

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL CONTRIBUTIONS

2

UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS LIBRARIES
1976

University of Kansas Publications
Library Series, 40

ADRESSE
D'UN CONSTITUTIONNEL
AUX
CONSTITUTIONNELS.

PAR M. LE C^{te} RÖEDERER,

Pair de France.

—
Seconde Edition.
—

*Troisième édition
augmentée de
l'observation et
d'explications*

— + —
Pris 10 sous
PARIS,

TYPOGRAPHIE DE FIRMIN DIDOT FRÈRES,

IMPRIMEURS DE L'INSTITUT DE FRANCE,

RUE JACOB, N° 24.

—
FÉVRIER 1836.

— + —
~~*pris 10 sous*~~
~~*l'envoi est gratuit au*~~
~~*domicile des personnes qui*~~
~~*voudront bien envoyer la demande*~~
~~*avec leur adresse affranchie.*~~

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL
CONTRIBUTIONS

2

UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS LIBRARIES
Lawrence, Kansas
1976

**PRINTED IN LAWRENCE, KANSAS, U.S.A., BY THE
UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS PRINTING SERVICE**

Contents

Pierre-Louis Roederer and the <i>Adresse d'un Constitutionnel aux Constitutionnels</i> (1835): Notes on a recent acquisition. By CHARLES K. WARNER	1
The "Secret Transactions" of John Bowring and Charles I in the Isle of Wight: a Reappraisal. By ALLAN J. BUSCH	13
Catesby, Curll, and Cook: or, The Librarian and the 18th Century English Book. By ALEXANDRA MASON	29

Pierre-Louis Roederer and *The Adresse d'un Constitutionnel Aux Constitutionnels* (1835): Notes on a Recent Acquisition

CHARLES K. WARNER

In 1832, Louis-Philippe, King of the French since the July Revolution of 1830, appointed Count Pierre-Louis Roederer, an aging but still energetic notable of the Revolutionary and Napoleonic eras, to the Chamber of Peers, the upper house of France's new parliament. In February 1835, during what was to be his eighty-second and last year, Roederer published a small pamphlet, *Adresse d'un constitutionnel aux constitutionnels*, which burst like an embarrassing bombshell in the middle of the worst ministerial crisis of the July Monarchy's early years.¹ Briefly, Roederer's pamphlet fustigated the efforts of such parliamentary leaders as Thiers, De Broglie and Guizot to obtain a ministry in some degree responsible to parliament and, more immediately, the right for the cabinet to meet apart from the King. According to Roederer, there was no constitutional basis for such "dangerous" maneuvers or precedents. The Charter (constitution) gave all executive power to the King. The ministers named by and responsible to him merely administered this power, and it was not intended they should entertain a policy independent of the King's. "To govern," Roederer tells us, "is the task of the King with one of his ministers at least, with several, with all, with others than his ministers, when the King desires it."² Roederer's conclusions were, in fact, a direct refutation of Thiers' current and popular dictum that "the King reigns but does not govern."

By February 1835, Louis-Philippe's proclivity for governing rather than just reigning was obvious and growing. In the months since April 1834, it had given France the then unprecedented total, for so short a period, of four changes of government. Emerging from the latter was a succession of military men—"illustrious scabbards" to borrow a description of Marshal Soult, the best known of them—who were prime ministers (*présidents du conseil*) in name only. In fact, on the same day, February 21, 1835, that the contents of Roederer's pamphlet were first revealed by the press (it had been published anonymously and for private circulation) the last of these figurehead prime ministers, Marshal Mortier, "a military innocent lost in the wilderness of a spiteful chamber,"³ resigned. The conjuncture was unfortunate for Louis-Philippe. According to Charléty's *Monarchie de*

juillet, Roederer's pamphlet "compromised the King by too faithfully translating the views attributed to him."⁴ Thus, while a hostile Parisian press daily excerpted and excoriated Roederer's pamphlet, some newspapers even claiming it was written by the King, Louis-Philippe frantically and fruitlessly searched for still another compliant prime minister. Frustrated at last by a hostile climate in large part engendered by Roederer's pamphlet, he had to fall back, on March 12, 1835, on De Broglie, the strong man whose resignation on April 1, 1834, had originally inspired the eleven-month experiment in personal rule. This was a bitter pill to swallow for which Louis-Philippe can hardly have been grateful to Roederer however much he may have sympathized with the latter's views. One of De Broglie's conditions for return was that the cabinet have the right to meet by itself when it wished. To quote Charléty again, Roederer's "clumsy defense" of the King had rallied parliament to De Broglie, and Louis-Philippe had "had to understand that the hour of personal rule had not yet sounded."⁵

Recently the Spencer Library of the University of Kansas has been fortunate in acquiring a copy of the anonymous and rare first edition of the *Adresse d'un constitutionnel aux constitutionnels*.⁶ This octavo pamphlet is bound in a handsome period binding with four other interesting and valuable items: a copy of the second edition of the *Adresse* also published February 1835, this time under the author's name and with the addition of a twelve-page *avant-propos*,⁷ the page proofs of this *avant-propos* with corrections and annotations in the author's hand, another copy of the second edition of the *Adresse* with further correction of the *avant-propos* in the author's hand intended for a third edition which was never published, and a copy of the original edition of a small brochure, *Fragments de divers mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de la société polie en France*, published in 1834.⁸

This last item represents the more literary side of Roederer's career pursued when he was rusticated by the Bourbon Restoration (1815-1830) and is an abstract of a longer work, *Mémoire pour servir à l'histoire de la société polie en France*, published, like the *Adresse*, in the last year of Roederer's life. The *Mémoire* is the enduring work of Roederer's *belles-lettres* period having been introduced belatedly to a wider public in 1853 by the praise of no less a critic than Sainte-Beuve.⁹ However, by far the greatest part of Roederer's work deals with political, economic and administrative topics. And the most interesting sections of it are his observations and descriptions of events and personalities, particularly of the Consulate and Empire, which he intended to include in his never-completed memoirs. Octave Aubry calls him the best interviewer and memorialist of his era

and notes that there is not a historian of Napoleon who has not drawn on him.¹⁰

Part of the interest that attaches to these last-mentioned writings was that Roederer was at the center of many of the events he describes. His career stretches back to the Ancien Régime when he was a young *parlementaire* in his native Metz drafting remonstrances to the King. Subsequently he was an important member of the National Constituent Assembly (1789-1791) where he was associated with Sieyès, Talleyrand and Mirabeau and joined the Jacobins. In 1792 he became *procureur-général-syndic* of the department of the Seine (roughly comparable to a latter-day prefect) where he came into conflict with the burgeoning power of the Paris Commune and the sections, a circumstance that forced him underground at the time of the Terror. During the Directory (1795-1799) he remained out of politics but as editor of *Le Journal de Paris* his was perhaps the most influential newspaper voice in the capital. He was one of the plotters of the coup d'état of 18 Brumaire 1799 and after that, as a member of the *Conseil d'Etat*, one of Bonaparte's close advisors. This relationship cooled somewhat after 1802, but Roederer continued to serve the Emperor loyally and assiduously in a number of difficult posts and was rewarded in turn with such dignities as Grand Officer of the Legion of Honor, Senator-for-life, Count of the Empire and Minister of the Grand Duchy of Berg.¹¹

Roederer's collected *Oeuvres* fill eight thick quarto volumes of an unfortunately scarce edition compiled by his son, Baron Antoine Roederer, and published between 1853 and 1859. The reader or researcher who consults these volumes may be forced to agree with Aubry's verdict that they are an "ill-digested pile" and edited with "perhaps too much piety."¹² The organization is poor; there are serious omissions; and dating and editorial comment are unreliable. There is no mention, for example, of the proposed third edition of the *Adresse* or of changes in the proofs of the second edition, also in the Spencer Library. To be sure, most of the latter are typographical rather than substantive. But some apparently insignificant changes on the title-page draft for the planned third edition, as I will show later on, point the way to an unpublished manuscript in which Roederer answered the critics of the *Adresse* and which has also been omitted from the *Oeuvres* (in spite of a claim to completeness¹³). This last omission along with Roederer's unfulfilled intention to publish a third edition presents a puzzle which a future biographer of Roederer will have to take account of. I offer a tentative solution below, but first a closer look at the press reception of the *Adresse* should be useful.

The pamphlet in its anonymous first edition was intended, according to

Roederer, to circulate privately and "place some dispositions of the Charter under the eyes of several members of both Chambers who I supposed held the same principles as myself."¹⁴ As near as can be determined this limited distribution took place February 16 and 17. On the 21st, *Le Courrier français* and *Le Temps* picked it up in front-page stories. By the 22nd, the rest of the Paris press had followed suit, and for the next two weeks "l'affaire du pamphlet" was the chief and most sensational topic of news.¹⁵ By March 9, when the last story on it appeared, the *Adresse* had been excerpted in its entirety and, as already noted, Roederer and its contents roundly attacked.

These attacks fall into three categories, the substantive, the personal and the sensational. Although those in the first category could become hysterical as they moved to the left, they all, from right to left, went to the heart of the matter in seeing the *Adresse* as an attack not only on the concept of a valid ministry but on the whole idea of representative government. Regardless of what the Charter left unsaid—because of its vagueness one could argue as logically for Roederer as against him—the nation (if the Parisian press was representative) believed it had contracted with Louis-Philippe in 1830 for a democratic parliamentary monarchy and that what Roederer was proposing and Louis-Philippe, in spite of his mask of democratic affability, probably wanted was an administrative monarchy, more on the Napoleonic model. As for personal attacks the press was quick to remember equivocal explanations Roederer had given for his actions on August 10, 1792. Then, as *procureur-général-syndic* of the Seine, he had the bad luck of being responsible for advising King Louis XVI and the royal family to cease resisting and flee the attack on the Tuileries for the supposed safety of the Legislative Assembly, advice which, as is well known, proved fatal.¹⁶ Roederer's revolutionary beginnings were also recalled, and the charge of hypocrisy levelled. It was apparently easy to remember, for example, that some forty-five years earlier in the National Constituent Assembly, Roederer had been a champion of democratic representation at all levels, even advocating an elected judiciary. In the unkindest newspaper thrusts, he was described as "superannuated," a "Napoleonic relic" and a "boot-licker" who had fawned over every regime and was now trying to ingratiate himself with the latest.

Under what can be called the sensational treatment of the *Adresse*, there were foremost the attempts to associate the pamphlet with the King. Although *Le Temps* announced as early as February 21, 1835, that the author was Roederer, the opposition press persisted in seeing a link with the Court. As we have noted, some newspapers went so far as to claim the

King had written the *Adresse*; others that his secretary M. Fain had written it and that, after the outburst of criticism, Roederer had been offered up as a "sacrificial goat." Even after Roederer's authorship could no longer be denied, the pamphlet was said to have been inspired, at the very least, by conversations heard in the Tuileries.

By way of rebuttal, as early as February 22, *Le Journal de Paris*, popularly described as the "ministerial newspaper," carried an announcement disclaiming any government involvement with the pamphlet, and this was repeated the next day in the semi-official *Moniteur*. But government denials could not stop the continuing flood of rumors, eagerly reported as always by the press. The *Adresse* was now described as a "trial balloon" launched by the Court. Were not M. Fain and the Duc de Choiseul, aide-de-camp to the King, still distributing it? Might not the pamphlet be part of the preparations for a new series of July Ordinances?¹⁷ Or even a coup d'état? Baron Montalivet, commander of the mounted National Guard, was seen issuing it to his troops.¹⁸ Other rumors, if less sensational, seemed to aim at creating an air of mystery about the pamphlet. On February 23, for example, the removal of remaining copies from the printers was announced by two newspapers. "A well-known livery" had taken them away! On the day (February 28) the second edition was to appear, *Le Constitutionnel* reported that Roederer, arriving at his publishers at nine in the morning, had withdrawn the entire printing with the intention of "suppressing it . . . or, at the very least, of introducing important modifications in the preface." March 1, again according to *Le Constitutionnel*, Roederer, in fact, had opted for the latter course, and the changes dealt with his emphatic fears that the monarchy would be converted to a republic, a point which was an *idée fixe* with him.¹⁹

Meanwhile, what was the reaction of Roederer to all these attacks, rumors and calumnies? From what we know of his character, he was probably unmoved and more convinced than ever of the rightness of his views.²⁰ The most immediate expression of his reaction was, of course, the *avant-propos* or preface to the second edition of the *Adresse*. Here he disclaimed any connection between the pamphlet and the King,²¹ explained his motives for having first published it anonymously²² and his reasons for leaving the text of the second edition unchanged from the first.²³ He also re-emphasized his opinion, already elaborated in the text, that Louis-Philippe was a good and capable monarch whose beneficent authority was being undermined by the pretensions and obstructionism of a ministerial clique that would impose its "system" on the country, making Louis-Philippe a *roi fainéant* and the prime minister a *maire du palais*. Or more

ominously, this clique could be preparing the way for a republic. In what was probably the closest notice he took of the uproar he had caused, Roederer admitted that his pen "might, perhaps, have run too fast," but, in his opinion, "the matter was serious and the peril imminent."²⁴

For the rest, the sheer bulk of an interesting carton of clippings and notes in the Archives Nationales at Paris suggests that Roederer spent a busy month or so collecting press reports about his pamphlet, classifying them, commenting on them, writing drafts of replies to his critics and making notes for new editions of the *Adresse*.²⁵ The most important item in this collection is an apparently finished, twenty-five page manuscript, "Observations sur les critiques de l'Adresse d'un Constitutionnel aux Constitutionnels."²⁶ Here Roederer defends himself with verve, eloquence and, at times, an ill-concealed air of superiority at nearly every point where the press attacked him. He also painstakingly repeats the main arguments of the *Adresse* and again attacks the ministerial clique, more specifically now and giving names. This manuscript is, of course, the same one I referred to earlier as being omitted from the *Oeuvres* and as being part of a puzzle along with the unpublished third edition of the *Adresse*.

