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The First Edition of Candide
A Problem in Identification
BY IRA O. WADE

A person studying Voltaire must be prepared for surprises—some disconcerting and unpleasant, others intriguing and delightful. When the Princeton University Library purchased over twenty years ago what was believed to be the first edition of Candide, it was rather upsetting to have an article by a well-known Voltairean appear in one of our leading scholarly journals which, if correct, proved “beyond a doubt” that Princeton had purchased an interesting edition of Candide, but not the first. It was more disturbing still when at the same moment a French Voltaire scholar brought out an article in a French scholarly journal proving also “beyond a doubt” that the aforementioned American scholar was right. Of course fashions in scholarship should be permitted a change now and then, but for the fashion in this particular matter to change so abruptly just after Princeton had followed the older way of thinking seemed unfortunate.

Under such circumstances, I find it embarrassing to come face to face with the librarian in charge of acquisitions, especially if I have been instrumental in advising the purchase. However, in this particular case, he revealed a singular and friendly persistence: if I wanted a first edition of Candide and could not tell which one qualified, we would buy other early editions. There is always the consoling thought that if the Library possesses all the early editions of a work, it “probably” has the first. Over a period of years, Princeton acquired several 1755 editions and was very fortunate in securing Professor André Morize’s Candide collection when he...
retired at Harvard. At the present moment, the Princeton Library has nine 1759 editions of the work and a microfilm of a tenth, all of them dated 1759, the year of the book's appearance. In addition it has the second edition of Candide in English translation, also dated 1759, and a microfilm of the only known manuscript of the same. Since the most complete collection of early Candides I know—the one in the Bibliothéque Nationale—has sixteen of these 1759 editions, we have a right to be justly proud of our own collection. The manuscript just mentioned will play a role in determining the first edition, and it is well to speak of it here. Until about two years ago, no prepublication manuscript of Candide was known. Indeed, it was thought that no manuscript existed and that it was futile to seek one. Professor Morize, our outstanding authority on Candide, after careful search had stated in his critical edition (1929) that no manuscript existed. Moreover, it is now known that eighteenth-century printers had the custom of destroying manuscripts以后的text was not provided.
cumbstances that we have difficulty in determining which edition is the first.

**THE PRESENT STATE OF THE PROBLEM**

So many scholars have devoted themselves to the search for the first edition of *Candide* that it may seem superfluous to add another article to the mounting array already produced on this subject. Ever since the nineteenth century, when items appeared in *L’Intermédiaire des Chercheurs et Curieux*, pronouncements have been made sometimes dramatically, often in a high spirit of contradiction. In the 1850’s scholarly opinion inclined to an edition published by Lambert (297 pp. + 3 unnumbered pp. for the table of contents). Bengesco challenged this opinion in his *Voltaire; Bibliographie de ses Œuvres* (Paris, 1889-90, I, 444), maintaining that the first edition was brought out in Geneva, not Paris; Cramer’s, not Lambert’s. His stand was strongly substantiated by Morize in his critical edition of *Candide*. It should be noted, however, that neither Bengesco nor Morize gave any reasons for this opinion.

Bengesco’s and Morize’s pronouncements were accepted in the scholarly world until about 1893, when two other Voltaire scholars, Jean Tannery and Norman L. Torrey, brought forth what seemed an incontrovertible demonstration that the first edition of *Candide* came from the press of Lambert. The documentary evidence for their assertion was found in two little notes written by Voltaire to Cramer inquiring about this *Candide* which was creating such a stir, the inference being that if Voltaire inquired of his printer, Voltaire was certain that it was not Cramer who had printed the work. In 1938 this view was ultimately challenged by Bernard Gagnebin, who in a brilliant article adduced cogent reasons for selecting Cramer as the publisher of the first edition. This time, Mr. Gagnebin’s arguments are so conclusive, and his documents so clearly dated, that only a confirmed skeptic would refuse to accept them or only the discovery of some very significant unknown fact would nullify them.

Mr. Gagnebin’s conclusions are supported by some good, clear facts. Foremost among them is the evidence presented by Cramer’s office diary to the effect that as early as January 15, 1759, his firm had shipped literally one thousand copies of *Candide* to Robin in Paris, and hundreds of others to other correspondents. Since no one has ever discovered a document placing Lambert’s publication before February 15, this one fact presented by Mr. Gagnebin prac-

tically demolishes all the arguments set forth by Messrs. Tannery and Torrey.

However, Mr. Gagnebin’s discovery does not explain away all the difficulties. Why, for instance, were French authorities so slow in taking note of *Candide’s* appearance? Although it is possible that censorship might have moved very slowly, it is inconceivable that a full month would elapse—even allowing ten days for the book to reach Paris—before some cognizance of its appearance would be taken. Indeed, it is more reasonable to assume that the month and ten days between the issuing of the book by Cramer (January 15) and the official notice taken of it by Omer Joly de Fleury on February 9, must have been utilized by Lambert in bringing out his printed *Candide*. Thus Joly de Fleury, the Intendant, was speaking, in his letter to Omer Joly de Fleury, of Lambert’s copy, which was circulating in Paris, and not of Cramer’s edition, which conceivably was intended for the provinces and foreign countries. But we are not allowed to make any such assumption, for the first shipment of *Candides* consisted of one thousand copies to Robin in Paris. I mention all this to show the folly of assumptions concerning the first edition of *Candide*. And even if the assumption were correct, it would not explain how the Council at Geneva, which was so to speak in the very center of the trouble, did not get around to condemning the book until March 2, almost seven weeks after it had been circulating. This undue slowness on the part of authorities in both Paris and Geneva is very perplexing indeed.

