On Saturday, 27 April 1929, Lady Edith Jane Durning-Lawrence, widow of Sir Edwin Durning-Lawrence (1837-1914) died from bronchitis and heart failure at the age of 84. She left numerous bequests, some of which are enumerated in her obituary in The Times of 30 April 1929 and in more detail in Alexander Gordon’s Memoir of Lady Durning-Lawrence (privately printed, 1930, pp. 31-4). Among them was her husband’s library, evaluated at £48,000, together with £1,000 in trust for its upkeep, to the University of London. Thereupon the library passed from private into public ownership. The purpose of this article is to trace the fortune of the Durning-Lawrence Library, as her will stipulated that it was to be called, since then.

The Durning-Lawrence Library contained approximately 5,700 books and manuscripts, most of which had been amassed by Sir Edwin Durning-Lawrence to promote his belief that Sir Francis Bacon was responsible for the plays of William Shakespeare and for all other great works of Elizabethan and Jacobean literature. 1 It was particularly strong in editions of Francis Bacon’s works, texts about Bacon and the Bacon-Shakespeare authorship controversy, sixteenth- and seventeenth-century English literature, emblem books, and the works of Daniel Defoe. It also contained numerous items of perceived Baconian relevance. In view of Durning-Lawrence’s expansive views of Bacon’s authorship, extending beyond Shakespeare to Sir Philip Sidney, Christopher Marlowe, Don Quixote, and the final text of the King James Bible among other works, these were noteworthy, extending far beyond works which mentioned Bacon, had supposedly been owned by him, or were believed to have been used by Shakespeare.

A review article by Brian Vickers of four works on the question of Shakespearean authorship, ‘Idle Worship’, in The Times Literary Supplement for 19 and 26 August 2005, castigates Durning-Lawrence for his extreme Baconianism and states as an aside that his ‘name as the donor of one of its collections still embarrasses users of Senate House Library’ (p. 6). Embarrassment, however, was far from being the major emotion to greet the Durning-Lawrence bequest. Terminology applied to describe it in the University Library’s annual report for 1929 is as an important benefaction, a valuable library and as a munificent bequest:

which will place the University Library in an outstanding position among the libraries of modern universities. It contains, in addition to many other first editions and bibliographical treasures, a fine set of the first four folio editions of Shakespeare’s Works, the first edition of Coverdale’s Bible, printed at Zurich in 1535 (the first Bible printed in the English language), the first edition of Alice in Wonderland, with Sir John Tenniel’s original drawings[sic] inserted, several
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manuscripts, and exceptionally good Defoe, Cervantes, and Bacon collections. (University archives, UL 1/1/4).²

The praise is repeated with some variation and expansion in the annual report for 1931, when the collection entered the possession of the University Library, whence the Library Association Record took it up and promulgated it to the library community at large (Library Association Record, vol. 2, 3rd ser., 1932, pp. 178-9).

In 1964 Raymond Irwin and Ronald Staveley described the collection as ‘a very important collection ... containing one of the best collections in the world on Sir Francis Bacon and valuable collections on Shakespeare and Defoe.³ More parochially and recently, Alisa Thompson declared in the introductory paragraph of an article in FULLview, the newsletter for the Friends of Senate House Library: ‘It is a great honour to house the collections of individuals such as Sir Edwin Durning-Lawrence’.⁴

The praise was not misplaced. The Durning-Lawrence Library was the first named special collection to be bequeathed since 1903, and the first literary collection to be given at all. As the Library Association Record’s report highlighted, it increased the number of incunabula in the University Library, a traditional measuring stick of antiquarian excellence,⁵ but more importantly it virtually created its antiquarian literary and emblematic holdings.

Pride in acquisition, however, did not eliminate logistical problems. By 1929 the University Library, then housed in South Kensington, was severely overcrowded. For the first six years of its possession by the University of London, most of the Durning-Lawrence library remained in storage. Appropriate housing had been a consideration from the outset, Library Committee minute 93 of 7 November 1929 stating:

... the expense which will be incurred in the matter of housing, maintenance, etc., will not, in comparison with the great value of the collection, be large. The Library Committee proposes, when considering the planning of the Library in its new home on the Bloomsbury Site, to pay especial attention to the question of providing a special room to house this valuable collection.