This puzzle, we can now say, begins in Spencer Library with the corrections for the title page of the third edition. As an examination shows, these corrections were made on a copy of the second edition. The word "second" is merely crossed out and "third edition augmented with *observations* and *explanations*" added in Roederer's hand. Also the date of publication (February, 1835) of the second edition (as of the first) remains unchanged. The notation "10 sous" added above and below the place and date of publication suggests that Roederer was aiming at a wider audience for this edition. But as some crossed out marginal jottings further suggest, he was only reluctantly overcoming his preference for having his works privately printed and distributed.²⁷ At first look, this title page perplexed me. It is followed by the *avant-propos* with a few minor changes from the second edition, and then for the text of the *Adresse* proper there is nothing but unmarked, unsullied pages, identical to those of the second and first editions. Where were the promised "observations" and "explanations"? I jumped to the conclusion Roederer had been prevented by death from finishing the job. But here let us note that Roederer did not die until December 17, 1835, suddenly from a burst blood vessel induced by coughing and choking over a poorly swallowed drink. This during the night of a day in which he was in his usual good spirits and health.

Next I considered whether the publication of the *Mémoire pour servir à l'histoire de la société polie en France*, which it will be remembered also

appeared in 1835, could have interrupted the preparation of the third edition of the *Adresse*. Here, unfortunately, there is no hard evidence one way or another. Because like so many of Roederer's works the *Mémoire* was printed for private circulation, I have not yet been able to fix its exact date of publication. The first review I have found is in the September 1835 issue of the *Journal des savants*, but the book, of course, could have appeared many months before that. In any event, the writings and correspondence of Roederer's period of rustication during the Bourbon Restoration show that the *Mémoire* at least owes its genesis to that period, and they strongly suggest that a good deal of the writing was done then also. Additionally, there are the *Fragments de divers mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de la société polie en France* to show that the material for the longer *Mémoire* was well in hand by 1834. At the very least, therefore, we can conclude that Roederer did not have to write the *Mémoire* from scratch in 1835, and we can remember that neither preparing a manuscript for publication nor the printing process itself were the long drawn-out affairs they are today. Finally, for what should be the convincing chronological fix there is Baron Antoine Roederer's comment in the *Oeuvres* that the *avant-propos* to the second edition of the *Adresse* was "the last work of my father,"²⁸ i.e., the *Mémoire* was written before February 1835. If, however, I prefer to base my opinion that the publication of the *Mémoire* could not have interfered with the planned third edition of the *Adresse* on speculation other than Baron Antoine's comment, it is because I have to fault him immediately on another point.

First let me say, as the reader may have already guessed, that I believe the manuscript, "Observations sur les critiques de l'Adresse d'un Constitutionnel aux Constitutionnels," was intended as a concluding part of the third edition. (Remember the phrase on the title page, "*augmented* [my italics] with *observations* and *explanations*.") There is, however, a pencilled notation in Baron Antoine Roederer's hand on the margin of this manuscript to the effect that his father "did not find it sufficient" and "did not finish it." Here let it be said this assertion is belied by the composition and neat, finished appearance of the manuscript. It is in a very clear hand, obviously a secretary's, with virtually no corrections on it. The text could be described in no other way than "polished." The final paragraphs work up to a logical and formal conclusion, and there is even, in the style of the day, an appropriate end quote in smaller letters from Voltaire. Further, in the same archive there are, in Roederer's hand, two other drafts of replies to the critics of the *Adresse*,²⁹ not as neatly written, to be sure, or as long as the "Observations . . .," but finished in composition, and their contents

are incorporated almost verbatim in the latter. Both of these drafts, it should be noted, are dated February 1835. Unfortunately the final draft is not dated nor are all of the miscellaneous notes in the same archive. But most of the latter where dated are marked February 1835 and their contents in large part figure in the "Observations." There are only two items dated after March 1835, and their contents do not form a part of the "Observations." In short, the "Observations" and related drafts and notes look like an *abandoned* project rather than an *unfinished* one.

The evidence laid out above suggests to me that Roederer could have been ready with a third edition of the *Adresse*, which would have included the "Observations," not long after the second one. Indeed, the actual second edition may have been an unpremeditated "rush job" to silence the speculation, harmful for the King, over the authorship of the anonymous first edition. (Remember Roederer, as reported by *Le Constitutionnel*, hurrying down to the printers to make last-minute changes.) Further, the time lost by the "rush job" plus the continuing attacks in the press could have made Roederer eager to get out a third edition with the "Observations" as quickly as possible and would explain why February 1835 (wishful thinking?) was left as the date of publication. If everything, then, was so ready for a new edition by what a reasonable guess would put at the latest as the second week in March when the uproar in the press was still smouldering, the puzzle remains as to why this edition was not published. Here the most likely hypothesis is that a signal from an embarrassed Louis-Philippe, some time between March 1 (appearance of the second edition) and the selection of De Broglie as prime minister on March 12, 1835, put a stop to the next edition and ended "l'affaire du pamphlet."

If this is so, it must have been a disappointment to Roederer. He was not sensitive to criticism or the opinions of others, but it appears that in spite of protestations to the contrary and his advanced years, he hoped the pamphlet would give him a larger place and voice on the stage of public affairs. Instead it proved an embarrassment and blemished the end of a long and distinguished career. Even Roederer's graveside eulogist, for example, felt obliged to "explain" the *Adresse*,³⁰ and in the last echo of the rumors that always surrounded the pamphlet, it was reported after Roederer's death that the government had bought and suppressed his papers.³¹ Baron Antoine's omission of the "Observations" in the *Oeuvres* some twenty years later and his silence about the third edition may well be a reflection of this embarrassment—that "piety" which Aubry mentions could simply have made it disagreeable for him to drag out "l'affaire du pamphlet" again in the pages of his collection.

This is not to say that later under the authoritarian Second Empire, and after the experience of 1848 and the Second Republic, Roederer did not enjoy some posthumous vogue as a prophet. The *Oeuvres*, of course, appeared then, and Sainte-Beuve described the *Adresse* as having some "right ideas, truths and previsions in part justified."³² In this respect it is also interesting that Baron Haussmann, Napoleon III's prefect of the Seine and autocratic rebuildier of Paris, praised the pamphlet fulsomely as a young man.³³ But subsequent generations have seen the *Adresse* in a less kindly light, and the irruption of a prophetic if opinionated voice from the past in the debate over what kind of a compromise the July Monarchy really represented has not been overly appreciated by historians.

Notes

1. For the best and most succinct description of the crisis and the impact of the *Adresse d'un constitutionnel aux constitutionnels*, see S. Charléty, "La Monarchie de Juillet." Ernest Lavisse, ed., *Histoire de France contemporaine*, vol. 5 (Paris: 1921), pp. 112-16. Longer or more piquant accounts are found in Louis Blanc, *Histoire de dix ans, 1830-1840*, 12th ed., vol. 4 (Paris: 1877), pp. 335-41; Paul Thureau-Dangin, *Histoire de la Monarchie de Juillet*, 2nd ed., vol. II (Paris: 1888), pp. 253-95.

2. *Adresse d'un constitutionnel aux constitutionnels* (Paris: 1835), pp. 38-39. As this last sentence suggests, what Roederer had in mind was something closer to the old *conseil du roi* or Napoleon's *conseil d'état*. In the *Adresse*, Roederer argued that the Charter neither "constitutes" nor "supposes" a cabinet (*conseil du cabinet*) or a prime minister (*président du conseil*) as these would be understood in a modern parliamentary democracy. That Roederer, on the one hand, and Guizot, Thiers, *et al.*, on the other, could disagree so fundamentally on the limits of monarchical and parliamentary power was due in large part to the Charter's silence or ambiguity in this extremely vital area. For an account of the problem, see Félix Ponteil, *Les institutions de la France de 1814 à 1870* (Paris: 1966), pp. 141-55 and especially pp. 150-54.

3. Douglas Johnson, *Guizot: Aspects of French History 1787-1874* (London & Toronto: 1963), p. 172.

4. Charléty, p. 115.

5. Charléty, p. 116. "Clumsy" should refer to the timing and frankness of the pamphlet, not its style which is vivacious and caustic.

6. *Adresse d'un constitutionnel aux constitutionnels*. Paris, Typographie de Firmin Didot Frères, Imprimeurs de l'Institut de France, Rue Jacob, N° 24. Février 1835. 45 pp.

7. *Adresse d'un constitutionnel aux constitutionnels*. Par M. le Cte Roederer, Pair de France. Seconde Edition. Paris, Typographie de Firmin Didot Frères, Imprimeurs de l'Institut de France, Rue Jacob, N° 24. Février 1835. [4], xii, 40 pp.

8. *Fragments de divers mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de la société polie en France* par M. le Comte Roederer de l'Académie des sciences morales et politiques. Lu dans la séance publique des cinq académies de l'Institut, Tenue le 2 Mai 1834. Paris, 1834. 36 pp.

9. C.-A. Sainte-Beuve, *Causeries du lundi*, 2nd ed., vol. 8 (Paris: 1855), pp. 314-16. The title of the *Mémoire* is somewhat misleading, since it is serious literary history and criticism. Sainte-Beuve gives Roederer high marks for having initiated a latter-day appreciation of the seventeenth-century figures associated with the blue-stocking literary salon of the Hôtel de Rambouillet. He also praises him for being

the first to notice the influence of conversation and, complementing the latter, the unique influence of women on French society and letters.

10. Octave Aubry in the preface to P.-L. Roederer, *Mémoires sur la Révolution, le Consulat, et l'Empire*, Textes choisis et présentés par Octave Aubry (Paris: 1942), p. xiv.

11. This is, of course, only a very summary account of a very interesting career that has not received the attention it deserves from historians. There is for example no full-length published biography of Roederer. The best biographical sketches are Sainte-Beuve, pp. 262-316; A. Mignet, "Roederer, sa vie et ses travaux," *Revue des deux mondes*, January 1838, pp. 78-100; and the notice in *Biographie universelle*, vol. 79 (Paris: 1840), pp. 294-316. The introduction to Maurice Vitrac, ed., *Autour de Bonaparte: Journal du Comte P.-L. Roederer* (Paris: 1909) is useful for Roederer's early years. M. C. Godelle, *Notice sur le Comte Roederer* (Metz: 1865), another sketch, draws principally on Roederer's collected *Oeuvres*. Blanche-Joséphine de Corcelle, Comtesse Roederer, *Notice et souvenirs de famille* (Brussels: 1899) by Roederer's daughter-in-law is mostly about her own family but does have some vignettes of Roederer at Bois Roussel, the retreat where he spent the Restoration years.

Special studies include Baron Seillière, *Roederer, historien de la société polie au XVIIe siècle* (Paris: 1943) and Jean Roels, *La notion de représentation chez Roederer* (Heule: 1968). Annie Winsor Allen, *Pierre-Louis Roederer, sa vie et son oeuvre* (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Paris: 1965) is a useful full-length account centered upon Roederer's literary production.

I am grateful to Mme Reynaud, *conservateur* at the Archives Nationales, for calling this last-mentioned work to my attention and for other assistance.