One of Mr. Gagnebin’s substantiating facts is based on the two little notes written by Voltaire to Cramer, one inquiring what this *Candide* is, and a subsequent one stating that he, Voltaire, has now read the book. Ironically enough, these same two notes were used by Messrs. Tannery and Torrey as major items in proving Lambert the first editor of *Candide*. Here we have a question of interpretation: Messrs. Tannery and Torrey accepted the notes in all seriousness, although it is perfectly evident that Voltaire is fooling somebody. Mr. Gagnebin is certainly on firmer ground when he interprets the meaning of the two letters as precisely the opposite of the literal statement. He is on less firm ground, however, when he states that Voltaire’s purpose in writing them was to prevent the Genevan authorities from searching Cramer’s premises in an endeavor to discover the source of the *Candides*. According to Mr. Gagnebin’s own discovery in Cramer’s diary, when the police of Geneva presented themselves at Cramer’s on February 68,
and also during the previous week, for there were apparently two inquiries made on two separate occasions, Cramer’s edition had been printed and shipped away to his correspondents in Paris and elsewhere, and consequently not a single copy was found. There was thus no need for the note toioxidink the police of Geneva. Mr. Gagnbin is even more dangerous ground in dat-
ing these two notes March, 1759, presumably because condemnation on the book was passed March 2. In fact, he was forced to this dating by his explanation, a rather circular way of dating. Nor does Mr. Gagnbin’s argument gain in force by his citing other disavowals of Voltaire written in March to Thiériot (March 10), to the Maire des Thibouville (March 15), and to Jacob Vernes (no date). Certainly these notes were not designed to deceive the Genevan authorities, or any other authority for that matter. The strange thing about them is that they all sound alike and that the only sure date we can assign them is around the tenth or the fif-
teenth of March. As disavowals, they are remarkably late, from seven to nine weeks after the appearance of the book.

In truth, although Mr. Gagnbin has performed a service for Voltaire students, he has not established Cramer as the publisher of the first edition of Candide. He has presented as proof that the earliest reference to a printed Candide which we now possess is January 15, 1759, citing his date from Cramer’s business diary. There are even those who would question that this is the earliest reference to a printed Candide. J. S. Evich, it will be recalled, mentions in La Fance Littéraire (Hamburg, 1797-98, III. 404), an edition dated 1758; and there is still a queer letter, dated September 13, 1758, from Northeim, referring to a Candide, manuscript or printed, which is mentioned in the Charavay ficher, No. 1509. But should the January date still hold out to be the earliest reference, Mr. Gagnbin has not stated which Cramer edition of 1759 is the original. More precisely put, he has assumed without any apparent evidence the Cramer edition selected by Bengesco and Morize to be the first.

It would seem, therefore, that the time has come to review the situation to see if the facts and documents which have been accumu-
ating around this intriguing problem can throw new light upon it. Because, though it is important to know which one of the seventeen or so 1759 editions was the first, it is more important still to know just what happened when Candide was published. This problem should, it seems, take precedence over the dating:

indeed, unless we follow this order of procedure we may never reach an adequate solution of the edition dilemma.

THE EDITIONS OF 1759

Perhaps the clearest way of beginning a new analysis of these editions is to list in order all the known 1759 editions as they have been described by the articles “Edition originale de ‘Candide’” in L’Intermédiaire des Cherocheurs et Curieux, VI, No. 127 (Apr. 25, 1870), 251-253; by Georges Bengesco, Voltaire; Bibliographie de Ses Œuvres, Paris, 1888-90, I, 444 ff.; by Andrè Morize in his criti-
bers of those editions which are in the Princeton Library.

1. Intermédiaire C, Bengesco 1434, Morize 59a
Princeton: Ex 3280.323
2. Bengesco 1455, Morize 59b, Tannery 59c
Princeton: Film 3280.823
3. Bengesco II, xvii, Morize 59a
Princeton: Ex 3280.323.11
4. Intermédiaire B, Bengesco 1436, Morize 59a
Princeton: Ex 3280.323.14
5. Intermédiaire A, Bengesco 1437, Morize 59a
Princeton: Ex 3280.323.15
6. Intermédiaire D, Bengesco 1438, Morize 59a
Princeton: Ex 3280.323.13
7. Intermédiaire F, Bengesco 1440, Morize 59a
Princeton: Ex 3280.323.16
8. Intermédiaire E, Bengesco 1449, Morize 59a
Princeton: Ex 3280.323.15
9. Morize 59a
10. Not in Bengesco nor in Morize
B. N.: p. Y 1924 (1)
11. Bengesco 1441, Morize 59a
Princeton: Ex 3280.323.12
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been given this preference I do not know except that they were very active publishers of Voltaire material. For some unknown reason no one has even suggested that the first edition might have been brought out by Duchene, Prault, Marc-Michel Rey, or any other publisher of a 1759 Candide. It may have been reasoned that since Voltaire moved to Geneva to have Cramer do his publishing, Cramer would logically publish Candide, and since there was an understanding that Lambert would publish Voltaire for the Parisian area, if Cramer did not get out the first edition, Lambert did so. This type of reasoning has produced the "now it is Lambert, "now it is Cramer" criticism. Of course, it could be perfectly valid, for chance can be as logical as logic itself, but there is no supporting evidence.

There is, in fact, some evidence of support of the opposite view, this time of a documentary nature. Cramer shipped his thousand copies to Robin on January 15, presumably in sheets. Theodore Besterman has pointed out that it would take some time for them to arrive in Paris, be assembled, and distributed. How long we certainly do not know. When the book appeared in Paris, the Duc de la Vallière wrote a letter to Voltaire attributing his enthusiastic public reception, but unfortunately his letter is undated and internal evidence it provides makes dating possible any time between December 19, 1758 and February 24, 1759. The first document officially dated was D'Hémeré's "Journal" (f. r. 2161, f. 10) on February 22, 1759, where D'Hémeré speaks of Candide as "a brochure in-12 imprimée à Genève et distribuée à Paris sans permission." Three days later the French police at the instigation of the Procureur Général made an investigation at Grange's and discovered him printing from sheets an edition of Candide. The report made by D'Hémeré and Rochebrune (published by Emile Campardon, Voltaire; Documents inédits, Paris, 1880, pp. 178-179) noted that the work was already "répandu dans le public." Obviously, the Parisian police, knowing that it had been shipped from Geneva and was being distributed in Paris, knew also that it was being reprinted in Paris and also distributed. It is significant to note that D'Hémeré was aware of both operations. The police nonetheless moved to cut off the Paris sources.