In 1931 plans for the room became more concrete. The house at no. 13 Carlton House Terrace, occupied during the 1840s by Gladstone, in which the Durning-Lawrences and their niece Theodora Durning-Lawrence had resided since early 1896, had never been cheap; Gordon’s Memoir of Lady Durning-Lawrence (p. 24) names £16,250 at the time of moving in in 1896, and a heavy rent. In 1931 Theodora decided to vacate the property, ‘as owing to high taxation, etc., she finds it difficult to maintain these premises as they should be kept’. In connection with her move, she offered the University of London the furnishings of the library at 13 Carlton House Terrace: ‘This proposed gift, which includes the bookcases, tables, chairs, settees and carpets, etc. would enable the
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² All subsequent quotations from Library Committee minutes or annual reports 1928-1933 are from this volume; quotations from Library Committee minutes or annual reports 1933-1938 are from UL 1/1/5.
⁴ Alisa Thompson, ‘The Other Friends of the University Library’, FULLview, 11 (1993), 9-12 (p. 9).
⁵ The Durning-Lawrence incunabula still account for 13% of the Library’s total.
University to reproduce, in their own buildings, the Library exactly as it was in Sir Edwin Durning-Lawrence’s days’ (letter of 8 June 1931, reproduced in minute 273, Library Committee minutes, 2 Nov. 1931). The matter was pressing, as Miss Durning-Lawrence wished to leave the house by 29 September. The University agreed, and housed most of the furniture, including the bookcases and a large oil portrait of Sir Edwin Durning-Lawrence, executed by A.E. Emslie, in storage, at an expense of £332.7s.10d. The plan, stated in the Library Committee’s annual report for 1935, was to house the Durning-Lawrence Library on the first floor, in: ‘a lofty and imposing room (87 ft. x 33 ft.) in a prominent position above the main entrance to the building. With its more homelike furniture it will possess a specially intimate charm, comparable with the reading lounge of a Club’. By 1938, the Library was dubious about the relevance of the gift of the furnishings, both the Senate House architect, Charles Holden, and the Librarian, Reginald Arthur Rye, believing them to be unsuitable to the new building. Miss Durning-Lawrence, however, insisted on their use (Library Committee minute 461, 16 May 1938). So plans were altered. The room previously intended as the Palaeography Room was earmarked for the Durning-Lawrence Library, while the first-floor room proposed for the Durning-Lawrence Library became a space in which to study palaeography and house special collections. In September 1937 the rare books were brought from Chancery Lane to the new University Library building at Senate House in Bloomsbury.

While the Durning-Lawrence Library became an imposing room, it remained a responsibility, however. Library Committee minutes of 28 October 1971 note the furniture as a recurrent expense:

The chairs in the Durning-Lawrence Library were last completely re-upholstered and re-covered in black leather in 1955 ... . Since then some minor renovation has been carried out, but deterioration has been rapid in the last few months and re-covering of at least some of the chairs is urgent. One settee and two chairs were in fact dealt with earlier this year ... . A further four of the large chairs ought to be done soon. The average cost of re-covering in P.V.C. material, which looks like leather, and is thought to be more durable, is about £40. (University Archives, UL 1/1/14)

Breakage was also a threat: meetings and receptions were held in the room, and notices on fragile pieces of furniture imploring occupants not to sit on them were not always heeded. The furniture had to be moved constantly, either out of the room entirely for some meetings, or away from the bookcases to allow access to books on the lower shelves. In 2005 the chairs and settees were sold. A plan chest and the bookcases remained to bestow a gentlemanly air upon the room.