12. Aubry, p. xxii.

13. The title page citation reads "Oeuvres du Comte P.-L. Roederer publiées par son fils le baron A.-M. Roederer, . . . tant sur les manuscrits inédits de l'auteur que sur les éditions nouvelles de ceux de ses ouvrages qui ont déjà été publiés avec les corrections et les changements qu'il y a faits postérieurement."

On p. 452 of vol. VIII Baron Antoine also notes "I did not use the authorization which he (Count Roederer) gave to choose between his works those which would be good to publish or reprint. I looked everywhere for what he had published and I reprinted it. I omitted nothing. I also inserted in here (the *Oeuvres*) all his works remaining in manuscript which appeared to represent a complete ensemble—even though I knew they might not be definitive. . . . I have even gone further and placed in this collection fragments of works evidently not terminated, not coordinated in their ensemble. . . ."

14. P.-L. Roederer, *Adresse*, 2nd ed., p. i.

15. The account that follows of the press reception of the *Adresse* is based on a reading of the February and March 1835 issues of the following newspapers, *Le Moniteur universel*, *Le Temps*, *Le National*, *Le Constitutionnel*, *La Tribune*, *Le Réformateur*, *Le Journal des débats*, *Le Journal de Paris*, *Le Courrier français*, *La Quotidienne*, *La Gazette de France*. These are the principal Paris dailies of the epoch and cover the political spectrum. I have dispensed with individual citations in most cases so as not to interfere with the narrative and to avoid a surfeit of repetitive footnotes.

16. Threatened with being summoned before a revolutionary tribunal for trying to save the King, Roederer maintained that by sending the King and the royal family to the Legislative Assembly he had obtained "useful hostages in a war undertaken in their name and who would stand in the stead of a great number of legions against our enemies." This was a statement which was to embarrass him later and which he explains in *Chronique de cinquante jours, du 20 juin au 10 août*, published in 1832. The latter is reproduced in vol. III of the *Oeuvres*, where see especially p. 259.

17. Ordinances reducing the electoral franchise, instituting strict censorship and dissolving the Chamber issued by Charles X on July 25, 1830. They were in effect the *casus belli* of the Revolution of 1830.

18. This was denied by Montalivet in letters to the *Journal de Paris*, February 23, 1835, and the *Moniteur*, February 24, 1835.

19. *Le Constitutionnel* was correct, and the change, a deletion of a paragraph where Roederer shows how France's departmental system of political and territorial organization could be converted into a federal system like that of the United States, can be seen in the Spencer proofs. In the unpublished manuscript "Observations sur les critiques de l'Adresse d'un Constitutionnel aux Constitutionnels" described in my text, Roederer acknowledges that he deleted this paragraph, reproduces it and claims that he deleted it for fear of furnishing a "formula" for republicans. Roederer's fears about a republic proved correct, of course, in 1848, but the departmental system then as before (and since) continued to be a centralizing force, an evolution that should not have escaped as seasoned a political observer as Roederer. Was he unduly influenced by his memories of Girondist "federalism" in 1792-93 or overreacting to the favorable reception of De Toqueville's *De la démocratie en Amérique*, the first part of which appeared in February 1835? In any event, the whole episode is an interesting footnote to the fears that even a fervid supporter of the July Monarchy could have for the regime's stability.

20. Roederer once described a "stubborn logic" as "one of the qualities of my spirit" and a "stiffness" as "perhaps" being in "my character." Quoted in Sainte-Beuve, p. 268.

21. *Adresse*, 2nd ed., p. i.

22. "It [the *Adresse*] was not for sale. I did not have the presumption to believe that it would do anything for my name or my name anything for the work. . . . My brochure is a work of conscience distributed in confidence," *Adresse*, p. i.

23. He stands on what he has written and will reply, "if necessary," to critics (specifically M. Garnier-Pagès of *Le Temps*) in a later brochure, *Adresse*, p. xii.

24. *Adresse*, p. iv.

25. Archives Nationales: 29 Archives privées 80.

26. AN: 29 AP 80 (281-305).

27. The additions at the bottom of the title-page read (in Roederer's hand) "price 10 sous at bookstores the author will send it free to the domicile of persons who send a request to him with their address." Then everything except "prix 10 sous" is crossed out.

28. *Oeuvres*, vol. VII, p. 414, f.n. 1.

29. AN: 29 AP 80 (243-254).

30. *Le Moniteur universel*, December 23, 1835. See also *Oeuvres*, vol. VIII, pp. 453-54.

31. This was vigorously denied, of course, by Baron Antoine Roederer in a letter published in the *Moniteur* of August 24, 1836. Curiously, this canard is repeated in *Larousse: Grand dictionnaire universel du XIXe siècle*, tome XIII (Paris: 1875), p. 1288, with the added and piquant detail that the papers were "delivered to the flames"!

32. Sainte-Beuve, p. 316.

33. In a letter to Roederer on the occasion of the pamphlet's publication, AN: 29 AP 11.

The "Secret Transactions" of John Bowring and Charles I in The Isle of Wight: A Reappraisal

ALLAN J. BUSCH

In 1703 there appeared a published collection of tracts found among the papers of Sir George Savile, First Marquis of Halifax.¹ In this collection is a work purportedly written by Sir John Bowring and entitled "Many most occult considerable Concerns, and secret Transactions."² The "Secret Transactions" form a relation of Charles I's imprisonment at Carisbrooke Castle, Isle of Wight, from 1647 to 1648, and the author's participation in that event. It is probable that the Bowring narrative passed into Sir George Savile's hands between 1663 and 1665.³ This is not certain, but is likely since Bowring was a persistent suitor to Charles II from 1660 to 1666.⁴

An investigation of the political career of John Lisle, the regicide and Lord Commissioner of the Great Seal, led the present author to a consideration of the Bowring narrative.⁵ However, there was cause to examine carefully the veracity of Bowring's account of the Isle of Wight affair. The extant correspondence of most of the principals involved in the Isle of Wight events gave no reference to John Bowring, directly or indirectly.⁶ Contemporary as well as later published accounts made it apparent that Bowring and his narration had been relegated to obscurity. Only in three published works, all written in the nineteenth century, was there any mention of the Bowring narrative.

Within a few years of the King's execution in 1649, two accounts concerning the King's escape from Hampton Court to the Isle of Wight were written, those of John Berkeley and John Ashburnham, two of the principals in the escape. Neither Berkeley nor Ashburnham, nor the later short memoir of Henry Firebrace, servant and confidant of Charles I, makes mention of John Bowring.⁷ However, in the introduction to Ashburnham's relation, published in 1830, and in E. B. James's collection of letters on the history of the Isle of Wight, published in 1800, the respective editors mentioned Bowring and John Lisle but provided no critical comment.⁸ The third work, by the nineteenth century historian George Hillier, did give critical comment on the Bowring narrative, but doubted the credence of Bowring's claims. Hillier wrote of Bowring as follows:

. . . the singular political foresight of the knight [Bowring], in every event which he records, is so wonderful, that he is to be suspected as having been one of those great predictors, who enjoy the advantages of prophecy after the events have been realized.⁹

Hillier noted the absence of any mention of Bowring or of Dr. Cade, Bowring's alleged intermediary with the King, and added that the Bowring version was only an enlargement and confirmation of Sir John Berkeley's account.¹⁰ With this condemnation by Hillier, Bowring and his narrative briefly engaged the interest and then faded out of consideration by historians of the English civil wars. Even the accounts of this century, including the most recent, fail to give any recognition to the Bowring narrative.¹¹

In answer to Hillier, a comparison of Bowring's narrative with those of Berkeley and Ashburnham shows that it bears no resemblance to the other two, either in the subject matter related or in the purposes for which they were written. In fact, the greater part of Bowring's narrative concerns the period following Charles I's confinement, after Parliament dismissed Berkeley and Ashburnham from attendance on the King. Berkeley composed his work while in exile on the continent with little chance of Bowring's having seen it. Furthermore, Berkeley's narration was not published until 1699.¹² Ashburnham, as a known Royalist, spent a good part of the Interregnum in prison and his account was not published until 1830. Even the Firebrace narrative was composed in 1675, after Bowring's, and remained unpublished until 1932.¹³ It is rather doubtful that Bowring ever had access to any of these contemporary accounts.

Only scant references to Bowring's early life exist. It is possible that he spent some of his childhood in Hampshire near the Solent, for he mentions that John Lisle, who resided in the Isle of Wight, ". . . had known me of a Child, and came often to Sir Guy Palmes at my Father's House."¹⁴ Sir Guy Palmes of Rutlandshire also owned several estates in Hampshire near the Solent.¹⁵ However, the only confirmed Bowring residence was one of 1652 in St. Margaret's Parish, Westminster.¹⁶ It may be that Lisle and Palmes, as acquaintances from Hampshire and associates in the early years of the Long Parliament, met at the Westminster home of their mutual acquaintance, Bowring's father. Bowring stated in his narrative that he trained as a law clerk and sometime during the civil wars, most likely after 1645, he became a clerk to John Lisle, a very important and influential man in the radical wing of the Parliamentary party.¹⁷ Bowring's claim to a baronetcy granted him by Charles I remains unconfirmed despite the flurry of interest among latter-day Bowrings.¹⁸

Bowring presented his "Secret Transactions" to Charles II as a petition for recognition of services rendered to Charles I. The most important of these services was Bowring's plan to convert the Court of Wards into a parliamentary grant of £200,000 a year. If Bowring had been able to persuade Parliament to make the conversion, he would have had £3,000 a year for the management of it and would have hidden away the remainder as a residual fund for the royal family in times of crisis.¹⁹ It was to that great charge that Charles I had committed Bowring, and further, should the King not be there to realize its accomplishment, Bowring was to impart the scheme to Charles II.²⁰ The general purpose of the Bowring narrative was then to persuade the new King of Bowring's ability to manage the royal revenue as Charles I had earlier been persuaded.

Two themes can be traced through Bowring's narrative. The above, being Bowring's importance to Charles I as a fiscal manager in consequence of which Charles II ought to accept Bowring's scheme as a trust from his father to Bowring. Secondly, Bowring was hard-pressed to explain his close association with the parliamentary radicals and especially with John Lisle. Bowring's association with John Lisle, a matter of public knowledge, was a grave one when appealing to Charles I's son for a position of trust in the royal household. He accomplished the task by explaining that he, being acquainted with Lisle since boyhood, had been commissioned by the King to exploit the confidence of Lisle and serve as a Royalist spy in the Parliamentary groups.²¹ Bowring asserted many times in the narrative that he made great use of his friendship with Lisle for the King.

Bowring's "Secret Transactions" with Charles I began with Bowring, on the deathbed instructions of Lord Keeper Sir Edward Littleton, being presented to the King at Oxford by several high personages, the Earl of Lindsey, Lord Keeper Richard Lane, and Chief Justice Sir Robert Heath. In respect of this recommendation Charles, for the lack of any other, granted Bowring the place of Clerk of the Council Extraordinary. When the King left Oxford, Bowring was placed in charge of the Council papers in the Earl of Lindsey's coach. All was quickly ended by the fatal defeat of the Royalists at Naseby in June 1645. Following the capture of the King's most important papers and letters at the battle, Bowring attempted to justify the circumstantial evidence which weighed heavily against him. He wrote of Naseby and the capture of the King's papers as follows:

. . . yet this Coach and Papers came all safely off to the King's Garrison at Leicester, until all were unhappily dispers'd. But these were not the Papers that were afterwards put in Print.²²

It is no wonder that Bowring should seek to dispel any hint of his possible complicity in the capture and publication of the King's famous "Naseby Letters" which caused so much grief for the Royalists.

One of the Parliamentary cavalry commanders, Sir John Gell, who pursued the fleeing Royalists to Leicester after Naseby and captured many of them, was an associate of Bowring's.²³ Furthermore, it was Bowring who later performed services for Gell, both with Charles I²⁴ and with the Commonwealth regime.²⁵ Nor was the loss of the King's papers the only point against Bowring in the Naseby Letters affair. His known associate, John Lisle, was a leader in the Parliamentary move to publish the letters and make the greatest propaganda use of them.²⁶ There was considerable confusion regarding the origin and transmittal of these letters to Parliament, making impossible any determination of exactly where they did originate or who surrendered them. Many of the letters were not even published by Parliament but were suppressed, for which, the parliamentary radical Edmund Ludlow wrote, some were handsomely rewarded when the King briefly returned to public favor in 1646.²⁷ One wonders, as Charles II must have, if Bowring was as innocent in this matter as he proclaimed. It would have been relatively easy for Bowring to secure a pardon after Naseby and Leicester by influence with Gell and Lisle; Council papers in his possession would have been helpful indeed.