Voltaire makes two references to the Paris distribution. In an undated letter to Cramer (Bernard Gagebin, ed., Voltaire; Lettres Inédites à Son Imprimeur Gabriel Cramer, Geneva, 1952, p. 28), which we can judge with a fair amount of accuracy was written February 21, he vouchedsafe to his printer: "Il s'est vendu six mille
Candides.” Obviously, he was talking, not of Cramer’s edition, but of some other, or the information would be both superfluous and ridiculous. And if it was not Cramer’s, it must have been these Paris editions. Following the Grangé incident, Voltaire again wrote his printer (ibid., p. 31): “On a fait cinq éditions de Candide à Paris, et à la fin on l’a défendu. Aussitôt on a commencé la sixième.” This letter is again undated, the only indication of its date being the search of February 25. Thus there can be no doubt that by February 25 there were circulating in Paris Cramer’s edition and five Parisian ones. Practically at the same moment an official investigation was being made among the printers in Geneva with totally negative results because Cramer had shipped his whole edition away.

It thus seems impossible to determine from historical documents which was the first of these editions, for the documents indicate clearly that all six were circulating simultaneously.

The evidence of the documents goes even further. There are three more letters written to Cramer by Voltaire involving Candide. Two of them have been much discussed by Mssrs. Tannery, Torrey, and Gagnebin. They are all undated, although Mr. Gagnebin has attempted to assign them dates. The first (ibid., p. 29) reads:

Qu’est-ce que c’est qu’une brochure intitulée Candide, qu’on débite, dit-on, avec scandale et qu’on dit venir de Lyon? Je voudrais bien la voir. Pourriez-vous, Messieurs, m’en faire tenir un exemplaire relié? On prétend qu’il y a des gens assez impertinents pour m’imputer cet ouvrage que je n’ai jamais vu! Je vous prie de me dire ce qui en est. (Début mars 1759.)

The second, obviously written later, states (ibid., p. 30):

Je viens de lire enfin ce Candide. Je trouve cette plaisanterie dans un goût singulier, mais je ne la crois point du tout faite pour ce pays-ci. S’il est vrai que vous en avez reçu de Lyon ou de Paris, je vous conseille de ne les pas produire et de retirer les exemplaires, si vous en avez. C’est un conseil d’amitié et d’amitié que je donne à mes amis. (Mars 1759.)

The third (ibid., p. 33, dated “Été 1759?”) merely states that an Italian has translated Candide and adds the cryptic remark: “Estes-vous gens à braver l’inquisition.”

These notes to Cramer are very puzzling. In their discussion of the first two, Mssrs. Tannery and Torrey have concluded that since the notes conveyed information not possessed by Cramer, for otherwise they would be ridiculous, they must indicate that up to then he had no knowledge of the work, or at any rate had not published it. Thus if Cramer had not yet published it and an edition had appeared, it must be Lambert’s. That as we now know does not follow. Mr. Gagnebin, for his part, is of the opinion that the notes were “ostensible,” devised to show the investigating authorities when they visited Cramer. It might be remarked that Mr. Gagnebin dates them, too late if such was their intended use, for the two investigations were made on February 26 and the preceding week. If they were to serve any purpose with the police they must have been written before February 21. But there was no purpose to serve, since there was no edition to protect, it having been sent away in sheets over a month before.

It is reasonable to take the notes at their face value. In plain terms they say that Cramer has not yet published the Candide, that someone else has, that there is already an Italian translation, that the printer is sending the books from Lyons to Geneva or at least via Lyons to Geneva, that if Cramer is contemplating an edition, he should not consider it a book for Genevans. It is to be noted that Voltaire’s recommendation was followed to the letter when Cramer did publish his edition. There seems to be no avoiding the conclusion that these notes make sense only if they were written before Cramer’s edition, that is, before January 15, and since it is manifestly impossible for them to refer to Lambert’s, or any of the Paris editions either, they must refer to an edition not yet discovered. They are, in fact, the earliest references Voltaire made to Candide.

The conclusion to the evidence of the documents is simple. They show, though haltingly, that there was an edition or editions before both Cramer’s and Lambert’s.

THE EVIDENCE OF THE TEXT

Since the documents indicate the existence of an edition precedent to both 59° and 59°, it is our task to seek editions differing significantly from A and E and to compare these differences with the manuscript version. The so-called Lambert group, E, F, G, H, I, presents no difficulty, since there is no important divergence in the text. Differences occurring are minor ones, such as badly numbered pages, or a misspelled word, or misplaced line. D and J should be examined more carefully, not because of any striking
d'ordre de textes, but because they are two-printing jobs and Voltaire is known to have resorted to this method (Zadig, for example) to forestall discreet pirating. D, for instance, has two sheets, X and G (pp. 141-168) composed of a type larger than that in the rest of the book. The watermarks in these two sheets are similar to those in other parts of the book. When the texts are compared, there is no significant difference with A. True, D was very carelessly proofread, and its fleurons are totally different from those of A and X. It is possible to argue that A copied and corrected the badly proofed text of D; it would seem far-fetched to regard it as the model for A or X or Y, or even K. It is in fact inconceivable that D could be anything more than a badly printed edition of the A text. Probably, the printer and bookseller were not one and the same person and the latter used this method to prevent the printer from pirating the edition before he had disposed of it. The same thing is true of J, which is copied faithfully line for line from A down to page 193, and from E between page 195 and the end. In both parts the watermark in the paper is similar. There are, however, no important diversions in the texts of A and E. K might be a candidate for the first edition, since it does not follow too closely a line-for-line reproduction of A, and since its format and pagination seem to vary. On close examination it is apparent that K has attempted to follow a page-for-page reproduction of A and does not differ from it significantly in the text. The same is true for L and M, two very poor printings of the A text with different format and number of pages. N, however, is quite another matter. Its text shows marked variations from A, and it therefore must be a contender for the first edition. The same thing is true for X and Y.