Once the collection was housed, it required cataloguing and classification. Two library inventories, made for insurance purposes in 1914 and 1929, list the contents case by case, shelf by shelf. They reveal that Durning-Lawrence had not ordered his books entirely consistently. Clumps of similar books had been kept together: for example, the Defoe collection; Shakespeare quarto facsimiles; seventeenth-century plays; Shakespeare’s four folios; and music scores (not bequeathed). But quite often authors or themes were separated: for example, Bacon (unsurprisingly, perhaps, in view of the large
quantity) scattered over eleven shelves in seven bookcases and in open shelves above the bookcases; Montaigne’s *Essais*. When the Durning-Lawrence Library became institutional property, it was classified by the homegrown classification scheme used across the University Library, with the distinguishing prefix [D.-L.L.] before classmarks. This system begins with classical, then modern philology; proceeds to classical, then modern literatures; then history, topography, geography, biography, philosophy, theology, law, political economy, education, mathematics, astronomy, sciences, arts and trades, and general works. Physical violence to the sequence reflected the importance of the collection to the collector: Bacon’s works, grouped together as ‘English literature’, followed by Shakespeare’s and by Bacon-Shakespeare criticism and then by emblemata (which occupy a place between biography and philosophy in the classification schedule), keep their logical classmarks but are shelved at the beginning of the sequence. A small amount of separation of authors remains, owing primarily to standard library practice of separating folios from smaller volumes to save space. A complete overview of contents has never been vouchsafed the viewer. The original bookcases include two cupboards with wooden doors. Moreover, in one bookcase the shelves swing back to reveal a second layer behind the first. As it did in Durning-Lawrence’s house, the collection overflows into additional storage space in the University Library. But texts and authors came together more logically than they had done ever before. As a consequence, Durning-Lawrence’s emphasis remains clear, more visibly so than previously, with most of the first side of the square room occupied by works by and about Francis Bacon and William Shakespeare.

Even when it first arrived, the Durning-Lawrence Library was no longer exactly the library which Sir Edwin Durning-Lawrence left behind him when he died. According to Alexander Gordon’s *Memoir of Lady Durning-Lawrence*:

> In the vast collection of books and manuscripts brought together by Sir Edwin for the purpose of his enquiry, she took the most lively interest, knowing every volume, and frequently visiting the leading purveyors of old books whose catalogues promised anything likely to be of service to the collection. (p. 33).

There is no evidence from the books that Lady Durning-Lawrence made proactive steps to extend the library, merely that she kept it intact, refusing an offer by Folger to buy its First Folio. A handful of inscribed books however, indicate something of Lady Durning-Lawrence’s circles of acquaintance and influence (admittedly a perpetuation of those of her husband, whom she supported wholeheartedly). Her obituary in *The Times* of 30 April 1929 states that she was a member of the Bacon Society and president of the League of Francis St Alban, and that she had supported not only hospitals, but the Ross Institute of Tropical Diseases. A *Times* obituary of 1 May 1929 by Sir Gregory Foster, Provost of University College London, adds:

> Since his [Sir Edwin’s] death, Lady Durning-Lawrence had been very active in work both for college and school. She contributed most generously to the College
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6 Namely Case 2, shelf 4, Case 4, Shelf 5, Case 4, Shelf 8, Case 9, Shelf 1 and 4-5, intermingled with other authors in Case 10, Case 11, Shelves 4 and 6-8, and Case 12, Shelf 7.
Centenary Fund and attended all the centenary functions. ... Both college and school mourn her death and the consequent severing of a link with their founders.

Books substantiate the biographical facts. The most significant book presented to Lady Durning-Lawrence, from the standpoint of highlighting Durning-Lawrence’s Baconian views, is *Bacon – Shakespeare – Cervantes*, by Alfred von Weber Ebenhoff (Leipzig and Vienna, 1917), with an inserted manuscript letter from the author to Lady Durning-Lawrence, 17 July 1920, including the words: ‘I am very glad that you are pleased by the Cervantes-Chapter of my book, to which I have been initiated by the late Sir Edwin’ (this refers to the belief mooted by Durning-Lawrence that Bacon was the author of *Don Quixote*, composed in English and translated by Cervantes into Spanish, the language in which, for political reasons, it was first published). Among the other examples of Baconiana inscribed by their authors to Lady Durning-Lawrence, the most significant is probably Mrs Henry Pott’s *Philomir, or, Self’s the Man* (London, 1915), inscribed: ‘To Lady Durning-Lawrence with very kind regards from Constance M. Pott, Mar. 1915’; Mrs Pott was the founder of the Bacon Society. Reflecting other circles in which Lady Durning-Lawrence moved, *Centenary Addresses of University College London* (London, 1927), is inscribed: ‘To Lady Durning-Lawrence, as a memento of the Centenary and in recognition of her valuable help’, and – perhaps the most significant non-Baconian gift - towards the end of her life Sir Ronald Ross (1857-1932), who discovered the mosquito cycle in malaria which helped to eradicate this disease, gave her a copy of his *La Découverte de la transmission du paludisme par les moustiques* (Paris, 1929), inscribed: ‘Lady Durning-Lawrence from Ronald Ross – the best description of my work. 14.1.29’.