Bowring gives no account of his activities immediately following the fall of Leicester. He must have been made prisoner, for the King fled with only a few of his close advisers. There is a break in the chronology of the narrative of about a year, and then, Bowring informs the reader, the King rewarded him for his faithfulness. In 1646, while the King was periodically interned at Hampton Court and Sion House, he invested Bowring with a "special Confidence and Trust." It was at a meeting at Sion House between Charles and Bowring that the Prince Elector of the Palatine recognized Bowring as one of Lisle's associates. Bowring related that Charles saw the opportunities of such a relationship, and Bowring was launched upon his career as a spy for the Royalists. After the King fled to the Isle of Wight it was apparent to Bowring why Charles had desired his influence with Lisle.²⁸ Concerning this assignment from the King, Bowring wrote,

. . . from that time His Majesty . . . employed me to manage and transact His private and particular affairs, relying upon me in all things principally, of Care and Hazard to Himself, and which was not in the power at that time of any other Person living to do his Majesty any good, except they had a secret Interest with Lisle; and

this the King understood very well, because his Majesty knew, that Hammond [Colonel Robert Hammond, governor of the Isle of Wight] received his Orders from Lisle in all things, by reason Hammond was otherwise a stranger to the Island.²⁹

The claims of Bowring which are found in the succeeding pages of the narrative must be exaggerated. As Bowring would have it, he became one of the principal advisers to the King (in secrecy of course) in the negotiations for the first Isle of Wight treaty with Parliament, advising Charles on the proposed bills of security including the Militia Bill, Adjournment Bill, Honors Bill and Indemnity Bill. With the cooperation of one Dr. Cade as intermediary with the King and Royalists, and Bowring's influence with certain people, the treaty would progress rapidly. If it did progress, then Bowring was to have the place of secretary to the negotiations. Through John Lisle, who was present as one of the Parliamentary commissioners, there was influence with Cromwell with whom Lisle was in correspondence.³⁰ One sees Bowring scurrying between the King, Dr. Cade, Colonel Hammond, the commissioners and John Lisle, and working industriously to bring all to fruition. Such was not to be; a confrontation between Charles and the commissioners dispelled any hope of an immediate treaty. Even the indefatigable Bowring could not rectify the King's fatal bent for failure.

Bowring reported that following the failure of the treaty, the King sent him into Scotland to discover all he could of events there. In Scotland as in England, Bowring moved with unprecedented ease in all circles of the Scots, both Royalists and Parliamentarians. As the Duke of Hamilton's army prepared to march into England in the Royalist cause, the King was concerned that his son, Prince Charles, not be captured should the invasion be abortive. Bowring claimed that his contact in Scotland was Sir Thomas Glenham, a Royalist officer, by whom Bowring sent word to the Prince of Wales in Holland not to come to Scotland since Hamilton's venture was doomed.³¹

Bowring then departed by ship for England, he wrote, in fear of capture by the Scots. During his stay in Edinburgh, Robert Goodwin, Parliamentary commissioner to Scotland, had approached Bowring to carry a letter to England, addressed to John Lisle and Nicholas Love.³² Both Lisle and Love later examined Bowring on Scottish affairs, which caused some of the Presbyterians in Parliament, one of them, Thomas Gell, brother of Sir John Gell, to solicit further information from him. Again Bowring's farsightedness burst forth, and he informed them that Hamilton's army was doomed because Cromwell, even from Wales, would stop the Scots'

advance and gain all power in the state. He advised them to set up a new treaty with the King in the Isle of Wight with all speed. This the House readily did, 28 July 1648.³³

Hurrying to the Isle of Wight, Bowring related, he took up his role as adviser and intermediary for the King in this new treaty. Bowring's freedom of movement between Royalist and Parliament groups was explained as follows:

But yet I very well knew how difficult it was, and how hard to be done, to get to speak one word, or to see his Majesty in Caresbrook Castle; though by me, that well understood, and was favoured by Colonel Hammond for Lisle's sake, under whose Interest I had a freedom in the Island, and to come to the Castle too, with Hammond's leave, and without suspicion.³⁴

Superficially such a statement might explain how Bowring could move about with impunity. Bowring has informed the readers why the King allowed him among the Parliamentarians: to be of service to him. Perhaps a dual role would be nearer the truth for Bowring's mission. It is well-known that the Executive Committee of Both Houses at Derby House, controlled by the army, was fully apprised of the thoughts and movements of the King and his adherents; intelligence flowing the opposite way often moved equally as well.³⁵ That there were leaks in intelligence, probably many of them, does at least compromise Bowring who freely admitted access to both groups.

The King vigorously entered into the new treaty negotiations, and Bowring charged here and there with letters for Hammond, Lisle and Parliament. He told of his work among a new set of colleagues, Sir Edward Walker, William Murrey, Sir Thomas Gardiner and Thomas Cooke, all of whom are frequently mentioned in the contemporary accounts as close associates of the King. However, only Thomas Cooke later discussed Bowring's activities, and that was to accuse him of duplicity before the Parliamentary Examination Committee in 1651.³⁶ For Bowring the whole of the treaty negotiation in 1648 was a race against time—against the forty days allowed by Parliament and the gradual nearing of Cromwell's army to London after the defeat of Hamilton in the North. Over and over, Bowring wrote, he pleaded with Charles to make some small concessions, in order to re-unite King and Parliament against the army.³⁷ In the meantime, Bowring found opportunity to intercede with the King for favors to several people: Sir John Gell, Sir Guy Palmes, John Lisle and himself.³⁸

To Bowring's chagrin, Charles took little heed of the time element.

Instead the King dallied over the position of the bishops in the Church, in the end refusing to yield, although, according to Bowring, he was later repentant for not listening to his warnings. Bowring then turned his attention to the last resort, escape. £400 in gold flowed from Bowring's pockets as easily as ideas from his head, but all his efforts were frustrated by the King's lack of decision and the uncannily good information received at Derby House.³⁹ With the King spirited away by the army, first to Hurst Castle and then to Windsor, one would think that Bowring's mission was concluded. Nevertheless, the undaunted Bowring stood by the King at Windsor and during his trial, keeping Charles informed on important matters.⁴⁰

From what has been related of the contents of the Bowring narrative thus far, one can readily ascertain that Bowring has claimed much, indeed, far more than contemporary evidence will permit. The question is what of Bowring's account can be accepted and what cannot. By a limited examination it has been possible to corroborate some of Bowring's statements.

The most logical point on which to begin is Bowring's association with John Lisle. It has been demonstrated that Lisle knew Bowring in Hampshire, or perhaps London, through Sir Guy Palmes. Reported meetings with Charles at Sion House where the Prince Elector recognized him as an associate of Lisle likewise demonstrates that Bowring had such a connection.⁴¹ Royalists reported the King so closely watched at Sion House that it was impossible for their spies even to come near him.⁴² Yet Bowring claimed to have interviewed the King there. In 1651, one of Bowring's former colleagues, Thomas Cooke, described him as a "servant of the Lord Commissioner Lisle."⁴³ Cooke's statement was in an account of the activities of Royalists given by him to the Commonwealth government in order to save himself. It is doubtful Cooke would have made such a statement about a subordinate of Lisle's, a man so powerful in the state, had it not been true. At one point in the narrative, Bowring digressed into an account of Lisle's presence in the Isle of Wight to bury Sir William Lisle, his father. At this juncture the King, through Bowring's intercession, offered to make Lisle a knight but Lisle refused because he could not afford such an "honor" under the circumstances. Although Bowring does not date the incident, it falls securely into his general chronology for the autumn of 1648.⁴⁴ Sir William Lisle died, 21 October 1648, and John Lisle was present for the burial.⁴⁵

Bowring's description of an attempted escape for Charles in November 1648, which implicated some members of the Lisle family, and was later veri-

fied by the informer Thomas Cooke in 1651 before the Committee for Examinations, matches that of a design known to the Committee at Derby House in 1648.⁴⁶ What Bowring proposed was that the King take ship for the Channel Islands or France from Wotton Park, the Lisle estate in the Isle of Wight. Charles would then be joined by the mutinous faction of the Parliamentary Navy, led by a "Vice-Admiral" Lisle, so that ". . . he [Lisle] will recover the Honour of his Family" ⁴⁷ "Vice-Admiral" Lisle was probably Lieutenant Thomas Lisle, a relative of John Lisle, who earlier had led a revolt of the Navy against Colonel Rainsborough, the parliamentary Navy commander.⁴⁸ The plot was undertaken by a number of young men of the Isle of Wight, including Lisle's brother William and the son of Sir John Oglander, John Lisle's godfather. They intended to surprise Carisbrooke Castle by night, flee on horseback, take ship to Tichfield and then effect the rendezvous with the mutinied ships. The ships never appeared and the undertaking failed.⁴⁹ The Committee at Derby House was fully aware of the plans and requested Colonel Hammond not to speak of the particulars, ". . . lest if it be declared it might divulge by what means the information comes to us."⁵⁰ The design became a matter of record in 1651 when Thomas Cooke confessed all to the Committee for Examinations.⁵¹

One of the principal characters of the narrative, and Bowring's confidant in the Isle of Wight, was Dr. Cade. It was on the basis of an absence of any knowledge of this person that Hillier discredited Bowring's account.⁵² Dr. Cade, like Bowring, was undoubtedly not as prominent an individual as was portrayed in the narrative; but Cade did exist and was a known Royalist. He was Thomas Cade of Somerset, graduated from St. Alban's Hall, Oxford, vicar of Llanwenog, Cardiganshire in 1638, and rector of Trimley St. Mary, Suffolk, in 1665.⁵³ Dr. Cade was in exile with Charles II in Holland, where he was regarded as something of a mountebank, claiming information for which he could not account.⁵⁴ Samuel Pepys, in his Diary, recounted a dinner party at The Hague in May 1660, where "At dinner in came Dr. Cade, a merry mad parson of the King's. And they two [Cade and one Captain Whittington] . . . got me . . . to see the King After that to the Dr.'s, where we drank a while or so. In a coach of a friend's of Dr. Cade we went to see a house of the Princess Dowager's" ⁵⁵ It is not difficult to imagine Bowring and Dr. Cade as a team; they were two of a kind.

Bowring's association with Sir John Gell has been mentioned above. Gell was a man who, without remorse, moved from one side to the other in the civil wars. After soliciting a baronetcy from the King in 1641, Gell

went on to raise a Parliamentary cavalry regiment in Derbyshire in 1642. With this force he harassed the Royalists of the Midlands and participated in the Battle of Naseby in 1645.⁵⁶ At the end of the first civil war in 1646, when it seemed that Charles might be restored, Gell sought a pardon from the King by advancing the sum of £300 on three occasions through Bowring.⁵⁷ With the establishment of the Commonwealth Gell came before the High Court of Justice for misprision of treason. Upon conviction in August 1651, Gell went to the Tower and his case came before the Committee for Compounding with Delinquents to effect sequestration of his property. Here again Gell called upon Bowring for aid, signing an agreement, dated 1 April 1652, that if Bowring could effect Gell's pardon and remittance of the fine, Gell would pay Bowring at least £300 and possibly £400, if necessary. On 13 April 1652, Gell was released from the Tower by order of Parliament.⁵⁸ In 1660, Gell sought the good graces of Charles II through a petition stating that he gave several hundred pounds in gold to Charles I by the hand of John Bowring.⁵⁸ Bowring's association with Gell was of long standing and attuned to all seasons. For a man like Gell to call upon Bowring for intercession says much for Bowring's ability in political circles; in both cases results were forthcoming.

At the beginning of his narrative, Bowring asserted that Sir Edward Nicholas, Secretary of State to Charles II, knew of Bowring's aid to Charles I and his service as Clerk of the Council Extraordinary.⁵⁹ For Bowring to make such an assertion in an appeal to Charles II, it would have to be essentially true or else foolhardy. That Bowring was afraid Nicholas might not remember him or that he might remember him with malice is certainly not demonstrated by a letter in 1661 from Bowring to Nicholas requesting a favor for Bowring's cousin.⁶⁰ In fact Bowring was supremely confident in his actions immediately following the Restoration in June 1660. He must have felt secure in his position as a known Royalist.