59° differs chiefly from 59 in six places. On page 31, 59° does not make a new paragraph beginning "mais il y a une raison suffisante," while 59° does make a paragraph. On page 41, 59° has a passage reading thus: "car, dit-il, tout ceci est ce qu'il y a de mieux; car s'il y a un volcan à Lisbonne, il ne pouvait être ailleurs. Car il est impossible que les choses ne soient pas où elles sont. Car tout est bien." This passage, which occurs in all the other 1759 editions does not appear in 59°. Instead 59° has the variant: "car, dit-il, c'est une nécessité que si un Univers existe, ce soit le meilleur des Univers. Or dans le meilleur des univers tout est bon, tout est bien, tout est au mieux; conseillez vous, réjouissez vous, & buvons." On page 84, 59° has the phrase: "Nos filles se trouvèrent presque toutes en un moment," while 59° has inserted in the sentence an additional word: "Toutes nos filles se trouvèrent presque toutes en un moment." On page 125, 59° reads "mais ils se levèrent précisément," while 59° reads "mais ils se levèrent précipitamment." Finally, on page 242 of 59° there is a whole paragraph non-existent in 59°. It reads as follows:

Candide était affligé de ces discours, il respectait Homère, il aimait Milton. Hélas, dit-il, tout bas à Martin; j'ai bien peur que cet homme-ci, n'ait un souverain mépris pour nos poètes Allemands, il n'y aurait pas grand mal à cela, dit Martin. O quel homme supérieur, disait encore Candide entre ses dents? Quel grand génie que ce Pococurant, rien ne peut lui plaire.

Finally, 59° printed erroneously on page 195 "que ce fut," an error non-existent in 59°.

These differences have occasioned much comment on the part of Mœurs. Bengesco, Morize, and Gagnon. Bengesco, basing his opinion on the fact that the added paragraph of 59°, page 242, could not be found in any edition before 1761, judged that this 59° was a spurious edition copied from 59° in which even the fleurons have been crudely copied, and the above-cited paragraph of 1761 and subsequent editions has been inserted. Professor Morize, while accepting that 59° is a "contrefaçon" as Bengesco had affirmed, ends his discussion by calling it a "pre-original" edition, whatever that may mean (p. lxxxiv):

Je crois, pour ma part, que cette édition est autrement précieuse que les diverses contrefaçons de 1759 et que c'est véritablement,—contrefaite, il est vrai,—la première impression de Candide, un texte, si je puis dire, "ante-original."

It is difficult to reconcile the idea of a "contrefaçon" with that of an "ante-original." Since Mr. Gagnon in his article of 1952 in the Bulletin du Bibliophile seems to accept at least in principle the conclusions of Bengesco and Morize, particularly Morize, it is well to examine very carefully the latter's interpretation of these changes. The variant on pages 41-42 represents a change by Voltaire from the 59° version to the 59°, a change made because he wanted to parody more closely the language of Leibniz and Wolff. The interpolation on page 242 represents a statement which he first had printed in signature L, then deleted as useless. He reprinted signature L, but the old signature L was bound in some copies making 59°. Later, in 1761, he decided to reinset the suppressed passage or rather he permitted its reinforcement without noting, as
he had done in 1759, its uselessness. I do not see any explanation for the correction "précipitamment" of 59* to "précisément" of 59*; Morize calls it a "correction de bon sens," but it would be more appropriate to call it an error on the part of 59* and the other editions which copied it.

There are accordingly certain objections to Morize's observations and especially to his interpretations. His insistence that 59* is at the same time a pre-original and a "contrefaçon" cannot be justified. He was led into error by Bengesco, who once having decided that 59* was in reality a 1751 edition, stressed its counterfeit aspect. Messrs. Morize and Gagnebin also emphasize that 59* is a "contrefaçon," conceding that it counterfeits 59*, but there is no evidence to support this contention except that several of the fleurons of 59* can be seen in 59*. Nor can it be said that signature L was reset in order to "use up" space left vacant by removal of the paragraph on German poets. Nor can it be shown that the divergences between signature L of 59* and signature L of 59* constitute proof of this resetting. There are divergences, it is true, but they are neither more frequent nor more significant than in other signatures. This theory of Morize must be discarded. 59* is certainly not a "contrefaçon" nor an "ante-original," nor an edition of 1751 predated, it is an edition in its own right.

An examination of 59* will prove this point. This edition, called 59* by Morize, was listed by Bengesco in his Bibliographie (1453), but for some reason Bengesco failed to compare it with 59* and 59*. His knowledge of it is evident from the fact that he pronounced it typographically the finest of the 1750 editions. Morize, on the other hand, failed to find it at the Bibliothèque Nationale (where it is numbered p. 2179) and consequently had no chance to compare it with 59*. Messrs. Tannery and Torrey have called attention to it in their articles, both noting that it is of the same order as 59*. It is Mr. Tannery who suggested the designation 59*, and who adopted the opinion that both 59* and 59* are pre-editions of 59*. Since he considers 59* the original, he concludes that 59* must be much later than he had originally supposed. Mr. Gagnebin's discovery of the Cramer diary has invalidated all of this reasoning. But Mr. Gagnebin has difficulties with 59* also.

This edition, a duodecimo of 299 pages, is distinctive in that it differs from both 59* and 59*, but agrees with 59*, at least insofar as the six important divergences we have noted in 59* are concerned. Like 59*, the number 295 of the first page of the table of chapters is encased in stars, but not like 59* in parentheses as well.

On the other hand, on page 31, the sentence "mais il y a une raison suffisante" does not begin a paragraph; the form of the variant on page 41 reads "car, dit-il, tout ceci est"; and on page 84 the phrase reads "Nos filles se trouvèrent presque toutes." In these respects 59* agrees with 59*. On the contrary, on page 125, 59* gives the reading "ils se levèrent précipitamment"; on page 242, the extra paragraph beginning "Candide était affligé" has been inserted; and the reading on page 103 is "que ce fut" and not the erroneous "que ce fut" of 59*. In these three respects 59* accords with 59*. There is a divergence, however, between it and both 59* and 59*, and that is in the fleurons, which are entirely different from those of any other edition.