The endowment of £1,000 enabled the purchase of new books for the Durning-Lawrence Library. While there are gaps in Durning-Lawrence’s holdings of early editions of Bacon, and a Library Committee minute of 18 May 1936 described the library as ‘requiring augmentation’, seventeenth and even eighteenth-century publications soon exceeded available means. At the end of the twentieth century such material, when published in English or in the British Isles, lost urgency through the availability of digitised surrogates on the databases Early English Books Online (EEBO) for the STC and Wing periods and Eighteenth-Century Collections Online (ECCO). Purchases have thus focused on monographs about Bacon and the authorship question. Some are standard general academic texts covering the arguments concerning Shakespearean authorship without bias, such as H.N. Gibson’s *The Shakespeare Claimants* (London, 1962) and John Michell’s *Who Wrote Shakespeare?* (London, 1996). Others propound the claims of men other than Bacon or Shakespeare to authorship of Shakespeare’s works: several on Edward De Vere, Earl of Oxford, but extending to Sir Henry Neville, the most recent contender, with Brenda James and William D. Rubinstein’s *The Truth Will Out* (Harlow, 2005). Some acquisitions are distinctly Baconian. For example, a Canadian-born Danish citizen retired from a career as an international management consultant, Ross Jackson, wrote a novel entitled *Shaker of the Speare*, which portrays Bacon as the son of Elizabeth I and author of Shakespeare, and a companion volume, *The Companion to Shaker of the Speare* (both Lewes, 2005); the Durning-Lawrence Library has them.

A recent acquisition from an earlier period is John Elisha Roe’s *The Mortal Moon, or, Bacon and his Masks* (New York, 1891). This 605-page book is drab in
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7 Some of this are enumerated in Attar, *op. cit.*, p. 308.
appearance but startling in its theory, that Francis Bacon was responsible for at least some of the output of Daniel Defoe (Robinson Crusoe and the first pages of The Storm). The book is especially significant in the context of Durning-Lawrence’s library in helping to explain the presence in this avowedly Baconian collection of first editions of Daniel Defoe’s works; something which I had tentatively attributed to Defoe’s admiration for Bacon, expressed in The Storm, and to a sense of Bacon’s influence on Defoe.

My favourite new acquisition is a children’s book, E.V. Lucas’s The Slowcoach (London, 1910). It is a story about a group of children who unexpectedly receive the anonymous present of a caravan, in which they take a fortnight’s trip. Their journey incorporates Stratford-upon-Avon, because nine-year-old Hester is keen on Shakespeare, and there they view the famous statue of him. They discuss his appearance, and the following discourse takes place:

‘But of course,’ said Horace, ‘it doesn’t matter what he looked like really, because he didn’t write the plays at all. They were written by Roger [sic] Bacon.’

This led to acute trouble.

‘How can you say such wicked things!’ Hester protested, bursting into tears.

‘But I read it in a book,’ said Horace, who had not wished to hurt her, but still desired to serve the truth. ‘It was sent to father.’

‘Everything in books isn’t true,’ said Janet.

‘Oh, I say!’ said Horace.

‘Of course it’s not,’ said Mary. ‘Books are always being replied to and squashed.’

‘Well, this book was by a Member of Parliament,’ said Horace.

This was very awkward for the defenders of Shakespeare. What were they to do? (pp. 103-4).