Charles II had hardly set foot in England in 1660 when Bowring wrote for permission to wait on the King ". . . to give particulars of his attendance on his late Majesty, both in the Isle of Wight and in Scotland, and for the place of a Commissioner in the Office of Alienations."⁶¹ This request coincided with Bowring's composition of his narrative, either for the prospective interview with Charles or more probably in lieu of an interview for presentation to the King by a courtier. Bowring had at least one interview with the King in June 1660 and continued to press himself on the King and the court with proposals of a grand design for the royal revenue, reminiscent of certain passages in the narrative itself. Later in a petition of the same year, he stated that the royal revenue was being embezzled,

which could be rectified by the establishment of courts of augmentation and survey, later to be merged into the Exchequer.⁶² He asked for estates for himself and his cousin, John Fifield, for services rendered in restoring Charles II, and the position of waiter in the Port of London for Fifield as recompense for his sufferings during the Interregnum.⁶³ In May 1662, Bowring requested that his place as Clerk of the Council to the Queen be insured by a royal warrant so he would not lose it to others.⁶⁴ There is something pathetic about his petitions for places and favors. There were more suitors for the King's favor after the Restoration than were manageable, and Bowring was always the petitioner, never the receiver.

His petitions of 1664 and 1666 were almost frantic. Nothing could shake his belief in his scheme for securing the King's revenue through a court of augmentation and survey. Charles must hear him personally for it was too important to commit to paper.⁶⁵ One may assume the King referred Bowring through intermediaries to speak with the Lord Treasurer by whom Bowring was admonished for suggesting anything so ridiculous. Of these things Bowring complained; all he wanted was to bring Charles a large secret fortune, like Henry VII's, so Charles would be impregnable in times of domestic strife.⁶⁶ After this final, pathetic plea, there were no more petitions from John Bowring.

Of Bowring's career and his authorship of the narrative there can be no doubt. He wrote of many incidents and associations with particular individuals which have been corroborated. However, Bowring has claimed much more than can be substantiated in the light of a cursory comparison with other sources. The intention here is not a vindication of Bowring or a plea for the acceptance of all his assertions. In fact Hillier's judgment of Bowring may be true in general, that Bowring was one who sought to profit by the advantage of hindsight. Nevertheless, it is for the historian to utilize all the available source material, to separate the true from the spurious in contemporary sources, not to ignore them, as historians have done with the Bowring narrative. If some of Bowring's "Secret Transactions" were based in fact, the possibility exists that more were so based. One of the difficulties in assessing the value of the Bowring narrative was the position of power and influence that Bowring accorded John Lisle. Recent investigation of the career of John Lisle during the civil wars and the Interregnum shows him to have been an extremely influential man from about 1645 to 1659. Moreover, the direction which Lisle purportedly gave to Colonel Hammond in the Isle of Wight has been documented.⁶⁷

Bowring's "Secret Transactions" afford at least the hint that he moved freely among Royalists and Parliamentarians, including the radical wing.

During the civil wars there were probably many like Bowring, who had no particular loyalties and moved about as the opportunities arose. Bowring's "Secret Transactions" are important for this reason as they serve to remind one of these minor personages caught up in the traumatic events of the civil wars and making a career of unabashed duplicity.

Notes

1. Sir George Savile, First Marquis Halifax, *Miscellanies, Historical and Philological* (London, 1703).

2. *Ibid.*, pp. 78-162. Hereafter cited as Bowring, "Secret Transactions."

3. H. C. Foxcroft, *The Life and Letters of Sir George Savile, Bart. First Marquis of Halifax* (2 vols.; New York, 1898), II, 540-41. Savile could easily have appropriated Bowring's manuscript petition while he was friendly with the Duke of York and Sir William Coventry in 1665 or when he was a Privy Councillor after 1672. During the civil wars Savile was usually associated with the Presbyterian faction in Parliament after 1645. He worked with Denzil Hollis, Bulstrode Whitelocke, the Earl of Lindsey and Sir George Digby. It was Savile who accused Hollis and Whitelocke of duplicity in treaty negotiations at Uxbridge. Savile himself had become suspect by the radicals for aiding the King. He had also served as an intermediary for the Royalists at Oxford in 1645. Robert Baillie, *Letters and Journals . . . From the Beginning of the Civil Wars, in 1637, to the year 1662 . . .* (2 vols.; Edinburgh, 1775), II, 136-37. Hollis and William Pierrepont were also known to be friendly with the Earl of Lindsey, in whose coach Bowring had charge of the King's papers at Naseby. *Historical Manuscripts Commission, 13th Report, Portland Papers*, I, 593-94.

4. Public Record Office, *Calendar of the State Papers Domestic, Charles II (1660-1667)*, *passim*.

5. For John Lisle see, Allan J. Busch, "A New Source for the Study of the High Court of Chancery: A Manuscript of John Lisle, Lord Commissioner of the Great Seal, 1649-1659," *Bibliographical Contributions* (University of Kansas Libraries), I (1969), 1-10, and "The Interregnum Court of Chancery: The Career and Writings of John Lisle, Lord Commissioner of the Great Seal (1649-1659)," (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Kansas, 1971). John Lisle (1610-1664) was M.P. for Winchester in the Short and Long Parliaments. He was associated with the radical element of the Parliamentary party after 1644 and was one of the 1649 regicides. Under the Commonwealth and Protectorates he served as Lord Commissioner of the Great Seal and presided in the Court of Chancery as well as the High Court of Justice. In 1660 Lisle fled to the continent and was assassinated at Lausanne in 1664 by Royalists agents.

6. The fact that correspondence of the period contains no references to Bowring or his activities in the Isle of Wight proves little. Never did Bowring claim to be a correspondent of the King or any other principal. His communications were always in person or through an intermediary. Moreover, there are several code names in the letters of the King and other persons which have never been identified. Some of these could very easily refer to Bowring. See C. W. Firebrace, *Honest Harry; Sir Henry Firebrace 1619-1691* (London, 1932), appendices, pp. 251-351.

7. Sir John Berkeley, *Memoirs of Sir John Berkeley* (London, 1699), in Francis Maeseres, ed., *Select Tracts Relating to the Civil Wars in England in the Reign of King Charles the First* (London, 1815), II, 353-94. John Ashburnham, ed., *A Narrative by John Ashburnham of His Attendance on King Charles the First from Oxford to the Scotch Army, and from Hampton-Court to the Isle of Wight* (London, 1830). Firebrace, *Honest Harry*, Appendix A, pp. 253-61. Berkeley, Ashburnham and William Legge were the Royalist agents who assisted the King in his escape from Hampton Court when it seemed that Charles was in danger of his life from the army in 1647. Edmund Ludlow, *The Memoirs of Edmund Ludlow* (2 vols.; Oxford, 1894), I, 153.

HMC, *DeLisle and Dudley MSS., Vol. VI: Sydney Papers* (1626-1698), p. 570. The correspondence of the Royalists after the Isle of Wight affair shows that Berkeley and Ashburnham were considered remiss in their duties. It was this attitude that produced the narratives of the two men. George Warner, ed., *The Nicholas Papers. Correspondence of Sir Edward Nicholas, Secretary of State (1641-1660)*, (4 vols.; London, Camden Society, 1886-1920), I, 233-34, 288, and II, 72. The Earl of Clarendon wrote in his *History of the Rebellion* that Berkeley and Ashburnham compiled their narratives in secret, Berkeley's on the continent in 1651 and Ashburnham's in prison between 1654 and 1658. Earl of Clarendon, *History of the Rebellion* (6 vols.; Oxford, 1888), IV, 269-70.

8. Ashburnham, *Narrative*, introduction, I, 152-4. Rev. E. B. James, *Letters Archaeological and Historical Relating to the Isle of Wight* (2 vols.; London, 1896), II, 265.

9. George Hillier, *A Narrative of the Attempted Escapes of Charles the First from Carisbrook Castle . . .* (London, 1852), p. 127-28.

10. *Ibid.*, p. 129.

11. Firebrace, *Honest Harry* (1932). Gertrude S. Stevenson, ed., *Charles I in Captivity from Contemporary Sources* (London, 1927). Jack D. Jones, *The Royal Prisoner, Charles I at Carisbrooke* (London, 1965).

12. *Nicholas Papers*, I, 233-34.

13. *Ibid.*, II, 72. It should be noted, however, that Bowring's narrative bears a certain resemblance in the facts and incidents covered in Firebrace's narrative written in 1675 from memory. The original copy was lost and the extant version is a copy by a relative of Firebrace in 1685. Firebrace, *Honest Harry*, pp. 253-61.

14. Bowring, "Secret Transactions," p. 80.

15. *Victoria County History: A History of Hampshire and the Isle of Wight* (5 vols.; Westminster, 1903-04), IV, 69, 71, 104, 276 and V, 118. Sir Guy Palmes (1580-1653), was M.P. for Rutlandshire from 1614 to 1643 when he was deprived of his seat. Palmes was noted for his outspoken attacks upon the King's policies in the early years of the Long Parliament, but by 1642 he had become non-political. He was related to the Wallops of Hampshire and owned several estates there. *VCH, Rutlandshire*, II, 109. PRO, *Calendar of the Committee for Compounding*, 1316. Mary Keeler, "The Long Parliament, 1640-1641; A Biographical Study of Its Members," *American Philosophical Society Publications, Vol. 36* (Philadelphia, 1954), pp. 294-95. Keeler, "There are No Remedies for Many Things but by a Parliament," *Some Opposition Committees, 1640*, *Conflict in Stuart England. Essays in Honour of Wallace Notestein*, edited by W. A. Aiken and B. D. Henning (New York, 1960), p. 144.

16. HMC, *9th Report, Pole-Gell Papers*, p. 395.

17. Bowring, "Secret Transactions," pp. 78-80. HMC, *13th Report, Portland Papers*, I, 594.

18. Bowring, "Secret Transactions," p. 123. *The Antiquary*, I (1880), 180-81. Cf. James, *Letters Archaeological and Historical . . .*, II, 267. *Notes and Queries*, 2nd Series, IX, 365. There was a John Bowring living in Chulmleigh, Devon, in 1670, *Notes and Queries*, 2nd Series, X, 67.

19. Bowring, "Secret Transactions," pp. 125-29.

20. *Ibid.*, pp. 161-62 and 100.

21. *Ibid.*, p. 80.

22. *Ibid.*, p. 79.

23. In fact it was Gell's regiment of horse that pursued the King's retreating forces from Naseby to Leicester. Colonel Edward Wogan related the following: "That day [Battle of Naseby] Sir John Gell was marching towards us with 1500 horse, and might easily have stopped all the King's party as they were going to Leicester; for which neglect he was by Cromwell soundly chid, and ever after suspected to be a well-wisher to the King's party." Wogan went on to state that when the parliamentary forces entered Leicester after two days there were many people left behind by the King who pestered them for favors. Colonel Edward Wogan, "The Proceedings of the

New-moulded army from the time they were brought together in 1645, till the King's going to the Isle of Wight in 1647," in Thomas Carte, *A Collection of Original Letters and Papers Concerning the Affairs of England, From . . . 1641 to 1660. Found among the Duke of Ormonde's Papers* (2 vols.; London, 1739), I, 129. CSPD (1644-45), XX, 615.

24. HMC, *13th Report, Portland Papers*, I, 594. Bowring, "Secret Transactions," p. 121.

25. HMC, *9th Report, Pole-Gell Papers*, p. 395.

26. *Commons Journals*, IV, 183 and 190-92. John Lisle, Zouch Tate, John Brown, *Three Speeches Spoken at a Common-Hall . . . the 3rd of July, 1645, . . . Containing many Observations upon the Kings Letters, found in His own Cabinet at Naseby fight, And sent to the Parliament by Sir Thomas Fairfax . . .* (London, 1645).

27. Baillie, *Letters and Journals*, II, 136-37. Ludlow, *Memoirs*, I, 122-23. Both Baillie and Ludlow commented at length on the disorganized manner in which the letters were obtained and forwarded to Parliament. No one knew who found them or who had them for several days before Fairfax sent them to Parliament. See also HMC, *7th Report, Verney Papers*, p. 451.

28. Bowring, "Secret Transactions," p. 80. *Nicholas Papers*, I, 87-8. Although Bowring does not inform the reader how he escaped after the fall of Leicester, it will be recalled that William Pierrepoint, a friend of Denzil Hollis, the Earl of Lindsey and Sir George Savile, was on the parliamentary committee of 1645 to negotiate with enemy garrisons "for discovery of such as give the enemy intelligence." HMC, *13th Report, Portland Papers*, I, 593-94, and Baillie, *Letters and Journals*, II, 119. Bowring's association with Gell and Lisle may also have been of great use at that time.