This edition causes some embarrassment to Mr. Gagnebin, both because of the three places in which it accords with 59* and in the different set of fleurons. But Mr. Gagnebin seems to have dismissed it rather perfunctorily except in the one respect of the inserted paragraph on page 242. Indeed, he has printed in his Voltaire: Lettres Inédites à Son Imprimeur Gabriel Cramer (pp. 48-49) this very paragraph from the Voltaire collection of Seymoure de Ricci (N. Ac. fr. 2432, f. 390):

.... pensent comme moi, Candide était affligé de ces discours, il respectait Homère, il aimait Milton. Hélas, dit-il, tout bas à Martin, j'ai bien peur que cet homme-ci n'ait un souverain mépris pour nos poètes allemands; il n'y aurait pas grand mal à cela, dit Martin. Oh, quel homme supérieur, disait encore Candide entre ses dents! Quel grand génie que ce Pococurante, rien ne peut lui plaire!

Après avoir fait etc. comme d.

In a commentary to this text, Mr. Gagnebin notes: "Ce fragment de lettre contient le paragraphe de Candide que Voltaire avait inséré à la page 242 de l'édition Cramer, paragraphe qu'il a fait supprimer en cours d'impression, pour des raisons politiques, comme nous l'avons démontré dans un article du Bulletin du bibliophile (août-sept. 1925)." Voltaire's reason, says Mr. Gagnebin, for suppressing the passage was to avoid offending Frederick the Great, whom he was courting at the time and who was a German poet. But precisely Frederick was a French, not a German, poet, and if any sentence would have amused him it would have been the very one Voltaire is supposed to have deleted. The continuation of Mr. Gagnebin's footnote is questionable also: "Ce passage a paru pour la première fois dans la Seconde suite des
Mélanges..." But we have seen it in 50° and 59°. Finally, Mr. Gagnébin suggests that this note "pourrait bien être celui que Voltaire a adressé aux Cramér pour leur demander de rétablir ce fameux passage" (ibid., p. 49). It appears more reasonable to suggest that this was a correction sent by Voltaire to Cramer when he was printing the 59°, but it failed to get into the edition.

It is now time to turn to 59°. Some of the copies we have examined, including the Princeton copy, contain an "Avis au Relieur" reading:

Il fera attention que les pages 31. 32. 41. & 42. doivent être ôtées, & remplacées par deux cartons qu'il trouvera à la dernière feuille.

Il en fera de même des pages 89. 84. 85. & 86. dont les cartons sont aussi à ladite dernière feuille.

Thus these three cancels changed (1) pages 31-32, (2) pages 41-42, and (3) pages 89-86. Changed them from what? Until now, we have not been particularly clear as to what the change represented. We have assumed that since 59° began on page 31 a new paragraph with "Mais il y a une raison suffisante" and since 59° no longer begins a new paragraph at this point, this must have been one of the changes. Since there is a variant on page 41 of 59°: "Car, dit-il, c'est une nécessité," we have assumed this the second change made. And since the obvious repetition on page 84 of 59°: "Toutes nos filles se trouvèrent presque toutes..." was an obvious repetition if not an error, and dropping the first "Toutes" corrects this, we have assumed this the third change. All three of these assumptions can now be regarded as certainties, since we can identify a copy of 59° where the binder failed to make the indicated substitutions. But the consequences of this are startling, for if the cancelled passages are precisely three spots where 59° differs from 59°, then 59° must have preceded 55°.

There is at the Institut et Musée Voltaire at Geneva an edition (Besterman 4657) carrying the "Avis au Relieur." Under no circumstances can it be other than 59°, since 59° and only 59° has ever been known to carry the "Avis," and since, indeed, the "Avis" would make no sense in other editions. However, this copy 4657 of Mr. Besterman gives us the picture of an uncorrected 55°. For instead of carrying out the instructions of the "Avis," the binder destroyed the three cancels and bound in the three old leaves. Hence, page 31 reads "Mais il y a une raison suffisante" beginning a new paragraph, page 41 gives the version "Car, dit-il, c'est une nécessité," and page 84 reads "Toutes nos filles se trouvèrent presque toutes..." exactly as 55°. But it must not be thought of as a 59°, for page 125 reads "précipitament" instead of "précipitamment." Moreover, page 103 reads "que ce ce fut," the characteristic error of 59°, and page 282 does not have the inserted paragraph "Candide était affligé," characteristic of 59° and 59°.

In the light of these facts there can be no doubt that the text of 59° when first set up and before the "Avis" took effect had already changed in two places: "précipitamment" had been changed to "précipitamment" and the paragraph "Candide était affligé" had been excised. In addition, 59° had introduced the new error "que ce ce fut" on page 109. After the type was set up and the book printed, Voltaire decided to make three additional changes in the text. The normal thing to do, depending upon the time he decided to make the revisions, was (1) correct the proof, inserting the new changes, (2) have cancels made and inserted in their proper place, or (3) have cancels made and inserted by the binder. Since Voltaire chose the last method, it is fair to conclude that he made the changes so late that only the binder could make the substitutions.

This situation, normal enough for any author having a work published, assumes here the appearance of a Chinese puzzle. That Voltaire wanted to alter his text at the last moment is perfectly normal. He was rarely satisfied with what he had written and practically always wanted to make alterations. However, these particular changes do not seem very important: the first one, in fact, is totally inconsequential; the second gave a variant which when closely considered appears no better than the original reading. It is true that the third, which involves avoiding the use of the same word twice in the same sentence, might seem important to a Voltaire or a Flaubert. If Voltaire was trying to prove perfectly his work, there were at least a couple of places where more serious errors occurred, but this is beside the point. He insisted that, though late, the changes be made, an insistence the more curious, since we know from his correspondence with Cramer that he did not approve of this procedure. If he resorted to it this time, it must have been because the changes had to be made and they had to be made in a hurry. But why should he have been in such a hurry? Simply because he and Cramer were trying to meet a deadline. And why, pray, meet a deadline? Because Candide was going to appear somewhere else in a certain particular text, and it was imperative that Cramer's edition appear simultaneously in the same text. One is tempted to guess that the mistake was not
discovered until the sheets were on the way to Paris and that Voltaire resorted to this as the only way of correcting them.