At the time plenty of people followed the Baconian theory and wrote books about it - this was in the middle of its heyday, from 1880 to 1930 - but surely Durning-Lawrence was the only Member of Parliament (or even, by that stage, ex-member of Parliament) to have done so. Moreover, Durning-Lawrence himself wrote of disseminating his book widely, a fact backed up by remaining invoices for printing and postage in the Durning-Lawrence archives. What is fascinating is the reference to Durning-Lawrence and the impact that his book Bacon is Shakespeare, published the same year, evidently made to infiltrate popular culture to such an extent.

Purchase has not been the only means of augmenting the collection. Awareness of the presence of the Durning-Lawrence Library at the University of London led to more gifts of related material, both manuscripts and printed items. A manuscript book, MS 437, is a bi-lateral cypher translation and transcription by Henry Seymour from Bacon’s The Historie of the Raigne of King Henry the Seventh, dated May 1921. It comprises fourteen introductory leaves, supposedly by Francis Bacon, referring to ‘my plays’ and
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8 Bacon’s dates are 1561-1626; Defoe’s are 1661?-1731. This is not the only known instance of Bacon having been considered as the author, rather than merely influencing, later works; a note by Constance M. Pott in the Francis Bacon Society’s copy of An Abridgment of Mr. Locke’s Essay Concerning Humane Understanding, 2nd edn (London, 1700), on permanent loan to Senate House Library, claims Baconian authorship for that work.

9 Attar, op. cit., p. 313.
claiming Elizabeth I for his mother, two leaves of alphabet, and 130 leaves of typescript translation, with letters and dots beneath each line to indicate the cypher. Valentine Smith, of the Francis Bacon Society, bought the volume when Henry Seymour died. Smith wrote to the University of London Library on 6 October 1950:

Now I was going to leave this translation and the books to the British Museum, but I think as you have the Durning-Lawrence Library it would be as well to leave it to London University, and if you will accept I shall be glad ...

There has been a great deal of controversy about the Bi-Literal but here is something [with] which there can be no fault to find, and done by one of the greatest cryptographers. It comes out exactly to the last number as Mrs. Gallup did it, but at the time (1922) her sight had failed and she was in America. The only assistance she gave to Seymour was to say which version she had used.

Just three years later, the Library acquired a packet of 111 letters written to George C. Bompas between December 1901 and March 1902 upon the publication and press coverage of his book The Problem of the Shakespeare Plays (1902), arguing for the Baconian authorship of Shakespeare’s plays (DLL/8/4). Most of the writers are Baconians, who write in complimentary fashion, some with evangelistic zeal. Constance M. Pott, for example, wrote: ‘I trust that your book will have a good circulation. Every new publication helps to enlighten a fresh set of people sitting in darkness & I never hear of any who go into this subject without coming over to our side’ (22 February, 1902), while one Schonach was enthusiastic: ‘The more I study your book the more I am convinced that it will enable us to reach the masses we have never yet been able to approach – let alone to reach. I wish I were a millionaire to scatter it broadcast – in a sixpenny edition – over the country’ (11 March 1902). There are some dry thanks – Bompas had evidently sent copies of his book to a great many people – and a few voices dissented: ‘You will be glad to know that the book cheered me through the suffering shade of influenza ... I confess that I remain unconvinced’ (Richardson Evans, no date); ‘I think that a more absolute waste of life could not be imagined than a study of the question entitled ‘The Shakspere-Bacon Question’’ (Clemen Shorter?, The Nineteen Hundred Publishing Syndicate, 27 February 1902). The means and reason for the gift are apparent from the accompanying letter written from F.N.L. Poynter, Deputy Librarian of the nearby Wellcome Historical Medical Library, to J.H.P. Pafford, Goldsmiths’ Librarian of the University of London Library, of 28 October 1953:

While going through a number of books which were given to me recently I came across a quantity of letters written to George C. Bompas when he published his book on Shakespeare (1902). It occurs to me that you might like to have these to add to your Bacon-Shakespeare collection. Do not bother to write; if you want them just telephone, and I shall send them down.