29. Bowring, "Secret Transactions," pp. 80-1.

30. *Ibid.*, pp. 81-91.

31. *Ibid.*, pp. 97-9. Sir Thomas Glenham was the King's military commander in the North. C. H. Firth, ed., *The Life and Memoirs of William Cavendish, Duke of Newcastle* (2nd ed.; London, n.d.), pp. 86 and 88. HMC, *13th Report, Portland Papers*, I, 254. Bowring's claim to have warned the Prince of Wales through Glenham must have had some basis in truth, for Bowring stated in his narrative that when he met with Charles II in June 1660, the new King recalled Glenham's mission and was grateful to Bowring for his aid. On this occasion Bowring had been summoned before the King to impart any information he might have had of interest to the King. Bowring, "Secret Transactions," p. 100. This meeting would correspond to Bowring's request in June 1660 for an audience with Charles II. CSPD, *Charles II (1660-1661)*, p. 101.

32. Mark Noble, *Lives of the Regicides* (2 vols.; London, 1798), I, 92. Nicholas Love was M.P. for Winchester after 1644, and was therefore the colleague of John Lisle, the other M.P. for that borough. Love was a member of the "secret committee" or Committee for Examinations which investigated Royalist sympathizers and spies. He was an active member of the High Court of Justice in 1649 and a regicide. Moreover, he and Lisle were close associates after 1644. In 1660, Love fled to Lausanne as did Lisle and other regicides. Busch, "The Interregnum Court of Chancery," pp. 57-8. Ludlow, *Memoirs*, II, 335-37. VCH, *Hants.*, II, 337. It is interesting that Bowring should confess in his narrative to having been saved from the gallows in 1648 by the influence of Nicholas Love. Bowring wrote of this incident as follows: "And I make no question, but Sir Edward Walker in Honesty and good Conscience, is well able to give Your Majesty an account, how honourable an intention Your Majesties Royal Father had to prefer me, as Mr. Thomas Cooke was able to accuse me of, and declared it of me at a Committee where he was examined concerning the King's Affairs, to get his Liberty of the pretended Parliament when he was a Prisoner in the Tower; for which I had been put to Death, if it had not been for Sir Nicholas Love." Bowring, "Secret Transactions," p. 138.

33. Bowring, "Secret Transactions," pp. 97-106.

34. *Ibid.*, p. 101.

35. *HMC, 13th Report, Portland Papers, I*, 601-02. W.A.D. Adams, *The History and Topography of the Isle of Wight* (Ventnor, 1864), p. 54. *CSPD, Charles I (1648-49)*, XXII, 220 and 322-24. The role of a double agent would have been nothing unique to Bowring, for there were other famous double agents of the civil wars such as Colonel Bampfield and Lady Carlisle. Bowring related an interesting incident with regard to the interception of intelligence between the King and the Royalists. In the autumn of 1648, Charles sent a message to the Prince of Wales in Holland by way of a man who proved to be an informer. This man hurried to London and to the Boar's Head in Holborn where he gave the message to John Lisle's agent, one Coleman. Bowring noted that he received knowledge of the treachery from Coleman. Bowring, "Secret Transactions," p. 135. Busch, "The Interregnum Court of Chancery," p. 53.
36. Bowring, "Secret Transactions," p. 138. *HMC, 13th Report, Portland Papers, I*, 594. Thomas Cooke was a Royalist and attended Charles I in the Isle of Wight. In 1651, Cooke was arrested by the Commonwealth, whereupon he made a full confession of the activities of Royalists to the Committee for Examinations, a sub-committee of the Council of State, which prepared cases for the High Court of Justice. John Lisle and Nicholas Love were members of this committee. For Cooke's full statement before this committee, see *HMC, 13th Report, Portland Papers, I*, 576-604. For the feelings of the Royalists about the revelations of Cooke in 1651, see *Nicholas Papers, I*, 234-90.
37. Bowring, "Secret Transactions," pp. 115-43.
38. *Ibid.*, pp. 121-25.
39. *Ibid.*, pp. 145-59.
40. *Ibid.*, pp. 159-62.
41. *Ibid.*, p. 79.
42. *Nicholas Papers, I*, 87-8. Clarendon, *History of Rebellion, IV*, 250-55.
43. *HMC, 13th Report, Portland Papers, I*, 594.
44. Bowring, "Secret Transactions," p. 154.
45. Francis Bamford, ed., *A Royalist's Notebook; The Commonplace Book of Sir John Oglander, Kt., of Nunwell* (London, 1936), pp. 123-25.
46. Bowring, "Secret Transactions," p. 146.
47. *Ibid.*, p. 146.
48. R. Powell, *The Navy in the English Civil War* (London, 1962), pp. 152 and 157. *HMC, Marquis of Ormonde MSS.*, II, 88 and 91. Here the editor has assigned the vice-admiral in the letters as Sir George Lisle, vice-admiral of the Irish Sea; however, the Lisle referred to by Bowring is Thomas Lisle, a subordinate of Colonel Rainsborough.
49. *HMC, 13th Report, Portland Papers, I*, 589. Bulstrode Whitelocke, *Memorials of English Affairs . . .* (London, 1682), p. 287. The King was even in correspondence with the Ogländers of the Isle of Wight as is seen in a letter of Charles I to Charles Oglander for a favor to Thomas Osbourne. Isle of Wight Record Office, *Oglander Papers*, OG/78/5.
50. *CSPD, Charles I (1648-49)*, XXII, 322-24.
51. *HMC, 13th Report, Portland Papers, I*, 589.
52. Hillier, *Narrative of Escapes*, p. 129.
53. Joseph Foster, *Alumni Oxoniensis*, Early Series (4 vols.; London, 1891), I, 228.
54. 23 April 1655, *Nicholas Papers, II*, 266.
55. Henry B. Wheatley, ed., *The Diary of Samuel Pepys . . .* (8 vols.; London, 1904), I, 134-35. One Mr. Cade was examined on 10 December 1656, to be a Navy Minister and was found sound and orthodox. *CSPD (1656-57)*, p. 481.
56. *HMC, 9th Report, Pole-Gell Papers*, p. 391. *HMC, 13th Report, Portland Papers, I*, 251 and 339. *CSPD, Charles I (1644-45)*, XX, 615.
57. Bowring, "Secret Transactions," pp. 121-22. *HMC, 13th Report, Portland Papers, I*, 594.
58. *HMC, 9th Report, Pole-Gell Papers*, p. 395. I was informed by a letter from Mr. Trevor Brighton of St. John's College, York, 2 March 1969, that an undated

note for a petition to Charles II, in Gell's handwriting, reads as follows: "I did present unto his late Majesty of blessed memory, in the Isle of Wight, at 3 several times £300 in gold by the hands of John Bowring." Mr. Brighton found this note among the uncatalogued Gell Papers, Staffordshire Record Office, Stafford. Gell was pardoned of misprision of treason, 5 April 1653. *Commons Journal*, VII, 274.

59. Bowring, "Secret Transactions," p. 79.

60. *CSPD, Charles II (1661-62)*, p. 16.

61. *CSPD, Charles II (1660-61)*, p. 101.

62. *CSPD, Charles II (1660-61)*, p. 462.

63. PRO, *Calendar of Treasury Books (1660-61)*, I, 32. *CSPD, Charles II (1661-62)*, pp. 16 and 219.

64. *CSPD, Charles II (1661-62)*, p. 394.

65. *CSPD, Charles II (1664-65)*, p. 147.

66. *CSPD, Charles II (1666-67)*, p. 416.

67. Thomas Birch, ed., *Letters between Col. Robert Hammond . . . and the Committee . . . at Derby-House . . .* (London, 1764). *Commons Journal*, IV, 508. Hillier, *Narrative of Escapes*, p. 5. These references show that Lisle wrote letters of direction to Hammond after the king was imprisoned and that it was Lisle who went to the Isle of Wight in 1647 to see Hammond properly settled in his governorship.

Catesby, Curll, and Cook: or, The Librarian and the 18th Century English Book

ALEXANDRA MASON

Just a few years ago, 18th century English books were both plentiful and cheap. In many libraries they were common open stack books and went freely out of the library, got their share of ballpoint underlining and jejune marginalia, and had their hinges and backstrips patched with double-stitched binder and plastic tape. If they happened to be unbound or (as more frequently was and is the case) disbound, they were glued and sewed or stapled into readymade pamphlet binders. Arcane messages from the cataloguer to the charge card typist were written across their title-pages or at length in the white space above a caption-title, property marks were rubber stamped across their illustrations, and the paper appurtenances of circulation were pasted to their wrappers or final blanks. Today rare books librarians, cursing the imperturbable ghosts of their predecessors to whom anything printed after 1700 (and most things after 1640) was without interest, walk the aisles of their libraries' general stacks, muttering and rescuing and wishing they had adequate restoration budgets.

As recently as five years ago, a library could have an arrangement with a dealer to quote 18th century English books and pamphlets under \$10 and would receive fairly long lists at frequent intervals. With alarming speed the limit rose to \$15, \$20, \$30. The last offer I had from an old acquaintance in the trade included only one item below \$30, a very small and battered pamphlet of no particular importance of which the Spencer Library already had a fine, untrimmed, unbound copy, bought in 1963 for \$2.50. What important 18th century English books fetch does not bear thinking of.

What all of this says, aside from the obvious statements about shrinking supply and the inconvenient immortality of libraries which don't die like decent folk and send their books back out into the market, is that the libraries and scholars and collectors now find 18th century English books highly desirable and see beauties in them which were not long ago imperceptible to all but a farsighted few. Part of this growing popularity stems from the classic scarcity pattern: if Caxtons are scarce, we find virtue in John Daye, then in the Jaggards and Stansby, and so on, moving ever forward through time. Part of it, I fear, may come from the increasing need to find research material for linguistically ignorant graduate students. To

the librarian, however, the most important reason is the growing interest in this period on the part of scholars.

Aside from the current fashion for things two centuries old which is a natural result of having one's two hundredth birthday, there has been for some years an increasing interest in the 18th century, in putting our own history in perspective in the world of the time, in understanding the ideas and concerns of that time. The books and manuscripts of the 18th century form a speaking portrait of that turbulent and expanding age, near enough in time to be comprehensible, speaking the language most of us know best, filled with self-made men trying to find their way in a society changed by their very presence, and politicians fighting the familiar rear-guard action against public exposure of their actions by the burgeoning new class of journalists. It is the pleasant and exasperating task of librarians to provide these silent witnesses to the vitality of an age.

In this hemisphere there are a few fortunate libraries which were able to collect the publications of the 18th century as they came off the press and, no doubt, to catalogue them to the satisfaction of the time with no more difficulty than cataloguers usually have with current books. The identity of anonymous polemicists could be discovered by conversing with one's friends—in the smaller society of that time, one was almost bound to know someone who knew—and written on the fly leaf if it was felt to be of any use or significance. The subject of the discussion would be known to any reasonably educated person and consequently did not have to be recorded anywhere, with the exception of those enticing blanks left in satiric poems which would occasionally be filled in by someone who fancied he knew the answers. Most American libraries are not in that enviable position, being too young or not foresighted enough, and their librarians have a fine set of pleasurable conundrums to solve: how to find the books, how to acquire them once found, and how to handle them once acquired.

In finding the books, librarians have a great deal of help; indeed the work is more often than not done for them by their obliging best friends, the booksellers. Every day's mail brings catalogues from all over the world, arranged in every order known to man (including purely random), some of them sumptuous affairs with coloured plates and some of them mimeographed or even (as with one of my favorite Italian dealers) ninth carbons in a particularly virulent and illegible blue. These have to be read with care, and they are—at the desk, at the breakfast table, in the bath tub, and in bed. This task is not only edifying but thoroughly pleasant, no matter how little money there is to spend. To find the sleeper amongst the known favourites, to learn the points of books not yet (and perhaps never to be)

owned, to indulge in the peculiar joy of seeing the current price of a book bought cheap ten years ago, to store up in the obliging subconscious prices to use when the next enquiry comes from someone with iron pyrites in his attic, to savour the occasional felicities of booksellers' prose—these are quiet pleasures not restricted by funds. If there is money to be spent, then the catalogues must be read quickly, the library's holdings checked equally quickly, and the order sent by the quickest means available. Then comes the frustrating period of waiting, only too frequently terminated with a "sold" note, but sometimes—often enough to keep up the heart—ending with the arrival of a parcel.