Let us return, however, to the cancelled passages. They occur in every 1759 edition of Candide with the exception of 59s and this one distorted copy of 59g. Even 59g carries the three new versions of 59s. But 59g cannot be a copy of 59s for reasons we have already given. Here a summary is called for that can best be demonstrated by a diagram.

If the cancelled passages were inserted with difficulty in their right place in 59s, they were incorporated in the text of 59g with surprising, almost startling, ease. This is all the more significant since 59g printed twenty lines to the page whereas 59s printed twenty-four. Any attempt to adapt the forty lines of pages 31-32 of 59g to the forty-eight lines of 59g after the type had been set up would certainly have met with disaster.

The fact remains that the cancelled sections of 59s occur in their proper place in 59g without the use of cancels. This could be explained in only one of two ways: either 59g was set up from a manuscript which carried the cancels or from a printed copy containing the cancels. The evidence points to the latter choice. There is every reason to believe that the printer of 59g made a consistent effort to follow 59s line by line (although the two types were different) and when in places he could not do so, he attempted to catch up with the Cramer arrangement before the end of the paragraph. While there are many of these places where he had to use considerable ingenuity to come out even, he seems to come to the end of the work without increasing the number of lines to any noticeable extent. However, in the case of the cancelled sections he would have had to make page as well as line adjustments if the cancels had been inserted after he had set up his type. Since the problem did not arise, it is evident that he copied A or a copy of A after the cancels had been inserted. This is true of all the E group, of group IV, and since it is manifest that it is also true of group III, the conclusion follows that A after the cancels were inserted was the model for all the 1759 editions with the exception of X, Y, and N.

Finally, the cancels can be used to determine which one of X, Y (N), or A copied the other. I shall analyze only one of these cases, although the others confirm the conclusion of this one. If page 41 is chosen, the case can be shown to be clear-cut. It should be noted first of all that the version of X is about one-half a line longer than the version of A and Y. The question first to be settled is whether X had to "make room" for this extra space, or whether Y and A had to dispose of it as rapidly as possible. There can be no doubt about the answer. X had no problem and continued the text in normal fashion until the end of the paragraph. Besides, we know that the X form of the variant occurred in the La Vallière manuscript, and that there a new paragraph was not begun immediately after the variant. Hence the problem was not X's: how to get more space; but Y's and A's: how to dispose of the superfluous space.

Y decided to begin a new paragraph immediately after the variant and to 'catch up' with the remainder of the space before the end of the paragraph. But Y did not catch up, and the result was that a new line had to be made for the end of "pu-nition." This procedure forced Y to carry the last line of X on page 42 over to page 43. Thus page 43 of X has eight lines, while page 43 of Y has nine lines.

56 did things a little differently. In the first place it had to carry over the last part of "forces" in line 4, and it took four lines to catch up. Y had no such difficulty at this point. A decided to use the extra space by beginning a new paragraph and by catching up as soon as possible. As a result it caught up within three lines and did not require an extra line for the end of "pu-nition." It was not an easy maneuver and A was forced, in order to make room for "nition" in the line, to carry the "a" of "il y a" back to the preceding line. The result was that A did not have to carry over the last line of X on page 42 to page 43. Thus page 43 of A has eight lines.

It is evident consequently (1) that Y is derived from X with a variant; (2) that the variant forced Y to begin a new paragraph.
immediately afterward in order to “use up” the space; (3) that it used up too much space and had to create an extra line; and (4) this extra line had to be carried over to page 43. Therefore Y, though it has the A version of the variant, could not be “cariconné” to give the A or else pages 41-42 and 43 would have had to be cancelled. Hence, (5) A does not derive from Y, but is derived from X.

THE EVIDENCE OF THE FLEURONS

All the evidence which can be collected from the text indicates that the early editions of 1759 were arranged in the following order: (1) 59a; (2) 59b; (3) 59c uncanceled; (4) 59d canceled. It now remains to examine who were the publishers of these editions. There can be no doubt that 59d issued from the Cramer presses. The cul-de-lampe page 3 was used several times in the Histoire de Russie: I, 101 and II, 138 of the 1759 edition (red ink) and I, 50 and I, 124 of the 1759 edition (black ink); as well as in many editions of other works, the Cramer Collection Complète, 1756, and the Questions sur l’Encyclopédie, 1770-71.

The ornaments of 59d show up time and again in Cramer editions of other works. For convenience, we have reproduced them in Plate II, lettering each vignette. Vignette a appears in the Recueil de Facéties Parisiennes, 1760, page 544; and in the Théâtre de Corneille, 1764, I, title-page. Vignette b occurs in the Recueil de Facéties Parisiennes, 1760, pages 148 and 241; and in the Poème sur le Désastre de Lisbonne en May, 1756, page 48; in La Puellce, 1762, title-page; and in La Puellce, 1771, page 258. Vignette c was used in La Puellce, 1762, page 190; La Puellce, 1771, page 202; and in La Henriade, 1757, page 254. Vignette d can be found in the Recueil de Facéties Parisiennes, 1760, page 66; and in Le Philosophe Ignorant, 1766. Vignette e is in the Histoire de Russie, 1759, I, 217; in La Puellce, 1760, page 324; in La Henriade, 1757, page 207; and in the Théâtre de Corneille, 1764, III, title-page. Vignette f was utilized in the Recueil de Facéties Parisiennes, 1760, page iv; in the Poème sur le Désastre de Lisbonne en May, 1756, page 45; in La Henriade, 1757, page 280; in the Remarques pour servir de Supplément à l’Histoire Générale, 1768, title-page; and in the Lettres à Mme de Maintenon, 1758, IX, title-page. Vignette g served as ornament in the Recueil de Facéties Parisiennes, 1760, pages 195, 238, and 380; in La Puellce, 1762, page 18; in La Puellce, 1771, pages 30 and 306; in La Henriade, 1757, page 300; and in the Théâtre de Corneille, 1764, IV, title-page. Vignette h is present in the Poème sur le Désastre de Lisbonne en May, 1756, page 24; in La Puellce, 1762, page 281; and in La Puellce, 1771, page 273. Vignette i shows up similarly in the Recueil de Facéties Parisiennes, 1760, page 49; in the Histoire de Russie, 1759, pages 127 and 296; in La Puellce, 1762, page 40; and in La Puellce, 1771, pages 54, 156, and 332. Finally, vignette j reappears in the Histoire de Russie, 1759, page 185; in the Poème sur le Désastre de Lisbonne en May, 1756, page 17; in La Puellce, 1762, page 190; and in La Puellce, 1771, title-page.