Was the awareness of another librarian nearby of the presence of the Durning-Lawrence Library at the University of London responsible for the gift of the Eggar Collection, a collection of approximately 250 books and 27 boxes of manuscripts bequeathed to the University Library in 1962 by Katherine Eggar (1909-1961), materials
for and the fruits of her research on the life of Edward de Vere, for an unwritten book? A
connection could perhaps be implied in a letter from Mrs C.E.A. Shann, executor to
Katherine Eggar, to J.H.P. Pafford, 19 January 1962, and in the acceptance of the
bequest:

I have been dealing with Miss Eggar’s effects and on the advice of Dr C.B.
Oldman, late of the British Museum, who knew Miss Eggar and the work she was
engaged on I am writing to ask you if this work ... would be of any interest to the
Library of the University of London? There are also a number of books on the
Shakespearean period. (UL 4/8/21).

An interesting recent gift of a single book to the Durning-Lawrence Library is a
facsimile copy of the First Folio, published in 1902, given by the Francis Bacon Society:
not intrinsically a valuable book (it fetches approximately £100 on the second-hand
market, and copies were already present both in the Durning-Lawrence Library and the
general library), but this particular copy was enhanced by the presence of Baconian
annotations by Edward Dinwoody Johnson and others referring to the supposed
Baconian cypher. The copy featured in the Shakespeare case of an exhibition November
2005 – April 2006, ‘Icons of Western Literature’, where it served double duty as
indicating part of the early history of Shakespearean publication – to have displayed an
actual First Folio would have been to make the Library a hostage to fortune – and as an
indication of a major literary debate about Shakespearean authorship.

Curating the Durning-Lawrence Library since it came into institutional hands has
involved learning about the collection, both as a whole and single items within it. Part of
the learning concerns rarity. The overall strengths, enumerated at the beginning of this
article, are apparent. However, in 2004 a preservation survey was carried out on the
Durning-Lawrence library, which involved filling in a form for every twenty-fifth book.
The questions included one on whether the book was unique. This required checking
books against COPAC, the union catalogue of major University libraries and national
libraries in the United Kingdom: a crude system in so far as COPAC does not cover all
academic libraries and many books in the libraries covered were not yet on COPAC (for
example, Cambridge University Library had not yet finished its project to catalogue the
items in its guard-book catalogues), but the best available guide. Durning-Lawrence's
collection of late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century works on the Bacon-
Shakespeare controversy (239 titles in the manuscript catalogue of his library) are neither
particularly old nor visually appealing, but the quantity is outstanding, and the high
proportion of American and to a lesser extent German material suggests that some of
these books are rarer than many of the older and more attractive ones. William Preston
Johnston's The Prototype of Hamlet and other Shakespearian Problems (New York,
1890) was not recorded at the time on COPAC; the only other copy of Über die
behauptete Identität der Metaphern und Gleichnisse in Bacon's und Shakespeare's
Werken (Grünberg, 1891) was in the British Library (cf five copies of the First Folio in
the British Library, and one other at Senate House).

Over time we established connections between items apart from the obvious
Baconiana and Shakespeareana. To an extent this involved reading Durning-Lawrence’s
own publications and contemporary ones to learn the more extreme views of the
Baconian theory, for example to discover the integral nature of emblem books, Rosicrucian literature, and early Bibles in the collection. (Bacon is supposed to have had a hand in printing early emblem books, which he used to display, in code for the initiated, his authorship of Shakespeare; to have headed the English Rosicrucians; and to have been the unifying hand behind the King James Bible.) The connection in Durning-Lawrence’s mind between Bacon and Cervantes first became clear via an internet search on the two terms (which inevitably also called up a great deal of irrelevant matter), although I could have achieved the same purpose by reading the Francis Bacon Society’s journal, *Baconiana*, the 1914 issue of which contains an article by John Hutchinson on the matter. Archival sources also played a role, notably for a rare quarto German Protestant tract of 1602 entitled *Nohtwendige Antwort und Defensionschrift der christlichen Revocation Predigt des ehrwirdigen Godefride Raben* The reason for the presence of this item would have been plain in Durning-Lawrence’s library, but was obscured in Senate House when the collection was classified and the book placed, correctly, in the theology section. Looking up Durning-Lawrence’s accession number in his manuscript accessions register revealed that it had been purchased with a clutch of French and German quarto Rosicrucian books of the same era, and the work is included under the heading ‘Rosicrucian books’ in Durning-Lawrence’s manuscript catalogue. Thus the presence of the text in the Durning-Lawrence Library, which is the only recorded copy in England and which complements two earlier works by Rabe in the British Library, was a mistake from Durning-Lawrence’s point of view.