The more fortunate of us can go on buying trips, visiting shops previously known only by correspondence and meeting booksellers known only as voices on the telephone, or to book fairs—Lucullan feasts where the unprepared can become so overwhelmed by the bounty as to fall into confusion and go away hungry out of sheer indecision or shoot an entire year's budget in one afternoon.

One result of all this activity can be the development of a special relationship with a few booksellers, getting to know them and their specialties while they get to know the librarian and his library's particular interests. This can lead not only to valued friendships but also to advance copies of catalogues and even to special offers. Special offers are particularly prized: the bookseller does not have to spend his time and money describing the books or manuscripts for a catalogue, the librarian has a little more time to do the necessary background work (including money raising) on what is often a major purchase, and maybe the price will be a little less. The example I think of particularly from my own experience happened about four years ago. At a book fair in New York I picked up a flyer from an English dealer listing a number of manuscript collections he had for sale. One or two of these were of interest but proved to be sold when I enquired. Some time later one of these was offered to me, all uncatalogued, unsorted, with little description of more than half of it save the intriguing "a roomful of old deeds." Upstairs in a house in one of those pleasant squares near the British Museum was a sizable room filled about knee-high (waist-high in places) with manuscripts—wrapped in newspapers, bundled in string, packed in tea chests, loose on tables and shelves and the floor. There were old deeds in plenty, and wills and marriage contracts and account books and letters and manuscript maps and files and roll-files and pipe rolls and desk spindles with the original contents still spiked on them. They were about land transfer, taxes (including stamped paper taxes), exchequer affairs, chancery affairs, naval and military matters, and a myriad other

matters. They were perfectly delightful. After about three hours of looking at them, the bookseller and I repaired to a pub in Southwark to talk about things over a beer. Not having to arrange and catalogue the collection dropped the price by a significant percentage. Agreement to pay fairly promptly dropped it still further. The Spencer Library ended up with fifty-three large cartons of manuscripts (fifteenth to nineteenth century, but mostly seventeenth and eighteenth century) at a low price, and the bookseller ended up with a fair profit and an emptied storeroom. I suppose I needn't add that relations between the two parties continue to be very cordial.

Getting the money to pay for the books once they've been found is especially difficult these days. The contrast with the fat times of the late fifties and early sixties is particularly painful. I read a lot of catalogues for pleasure and too few for orders now and my acquaintance with booksellers is more social than business.

The University of Kansas library, like many others, is turning to its friends to help out in these difficult times. Our Friends of the Library are a relatively young group, not yet five years old, but in that short time they have already proved their value—providing friendship, dedicated advocacy, and intangible support as well as assistance with purchases. One particular gift of our Friends is especially appropriate to mention at a conference dedicated to the 18th century: a complete set of all sixty volumes of *The Political State of Great Britain* (London: J. Baker, 1711-1740).

I can say very little about that very important source of books, the private collector as donor. None of the donors with whom I have worked has been interested in the 18th century although some who preceded my arrival at Kansas gave the library 18th century books, especially the late Charles B. Realey who bequeathed the library his collection on Sir Robert Walpole, and the California collector, Ralph Ellis, whose great collection of natural history included a number of 18th century books. In general, the care and cultivation of donors is a delicate and very personal activity; few can do it well and such people should be prized beyond rubies, no matter what their faults.

Another way of raising money, beyond appealing to Friends and legislatures, is the sale or exchange of surplus duplicates. This is a course to be embarked upon with considerable caution but definitely to be embarked upon. To keep true duplicates is to be selfish, assuming that local regulations permit alienation, but to let a book go without examining it critically, making absolutely sure that it is a true duplicate, is to be unprofessionally myopic. I may be overly sensitive on the matter of true duplication, partly

because Charlton Hinman has a study just down the hall from my office and since I occasionally assist him in teaching analytical bibliography, but partly because I know very well that some of the books I have acquired from other libraries as "surplus duplicates" have proved to be nothing of the sort, but previously unnoticed stop-press variants. Nonetheless, if due care is taken, the sale of duplicates can be a very valuable source of money to libraries and of stock to booksellers.

Once the books have been acquired, we get down to what is really special about 18th century English books, the delightfully difficult problems of cataloguing them and getting them and the potential researcher together. The same lack of bibliographical assistance about which we complain so bitterly (the long-desired and much-discussed 18th century STC), the variety of forms (re-editions, re-issues, and positive battalions of states), the stubborn anonymity of authors and the sheer quantity of the books themselves, all combine to make the cataloguer of 18th century English books a very fortunate librarian indeed. We still have to work with the book itself, exercise our ingenuity and bibliographical craft, and we have a very good chance of finding out something new, something that no one else has seen.

To give some context to these remarks, we should remember that the University of Kansas is 109 years old, began to acquire rare books deliberately twenty-one years ago, has about one and three-quarter million volumes (of which about two hundred thousand are in the Spencer Library—the rare books library) and over a mile of manuscripts and archives (all of which are in Spencer). Something over twenty-eight thousand of the printed volumes and a fair number of the manuscripts are from Great Britain in the 18th century. About twenty-five hundred of the 18th century English books were acquired in the last three years and about fifteen percent of the use of our printed books is of 18th century English books, that is, about 4600 volumes last year. It's a moderately busy place, with five librarians to do all the ordering, cataloguing, and public service—not just for 18th century but for all subject areas except Kansas history and University Archives which have their own staff. Like other librarians, we regret the lack of sufficiently helpful bibliographical aids and the unconscionable amount of time that it often takes to record a new acquisition sufficiently well to make it truly useful to our readers and researchers. Like other librarians, we make grateful use of the work of centuries of scholars—especially the generations of scholarly librarians who produced the British Museum Catalogue of Printed Books—and contribute the results of our own work to the National Union Catalog and to a Cornell University pilot

18th century short-title catalogue. We also enjoy the considerable intellectual effort which is necessary to catalogue 18th century books usefully.

The pleasures of dealing with these books are great. They afford scope for that fondness for puzzles, ciphers, and problem-solving that characterizes the rare books cataloguer and the bibliographer. They encourage and even require us to immerse ourselves in the politics and scandals of the age, teach us the foibles and nicknames of famous men, introduce us to obscure and anonymous people and make us exercise all of our bibliographical craft and historical ingenuity. For example, four recently answered questions: Who or what is Blue-String? What is the true date of the 1771 edition of Catesby's *Natural History of Carolina*? How was the abridged edition of Cook's third voyage issued? What do Edmund Curll and aboriginal Australian bark paintings have in common?

One of our 18th century collecting interests is separately published satiric poems. Usually anonymous in authorship, these are apt to conceal their subjects with nicknames, periphrases, and blanks. Sometimes these are easy to decode—"L-rds" and "C-mm-n's" and "K-ng" are hardly intended to be concealed by the mere omission of vowels, and the Duke of Marlborough is readily recognizable as the D— of M———. The more difficult concealments are probably not real problems to the specialist but they are great puzzles to the generalist librarian committed to the care of everything from papyrus to Charles Olson.

A couple of years ago we were handling a volume of folio satires from the 1730s and '40s. Amongst them were four particularly obscure pieces: *The Projector's Looking-Glass, Being the Last Dying Words and Confession of Sir Robert Marral* (London: T. Tibbit, 1733), *Suffolk and Norfolk: or, Two Prodigies in Nature* (London: P. Monger [!], 1735), *The Statesman. A New Court Ballad* (London: S. Slow, undated but after 1731), and *The Negotiators. Or, Don Diego Brought to Reason* (London: R. Thompson, 1738).

The Projector's Looking-Glass begins

With heavy Heart and trembling Hand,
I poor Sir B—ue S—ng, Knight
Write this, to let you understand
My sad and woeful plight.

and refers to a rise in politics accomplished by bribery and extortion as well as to present unpopularity.

The Statesman commences

Some Years ago from Norfolk,
 There came a gallant Wight,
 And tho' it is most strange, yet
 He could both Read and Write;
 So to London he wou'd go, woud go,
 wou'd go, so to London he wou'd go.

It tells of a rise to fame, fortune and power by corruption and extortion and ends

But yet not being satisfy'd,
 He needs must have a *String*,
 And it must be a *Blue* one,
 'Cause that's a pretty thing;
When to Norfolk he does go, &c.
 However, let him have his Whim,
 And dangle the *Blue String*,
 So he's but doom'd at last
 In a *Hempen* one to swing;
When to Tyburn he does go, &c.

Suffolk and Norfolk describes a medical prodigy (a man from Suffolk with a very unpleasant disease of the skin) and a political prodigy (a man from Norfolk with a very unpleasant case of avarice).

The Negotiators includes in its first stanza the lines

Since *Blue-String* the Great,
 To better their Fate,
 Once more has determin'd he will *Negotiate*;

These four pieces therefore appeared to have a common subject, Sir Blue-String from Norfolk, a man of considerable importance who gave rise to strong feelings in those opposed to him. His identity remained uncertain until the handling of the fourth piece, *The Negotiators*. This not only includes a reference to Blue-String but has the final needed clue. It has a very fine woodcut frontispiece, showing a stout bewigged gentleman holding a British lion by the tail as it stretches forth a clawed paw toward a mustachio'd man with a large whip who is driving three men in the shafts of a cart. The woodcut is all black-and-white save one spot of colour, a blue Garter ribbon across the bosom of the bewigged gentleman. It all comes clear. The stout man is Sir Robert Walpole (easily recognizable

from other cartoons of the day), displaying the Garter ribbon of which he proves to have been very proud, vainly attempting to restrain England from a war with Spain, the proximate cause of which was Spanish interference with English shipping and maltreatment of English seamen. Walpole then is Sir Blue-String and the Norfolk Prodigy.

Most of this can be found neatly laid out in Milton Percival's edition of *Political Ballads Illustrating the Administration of Sir Robert Walpole* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1916) but not until one at least suspects that the subject is Walpole—the reference book to solve the problem cannot be found until the problem is solved. The poem called *Suffolk and Norfolk*, by the way, does not appear in Percival's compilation.

The question of the true date of the 1771 edition of Mark Catesby's *Natural History of Carolina, Florida, and the Bahama Islands* came up while I was working on the bibliographical editing of a catalogue¹ of the Ralph Ellis collection, the large ornithological collection bequeathed to the University of Kansas some years ago by a California collector. Catesby's great work,² the first major treatise devoted entirely to the biota of the New World, was first issued in parts from about 1730 to 1748, although the title-pages of the two volumes of the first edition read "1731" and "1743." It came out again in 1754 with new title-pages, including the statement "Revis'd by Mr. Edwards," and again later with title-pages dated 1771. The Ellis Collection has all three of these editions, with two copies each of the 1754 and 1771 versions. This provides an opportunity for comparison of the text of the three editions.

This comparison was made and the textual differences proved to be minimal. Two minor alterations made by printed pasteover labels in the "first edition" are set in corrected form in the 1754 and 1771 versions. A sentence which breaks off at a semi-colon in the "first edition" has been completed in the 1754 "edition" by the addition of seven words, and there are three other changes involving a total of no more than nine words. The edition of 1771 adds a list of the Linnean names of the animals and plants described and makes some further very minor changes of wording. One is left with the impression that George Edwards's "revision" of the text was merely a checking for correctness resulting in no need for change.

The interesting revelations of the comparison did not relate to the text changes but to the printing history of Catesby's great work. After page 80 of volume I, the issues of "1731" and 1754 are identical save for an added dedication leaf and the title-page of volume II; obviously old sheets of the original printing were available in plenty. (So much standing type tied up in a warehouse for so long seems unlikely.) The first eighty pages of

volume I have been reset entirely, and (here's the joy of multiple "copies") forty-one of them have been reset twice. It was a very careful resetting, page-for-page and a great deal of it line-for-line. The only evidences of compositorial spelling preference I found were "blew" and "bluc," and "aboad" and "abode."

The text-pages of the two "copies" of the 1771 edition are identical with one another and obviously of quite a different setting of type from the earlier versions, no effort being made to follow the punctuation, capitalization, or spacing. They have their own concealed difference, however. Examination (following accidental observation, I must confess) of the paper reveals, in the plates of one copy, watermarks dated 1809, 1815, and 1816, while the plates of the other copy are printed on paper appropriate to a date of 1771. Once again, old sheets (this time of the 1771 edition, including the title-page) have been left and appear to have been bound up with 19th century prints pulled from the 18th century engraved plates.