Thus every ornament in 59d was widely used in such well-known Cramer editions as the Recueil de Facéties Parisiennes, 1760; the Histoire de Russie, 1759; the Poème sur le Désastre de Lisbonne en May, 1756; the Essay sur l’Histoire Générale, 1756; La Henriade, 1757; La Puellce, 1760, 1771; and the Théâtre de Corneille, 1764. Indeed they were used with such consistency in these works that it is natural to conclude them the hallmark of a Cramer publication. Their presence in 59d is ample warrant for believing it a Cramer edition.

Furthermore, 59e has always been deemed a Cramer publication, largely because Bengesco and Moret accepted the resemblances between the two works as sufficient justification for this assumption. But beyond format, number of pages, signatures, and the attempt at a line-for-line imitation there are no further resemblances. We have always thought, it is true, that certain of the vignettes resembled those in Cramer’s 59d. But Theodore Besterman has proven conclusively in his article in Rivista (New Series, Vol. II, Fasc. 5 [Oct., 1954], 133-143), “Quelques Éditions Anciennes de Voltaire Inconnues à Bengesco,” these resemblances to be superficial and the vignettes really different. There are three of them, and for convenience we arrange them in Plate III, side by side, in order to compare them more effectively.

Once these vignettes are carefully scrutinized, the difference can be readily discerned. For example, a* differs from a in the leaves at the bottom of the vignette; in a one leaf is apocoped, in a* it is rolled up; of the two leaves on the right at the bottom the upper in a* is longer than the lower, whereas in a the situation is reversed. The central shell of a* is shaped and shaded differently from that in a. The leaf on the extreme left of a* is stubby, in a it is longer and less round. The trumpet of a* is asymmetrical, while in a it is symmetrical.

The difference between e* and e is just as radical; the shading on the drum in e* is on the side opposite to that in e; the little boat-like blades of grass of e have been replaced by a mild island at the bottom of e*. The clear space surrounding these tiny islets
is shaped differently; the leaves at the top of the vignettes are all shaped differently in the two cuts.

Finally, j and j* present dissimilarities: the shading of the left-hand side of j and j* is very different; the trumpet of j* is symmetrical, while j’s is symmetrical; the two leaves beneath the trumpets differ in the two cuts; the string of the bow in j is drawn down the right-hand side of the bow, whereas in j* it is drawn across the bow and down the left-hand side.

These variations bring up a very interesting problem. As long as the vignettes appeared similar they occurred frequently enough in 59a to leave the impression that 59a and 59b resembled each other. To grasp the full import of the illusion, we must present (see Plate IV) the vignettes of 59b. The incidence in relation to those of 59a is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title Page</th>
<th>59b</th>
<th>59a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p. 3</td>
<td>cul-de-lampe differs</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 3</td>
<td>factotum differs</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 34</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 43</td>
<td>e*</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 54</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 64</td>
<td>e*</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 69</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 86</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 97</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 115</td>
<td>a*</td>
<td>g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 122</td>
<td>e*</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 134</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 146</td>
<td>f*</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 183</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 179</td>
<td>a*</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 187</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 193</td>
<td>j*</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 208</td>
<td>a*</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 213</td>
<td>e*</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 228</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 244</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 254</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 266</td>
<td>a*</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 275</td>
<td>j*</td>
<td>j</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 279</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus not a single ornament in 59b resembles an ornament in 59a, and yet, in spite of this fact, the illusion of resemblance is complete, due to the constant repetition of a*, e*, j*, and j* at strategic points in the work. One cannot avoid the suspicion that the simulated vignettes were utilized to throw an unsuspecting public off guard. But to state why or when this was done or who did the imitating is very hazardous indeed. Suffice it to say that Cramer used a and e in La Henriade of 1756 and j in the Poème sur le Désastre de Lisbonne en May, 1756. I know of no place in which the vignettes of 59a were used before 1758. There is thus a strong presumption that they were imitated from Cramer.

I do not believe, however, that the imitation was made for Canide or to befuddle the public. Strangely enough, though I have examined hundreds of editions of Voltaire’s works (in fact, every volume in the Institut at Geneva), I have found only one other Voltaire work bearing these 59b vignettes, namely, the Essay sur l’Histoire Générale et sur les Moeurs et l’Esprit des Nations, depuis Charlemagne jusqu’à nos Jours, 1758. The ornaments are as follows on the title-pages of the seven volumes: I, a*; II, j*; III, e*; IV, j*; V, e*; VI, a*; and VII, e*. The work is preceded by an “Avis des Editeurs” (pp. i-iv) signed “Les Frères Cramer.” There is, however, no record of an Essay sur l’Histoire Générale published by Cramer in 1758; we know only of a 1756 seven-volume Cramer edition. There is a strong suspicion, therefore, that the 1758 edition was pirated and its woodcuts made in imitation of the 1756 Cramer seven-volume edition.

The 1758 seven-volume Essay sur l’Histoire Générale is a literal reprint of Cramer’s 1756 seven-volume Essay, carrying even the “Avis des Editeurs” and the signature “Les Frères Cramer.” Bengesco has stated that the seventh volume of Cramer’s edition was revised in 1757 and that the declaration of the three pastors concerning Sauvigny dated March 30, 1757 was then added. When this was done, a new title-page marked “Seconde édition” was substituted and several changes were made in the list of writers contemporary with Louis XIV (see Bengesco, I, 331). But the gatherer left the title-page dated 1756 in some copies bearing these changes. The pirated edition carried neither changes nor declaration, and must therefore come from the first 1756 edition. One other feature should be mentioned: the Cramer 1756 has the same number of chapters as the pirated 1758; although the Cramer 1756 has two chapters marked CXIV. This error has been corrected in
the pirated edition. However, the latter has two chapters marked CXLIII, thus establishing a balance in the two editions.

