
| c 58 | GRATIOLO, Andrea. *Discorso di peste*.
|       | Venice, 1576. | Sloane MS 3972C, vol. 1, fol. 91 (p. 8). | The Sloane alphanumeric suggests an acquisition date before 1697. |
| l 679 | HIPPOCRATES. *Aphorismi*.
| l 681 | SCHEUNERUS, Fabianus. *De Catharri Artzneyer*.
| l 1021 | CRATO, Joannes. *Europorista Cratoniana oder Hauss*.
|        | Breslau, 1630. | Sloane MS 3972C, vol. 1, fol. 126v (p. CXX). | The Sloane alphanumeric suggests an acquisition date between 1697 and 1700. |
| l 1182 | FREITAG, Joannes Henricus. *Catalogus Testium veritatis Chimiatricae*.
| [ m 679] or [ l 23] | BERTRUCIUS, Nicolaus. *Compendium*.
|       | Lyon, 1509. | Sloane MS 3972C, vol. 1, fol. 131v (p. CXXV). | The Sloane alphanumeric suggests an acquisition date between 1697 and 1700. |
| [ m 679] or [ l 23] | | | Lindenius lists two copies. |
| x 4 | FIORAVANTI, Leonardo. *La Cirurgia*.
|       | Venice, 1630. | Sloane MS 3972C, vol. 1, fol. 26v (p. 25). | This volume contains two editions of the same work, both with MS notes, though only in 782.a.3(2) can they be firmly identified as the hand in fig. 2. It bears Sloane’s purchase code 1686, price 6d. |
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D 254  AVERROES. [Colliget. Followed by the 'Liber Theizir' and Antidotarium of Avenzohar.] Venice, 1553.

543.g.4 Sloane’s purchase code 1697, price 16s.
Lindenius, p. 2.

MS A 246  SILVATICUS, Matthaeus. Pandectae Medicinae. Lyon, 1541.

544.h.5 Sloane’s purchase code 1698, price 3s.
Sloane MS 3972C, fol. 267v (p. CLX).

MS 296; MS A 262  BRAUNSCHWEIG, Hieronymus. New Vollkomen Distillierbuch. Frankfurt, 1597.

717.l.38 (1) Sloane’s purchase code 1698, price 9s. 6d.
Sloane MS 3972C, vol. 1, fol. 155v (p. CLXIX).

MS 1432; MS C 652  FERRUS, Alphonsus. De ligni sancti multiplici medicina. Lyon, 1547.

547.a.9 Sloane MS 3972B, fol. 100v.

MS C 229 (formerly MS 556)  LÉRY, Jean de. Histoire d’un voyage fait en la terre du Bresil. [Geneva], 1594.

1052.a.16 Sloane MS 3972C, Vol. 2, fol. 2v (p. CC).
On the flyleaf, in Sloane’s hand, ‘John de Lery’s history of Brasil with ms notes and a translation by Dr Foot.’ [i.e. Daniel Foote]. The notes are not in Foote’s hand. The translation by Foote is now Sloane MS 608 ff 151–191b.


1174.b.7 Sloane MS 3972B, fol. 70r.


1167.a.48 Sloane MS 3972B, fol. 70r.
MS 533 seems to have contained four items, of which only these two have been identified.

PARACELSUS. Holtzbüchlein. Strasbourg, 1564.

546.b.13 (1) Sloane MS 3972C, fol. 206v (p. CXCI).

MS 534; MS C 58  VARIGNANA Gulielmus. Secreta medicinae. Basel, 1597.

1038.g.2 Sloane MS 3972C, fol. 206v (p. CXCI).

[R 2154]  Alchymia vera. [?1610].

1031.g.8 Sloane MS 3972C, vol. 4, fol. 102v (p. 1081).


1167.g.3 Sloane MS 3972C, fol. 206v (p. CXCI).
Lindenius, p. 678.