Exactly what we have here in terms of edition, impression, issue, and state, I am not sure. Certainly there are at least two editions, the "1731" and the 1771. Whether the resetting of eighty out of over two hundred and eighty pages qualifies the "1754" as an edition, I doubt. I guess I would say that we have one edition with two issues, the second issue having two states (i.e., the first edition: first issue, of "1731," second issue of 1754 existing in two states), and another edition also existing in two states but maybe only one issue (i.e., the edition of 1771: state A actually issued in 1771, state B made up after 1815 but perhaps never "issued" but just made up by a collector or bookseller). I hope that the publication of the description of this interesting problem here and in the second volume of the Ellis catalogue will elicit some further information from other owners of Catesby.

The work on the Ellis catalogue keeps producing problems to be solved. The latest of the series was a minor matter concerning the octavo abridged edition of Cook's third voyage, published hard on the heels of the first (Admiralty) edition and dated, like it, 1784.⁹ It is a fairly common book—the *National Union Catalog Pre-1956 Imprints* shows at least nineteen copies—and I probably would have paid it no particular attention if it had not been necessary to compare two copies for determination of duplication. The two copies proved to differ only in binding order and chart coloration. One copy has gathering Cc, containing "Directions for placing the Copper Plates, Charts, &c. in Captain Cook's Third and Last Voyage" and "New Pamphlets, printed for John Stockdale, for the Year 1785" bound at the end of volume I, following gathering Bb. In the other copy an identical gathering is bound at the end of volume IV, following a gathering also

signed Cc but containing the end of the list of subscribers. This apparently unlikely repetition of signatures does follow the order of printing, as can be seen from the printed note at the foot of the first page of the gathering: "Vol. IV.—No. 24." Such printed notes appear throughout, on the first page of each gathering except the preliminaries, revealing that this abridgment was issued in parts, each of approximately four gatherings. The duration of the issue is unknown except that it began in 1784 (as the title-pages are dated) and extended into 1785 (as evidenced by the date of Stockdale's list and of the folding chart bound in volume I). This is not a bibliographical discovery of any importance but it does demonstrate that almost any 18th century book is apt to contain a puzzle to be solved, the solution of which will add a little to our knowledge of publishing history.

This sort of cataloguing cryptoanalysis is highly pleasurable—the librarian's true craft—but it must not make us forget that the point of the exercise is to make the books available to other researchers. If we look this carefully at every book we will find ourselves sitting atop an ever-increasing glacial deposit of uncatalogued books. At Kansas we have tried many different shortcuts, most of them serving only to teach us that the shortest way across is the longest way home, but some of at least passing interest. For a year or so, until the mechanical problems became too great, we microfilmed the title-pages of all unbound pamphlets and printed out the photographs on Xerox card stock. These made very interesting catalogue cards, revealing more clearly than any transcription those differences of ornament or placement of type which are often the first clue to a variant printing. One of our readers was able to discover a useful number of the anonymous 18th century Birmingham imprints he was seeking by recognition of certain characteristic ornaments on these title-page cards as they appeared in the chronological catalogue.

The 18th century English books are used by all levels of reader and their appeal is broad. I can assure you that there is almost nothing else in a library so appealing to a group of sixth graders brought "to learn about the research library" as an 18th century English newspaper, that ladies' literary clubs are enchanted by early almanacs, and that it is a poor librarian indeed who cannot win over almost any group, from class to tour, with a few selected issues of *The Gentleman's Magazine*. The enlightened and scholarly attitude of one of our English faculty has proved that good freshman English students as well as graduate students can profit greatly from a detailed textual comparison of the first two editions of *Tom Jones*. The State Trials are a prime source for the students of English constitutional history while the hundreds of 18th century pamphlet sermons which one might be

tempted to dismiss as of little interest are a lode being assiduously mined by students of politics and the relationship of church and state. The tangled relationship of those two indefatigable and mutually plagiarizing annalists, David Jones and Abel Boyer, is being sorted out by one of our History faculty in the interstices of his continuing major work on Marlborough and Godolphin.

The 18th century collections serve not only our own university community but draw scholars from other universities in the United States and further afield. Recent researchers have sought Irish 18th century imprints, Robert Dodsley, and "all the 18th century English periodicals you have." This last researcher, intending to stay only a day or two, encountered the great wealth of the Richmond P. Bond collection and left reluctantly ten days later, far more aware of the magnitude and complexity of the monumental task he had set himself—to make a catalogue of all pre-19th century English periodicals.

The labours and accomplishments of these readers and researchers are shared and supported by the librarians. Our job does not end with finding, acquiring, and cataloguing but goes on—answering bibliographical queries which come by letter and from readers in the library, giving short individual courses in historical and descriptive bibliography and in palaeography, always keeping an eye open for the piece which will fit with a certain researcher's interests, and trying to keep abreast (or ahead) of everyone's work.

One 18th century researcher has defeated us. We cannot keep up with him. He began work with a group of others in the late '50s, intending to produce a list of our Edmund Curll collection (based on the private collection of the late Peter Murray Hill). As the years passed the Curll Committee, as it called itself, withered away, leaving the one determined man who became more and more fascinated with Curll. Slowly the list of the Curll collection became a checklist of all the Curll imprints he could find, and then turned into a biography of Edmund Curll with bibliographical appendices, including a greatly expanded and corrected Curll checklist, which should supersede Ralph Straus's *The Unspeakable Curll* (London: Chapman and Hall, 1928). It has a great deal about Curll's publications for, as the author puts it, "what can the biography of a bookseller-publisher be but a discussion of his books?" The Curll who will be revealed—we trust—is a very speakable fellow, a showman-auctioneer amongst other things who auctioned major libraries to a full house at the rate of twenty books an evening. Unfortunately the assiduous researcher, pursuing Curll imprints to the very Antipodes, became fascinated with a new thing, Aus-

tralian aboriginal bark paintings. He commenced to collect them. He was called upon to lend them to museums for public exhibition. He commenced to write about them. None of us has been able to see how we can speed the completion of the latest work on bark painting, and (according to my last conversation with this double enthusiast) we must wait for that before we can expect to see the new, speakable Curll.

A pleasurable problem, a chance to exercise the bibliographical craft, and the opportunity of working with scholars of an intriguing and congenial age: that is what the 18th century English book means to this librarian.

Notes

1. Robert M. Mengel, comp., *A Catalogue of the Ellis Collection of Ornithological Books in the University of Kansas Libraries*, Univ. of Kansas Publications, Library Series (Lawrence: 1972-), vol. I-

2. Mark Catesby, *The Natural History of Carolina, Florida and the Bahama Islands* (London: Printed at the Expence of the Author . . . , 1731-1743), 2 vols. Later editions referred to have the same title (with the addition of a comma following the word "Florida" in the 1771 edition), were both published in London, by Charles Marsh and others (1754) and Benjamin White (1771).

3. James Cook, *A Voyage to the Pacific Ocean . . . In the Years 1776, 1777, 1778, 1779, and 1780. Being a copious . . . Abridgment . . .* (London: J. Stockdale . . . , 1784), 4 vols.

This paper was delivered at the Rare Books and Manuscripts Preconference of the Association of College and Research Libraries in San Francisco, June 28, 1975, and formed the third of a series on the meaning of the 18th century English book to the bookseller, the collector, and the librarian.

UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS PUBLICATIONS

Library Series

Editor, JAMES HELYAR

1. *University of Kansas: List of Publications.* Compiled by Mary Saud Smelser. 1935. available on request
2. *University of Kansas Graduate School Theses, 1888-1947.* Compiled by Bessie E. Wilder. 1949. *
3. *Two Augustan Booksellers: John Dunton and Edmond Curll,* by Peter Murray Hill. 1958. \$1.00
4. *New Adventures Among Old Books: An Essay in Eighteenth Century Bibliography,* by William B. Todd. 1958. *
5. *Catalogues of Rare Books: A Chapter in Bibliographical History,* by Archer Taylor. 1958. *
6. *What Kind of a Business is This? Reminiscences of the Book Trade and Book Collectors,* by Jacob Zeitlin. 1959. *
7. *The Bibliographical Way,* by Fredson Bowers. 1959. *
8. *A Bibliography of English Imprints of Denmark,* by P. M. Mitchell. 1969. \$2.00
9. *On the Burning of His Library and On Medical Travel,* by Thomas Bartholin, translated by Charles D. O'Malley. 1961. *
10. *A Bibliography of the Frank E. Melvin Collection of Pamphlets of the French Revolution in the University of Kansas Libraries,* by Ambrose Saricks. 1961. 2 vols., \$7.50 *
11. *Observations on Paper as Evidence,* by Allen H. Stevenson. 1961. *
12. *University of Kansas Graduate School Theses, 1948-1958.* Compiled by Bessie E. Wilder. 1961. \$2.50
13. *Six Variant Readings in the First Folio of Shakespeare,* by Charlton Hinman. 1961. \$1.50
14. *A Petition Regarding the Conditions in the C.S.M. Prison at Columbia, S.C., Addressed to the Confederate Authorities by Col. John Fraser.* Edited by George L. Anderson. 1961. \$1.50
15. *William Dampier: Seaman-Scientist,* by Joseph C. Shipman. 1962. \$1.50
16. *Maps of the 16th to 19th Centuries,* by Thomas R. Smith and Bradford L. Thomas. 1963. *
17. *Looking at an Early Map,* by R. A. Skelton. 1965. *
18. *A Bibliography of James Joyce Studies,* by Robert H. Deming. 1963. *
19. *Maps of Costa Rica,* by Albert H. Palmerlee. 1965. *
20. *A Checklist of Linneana, 1735-1835,* by Terrence Williams. 1964. \$1.50
21. *International Bibliography of Vegetation Maps,* edited by A. W. Kuchler. Volume 1: North America. 1965. *
22. *Four Centuries of Shakespeare Publication,* by Giles E. Dawson. 1964. \$1.00
23. *A Guide to the Ssu Pu Ts'ung K'an,* by Karl Lo. 1965. \$1.50
25. *Censored: Books and their Right to Live,* by Elmer Gertz. 1965. *
26. *International Bibliography of Vegetation Maps,* edited by A. W. Kuchler. Volume 2: Europe. 1966. \$10.00
27. *Bibliography and Natural History: Essays presented at a Conference convened in June 1964 by Thomas R. Buckman.* 1966. \$5.00
28. *A Bibliography of 17th Century German Imprints in Denmark and the Duchies of Schleswig-Holstein,* compiled by P. M. Mitchell. Volumes 1-2. 1969. \$15.00
29. *International Bibliography of Vegetation Maps,* edited by A. W. Kuchler. Volume 3: Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Asia, and Australia. 1969. \$7.50
30. *Rilke's last year,* by George C. Schoolfield. 1969. \$1.50
31. *The Two Worlds of University Publishing,* by Roger W. Shugg. 1968. \$1.00
32. *Bibliographical Contributions, 1.* 1969. \$2.00
33. *A Bibliographical Catalogue of the Ellis Collection of Ornithological Literature.* Vol. 1. 1972. \$10.00
34. *The Cuban Revolution of Fidel Castro Viewed from Abroad: an Annotated Bibliography,* by Gilberto V. Fort. 1969. \$3.00
35. *Growth and Change in the Early English Press,* by Richmond P. Bond. 1969. \$1.00
36. *International Bibliography of Vegetation Maps,* edited by A. W. Kuchler. Volume 4: Africa, South America, and World Maps. 1970. \$12.00
37. *Gilbert and Sullivan: Papers presented at the International Conference held at the University of Kansas in May 1970.* Edited by James Helyar. 1971. \$6.00
38. *Watching the Ps and Qs: Editorial Treatment of Accidentals,* by James Thorpe. 1971. \$1.00
39. *A Bibliography of 17th Century German Imprints in Denmark and the Duchies of Schleswig-Holstein,* compiled by P. M. Mitchell. Volume 3. 1976. (Supplement to No. 28) \$6.00
40. *Bibliographical Contributions, 2.* 1976. \$2.00

*Titles marked with an asterisk are now in short supply, and are normally only available to complete the files of institutions maintaining exchange agreements with the University of Kansas Libraries.

The Library Series and other University of Kansas Publications are offered to learned societies, colleges and universities and other institutions in exchange for similar publications. All communications regarding exchange should be addressed to the Exchange Librarian, University of Kansas Libraries, Lawrence, Kansas 66045. Communications regarding sales, reviews, and forthcoming publications in the Library Series, should be addressed to the Editor of Library Publications, University of Kansas Libraries, Lawrence, Kansas 66045. European sales are handled by Anton W. van Bekhoven, Ruysdaelplein 35, Naarden, The Netherlands.