In addition, over time we have learned more, not only about the position of items within the collection, but about specific items themselves, and are correcting long-held misconceptions. A copy of the 1866 edition of *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* has long been valued for a manuscript copy at the front of Tenniel’s drawing on page 132 of Alice with the Duchess. This book was valued at £35 in the 1914 inventory of Durning-Lawrence’s library and at £200 in the 1929 inventory; in the latter, the note ‘with original drawing inserted’ is included. The 1929 annual report of the University of London Library, already cited, described it more explicitly as ‘the first edition of *Alice in Wonderland* (1866), with Sir John Tenniel’s original drawings [sic] inserted’, an attribution expanded further in the 1931 annual library report: ‘an original drawing by Sir John Tenniel of one of his illustrations for *Alice in Wonderland*, inserted in a presentation copy from him ...’. A Library Committee minute of 23 May 1932 records:

Considered: The question of lending the Durning-Lawrence copy of *Alice in Wonderland* (1866), with Sir John Tenniel’s original drawing, for the purpose of inclusion in the Lewis Carroll Centenary Exhibition to be held in Old Court House, Oxford Street, from about June 29th to the end of July, 1932.

Minute 391 of the Library Committee, 21 November 1932, cites a letter of 22 August 1932 from J.G. Wilson of the Lewis Carroll Centenary Exhibition:

In returning to you the copy of ‘Alice’s Adventures’, 1866, containing a drawing by Tenniel, I wish to express my grateful thanks and those of the Executive Committee for your kindness in lending the item for the Lewis Carroll Centenary
Exhibition. This particular items was very much appreciated, and the show itself was visited by almost 12,000 people.

As late as 2002 or so the drawing featured on the official University of London Library Christmas card.

In 2004 the library’s conservator happened to mention the drawing to a friend who thought that it was more likely to be a copy by one of Tenniel's pupils, a frequent practice. We showed the illustration to an expert in Victorian book illustration, Paul Goldman, who both examined the drawing himself and conferred with another specialist colleague for the period, Simon Houfe, and they both declared this to be the case. The drawing remains interesting and inherently exhibitable, but for a different reason.

Another misconception occurred with Albertus Magnus's *De animalibus* from 1495. The geometric binding supposedly shows the arms of Catherine de Medici. The 1914 inventory of Durning-Lawrence's library described it tentatively as a Grolier binding. The annual library report for 1931 highlighted its sixteenth-century French binding, and Reginald Rye and Muriel Quinn’s *Historical and Armorial Bookbindings Exhibited in the University Library: Descriptive Catalogue* (London, 1937) repeats that the binding is from the middle of the sixteenth century, done for Catherine de Medici. In fact the colours are too bright to be authentic, and Catherine's arms are not correct. The binding is a nineteenth-century forgery by Théodore Hagué, who under the alias J. Caulin sold imitations of Renaissance bindings as original via Bernard Quaritch. Quaritch sold these to a London merchant called John Blacker, whose books were sold by Sotheby's shortly after his death in 1897 as ‘a remarkable collection of books in magnificent modern bindings’, for a fraction of what Blacker had paid. The volume in question was not in that sale. A note with the volume states that it was purchased from Quaritch. Mirjam Foot instantly identified the binding as Hagué’s in 2003. The volume has since been exhibited, for the Association of International Bibliophiles and other groups, as the forgery it is.

From the outset, the Durning-Lawrence Library has had a high profile for readers and guests inside Senate House Library, owing to its room – normally locked, but with a placard outside it, and visible through the glass planes of the door – and through Emslie’s imposing portrait of Durning-Lawrence looking down over the nearby exhibition area. For those outside the library, more was needed to raise the profile of the collection. The 1937 exhibition commemorated by Rye and Quinn may have perpetuated an error concerning the binding on an Albertus Magnus incunable, but it did well as an early attempt to publicise the then new Durning-Lawrence Library: of the eighty-three bindings described, sixteen are from Durning-Lawrence’s books. Looking at the books from an entirely different angle, catalogue and publication merge in the article ‘English Renaissance Plays in the University of London Library’, in *Research Opportunities in Renaissance Drama*, 11 (1968), 65-72. This list of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century
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plays covers the Durning-Lawrence Library and the Sterling Library -- predominantly the former.

The ubiquity of the world-wide web has increased the ease of publicising the collection, via the Library’s website and others (for example, the MASC25 website, a description of special collections in academic libraries within the M25 motorway). Exhibitions, begun early, have continued, with books shown in varying contexts. The most spectacular was the National Shakespeare Exhibition held in Stratford-upon-Avon, Edinburgh, and London successively in 1964, to which twelve libraries lent books. Senate House Library contributed twenty-four items, of which between nine and twelve, including the First Folio, were from the Durning-Lawrence Library.\(^\text{11}\)

To highlight the twenty-first century, in 2006 the Library held two displays to commemorate the seventy-fifth anniversary of receipt of the Durning-Lawrence Library, one of Bacon’s *Essays*, in early editions, translations, and a private press edition, to highlight an obvious collecting point, one of Durning-Lawrence’s Bibles, to focus upon a less immediately obvious emphasis of the collection. Books from the Durning-Lawrence Library have been exhibited within the themes not just of standard literature, but as travel (e.g. Raleigh’s *The Prince* (London, 1642)), botany (Gerard’s *Herball*, 1597) and zoology (various volumes of *The Zoology of the Voyage of HMS Beagle*, 1838).

Children’s books exhibited have extended beyond the famous Alice to Thomas Day’s *History of Sandford and Merton* (3rd edition, 1786), *Robinson Crusoe* (1719), and a small much-abridged, illustrated version published in the series Tilt’s Handbooks for Children in 1855, *The Little Robinson Crusoe*; this latter is only seventy-eight millimetres high and hopes in its preface ‘that this tale of wonderful adventures, bitter sufferings, and perilous escapes, will teach our young friends the advantages of a safe and quiet home, and cure them of that sad disorder of the mind, a discontented and restless disposition’.

Since 2001 the collection has gained extra exposure by access to the catalogues of all the major exhibitions and the text of some of the minor ones on the University Library’s website.

Upon the arrival of the Durning-Lawrence Library at Senate House, it was catalogued, on the catalogue cards current at the time. By the beginning of the twenty-first century, users tended to ignore card catalogues, relying instead exclusively on computer ones, and numerous retrospective conversion projects had taken place. A grant from the Vice-Chancellor’s Development Fund enabled the early printed books to be catalogued afresh online (those published up to 1850, the end by conservative estimates of the handpress period), supplying details which had not appeared on the index cards: indexing printers and publishers of books published up to 1700, describing provenance and indexing former owners, providing further copy-specific information. Catalogue records appeared on COPAC as well as the University Library’s own online catalogue. Books published either in the English language or in the British Isles to 1800 were reported to the ESTC (English Short-Title Catalogue); English and foreign imprints were reported to the CERL (Consortium of European Libraries) Handpress Books Database, and the inclusion of the incunabula in the Illustrated Incunabula Short-Title Catalogue was checked and updated. COPAC ensured wide coverage in Britain; ESTC extended

\(^{11}\) There is no record of the classmarks of the books lent. Nine of the books definitely came from the Durning-Lawrence Library. There are copies of a further three in the Durning-Lawrence and in the Sterling Libraries, either of which might have been selected for loan.
awareness to America, and CERL to continental Europe. As for other collections, electronic cataloguing led to increased use.

The Durning-Lawrence Library has now been in the possession of the University of London for seventy-five years. It remains prominent as a meeting room and a collection. Some activities pertaining to it – cataloguing, classifying – are complete. Others – acquiring, learning, exhibiting, publicising - are ongoing. The Library’s interest is more comprehensive than Durning-Lawrence’s: whereas Durning-Lawrence used the collection to promote his Baconian beliefs, the Library interprets the collection as a snapshot of Baconian belief, and is interested both in the less obviously Baconian, or non-Baconian, items and in the books as objects. Yet we trust that the collector would be pleased with the collection and use made of it today.