Not only are the vignettes of the 1758 pirated Essay similar to those of 59, the type face, though different in size, is also similar. It is the same type face, though different in size also, used in the Considerations sur le Gouvernement Ancien et Present de la France par Mr. le Marquis d'Argenson, A Amsterdam, chez Marc-Michel Rey, 1764.

Indeed, it seems very likely that the Candide 59 was published by Marc-Michel Rey. The only other place I have seen the a*, e*, and j* together is in one of Marc-Michel Rey's editions of the Nouvelle Heloise, 1761.1 There a* serves as the ornament for the title-page of Part III, e* as the ornament for the title-page of Part IV, k for the title-page of Part V, and j* for the title-page of Part VI (see Plate V). The blocks are obviously a bit worn, the impression has been more heavily inked, but the distinguishing marks as we have detailed them above are all there. To Rey goes the honor of having brought out the first editions of those two eighteenth-century French works having the largest number of editions—Candide and La Nouvelle Heloise.

If Rey's 59 is the first edition, what about 59? From the text we have seen that it occupied a position midway between a* and the uncancell ed 59. Its vignettes are reproduced in Plate VI. Not a single one of these ornaments appears in any other edition. Some of them do occur, but rather infrequently, in other Voltaire works. The ornament of the title-page can be found at the end of the table of contents in The Ignorant Philosopher, London, printed for S. Bladon in Pater-Noster Row, 1766. The vignette v, but with the sides shortened, is on page 58 of the Lettres Ecrites de Londres sur les Anglais et Autres Sujets, par M. D. V., A Basle, 1734.

1 The title-page of this edition reads: Lettres de Deux Amans, Habituans d'une petite Ville au pied des Alpes, recueillies et publiees par J. J. Rousseau, A Amsterdam, Chez Marc Michel Rey, 1761. Described in the Annales de la Societe Jean-Jacques Rousseau, XIII (1900-1), (191)-290, by K. R. Gallas. Part II carries the "Preface," with the name of Marc Michel Rey on the title-page along with the privilege and the following note: "Avis du Libraire Rey. On trouvera incessamment chez moi les 10 planches qui ont été gravées pour Julie ou la nouvelle Heloise, depuis la publication de cet ouvrage." Mr. Gallas concludes that the Cohen copy which he studied is a "contre feu par Rey de l'edition Duchesne, autre que celle que signale M. Morret, Annales J. J. Rousseau, t. V. 39."

There is in the Princeton Library a copy of this 1761 Rey edition, but it does not include in Part II the preface of Professor Cohen's copy. Nor does it include any other of the above documents, such as approbation and the note of Rey. The fact that the Cohen copy does contain the note of Rey, however, is proof that the edition is by Rey.
II. Fleurons from Cramer's edition of Candide (598)

III. Comparison of some fleurons from 598 (a, e, j) and 598 (a*, e*, f*)
V. Fleurons from Rey's counterfeit edition of
La Nouvelle Héloïse, 1761

IV. Fleurons from Rey's edition of Candide (59°)
particular copy that I have seen belonged to a "G. Powell e Coll. Univ. Oxon, 1743." Vignette u was used in the Henriday, Londres, Woodman & Lyon, 1728, page 58. The ornament 2 appears on the title-page of the Poème sur la Religion Naturelle et sur la Destruction de Lisbonne, par M. de Voltaire [London], 1756. Finally, the vignette 3 also was used on the title-page of The Ignorant Philosopher, London, 1766. The regularity with which these ornaments show up in English printed works is most singular.

Some of them occur particularly in two English works: in The History of the Russian Empire under Peter the Great, by M. de Voltaire, London, printed for J. Nourse & P. Vaillant in the Strand, and L. Davis & C. Reynolds in Holborn, 1753 (2 vols); and in The General History and State of Europe from the Time of Charlemagne to Charles V, with a Preliminary View of the Oriental Empires, written originally in French by M. de Voltaire, London, printed for J. Nourse, at the Lamb, opposite Katherine Street, in the Strand, 1754. In The History of the Russian Empire vignette 3 occurs, for instance, at the end of the preface (p. xxiii); u, on II, 53; 3, on II, 137; p, on I, 140 and elsewhere; and w, at the end of the index in Volume II. In The General History vignette 3 was used on page 16, while u was used on page 416. The conclusion imposes itself that 3 is an edition printed in England, and, if it is possibility, for Jean Nourse. This probability becomes a certainty when we recall that Nourse did print and sell the English translation of Candide and that the trailer in the translation announced Nourse's publication of a French edition.

All the evidence we have been able to assemble has now been presented, with but one exception. I have seen six English 1759 translations of Candide and one Italian. All seven were made from X or V, not a single one from A. We can now conclude. Voltaire had a trial edition made: it was 35. It must have been set up at the end of December, 1758, close enough to the end to warrant the date 1759, although some copies may have actually been dated 1758. All the evidence indicates that it was published in Amsterdam at Marc-Michel Rey's, but there is still the possibility that it was published anywhere, and attributed to Rey: for instance, by Robin of Paris, or by a printer of Rouen or Lyons, or even by Nourse in London. It is certain, however, that whoever printed it also published the edition of the Nouvelle Héloïse which carried four of X's fleurons and the imprint Marc-Michel Rey. It is
also certain that Nourse's edition in London was printed on the same paper as that used by the printer of 59#. X attracted Cramer's attention and he began his edition at about the same time that 59# was being completed. Both editions were set up from the text of X. Voltaire seems to have intended making three changes in Y and five in X, that is, the three cancelled passages, "précisément" for "précipitamment," and the deletion of the inserted paragraph. In any case, 59# was to be the authoritative edition, and all the other editions except X, Y, and N were patterned upon it. Voltaire made his arrangements with Cramer, Lambert, and others. When the flood of Candides appeared, no power on earth could stop it.

Arthur Symons' Renderings of Mallarmé

BY ROGER A. LOMBREAUD

Among the manifold activities that engrossed Arthur Symons (1865-1919) throughout his life, besides his creative tasks and his efforts at interpretation in seven arts, his role as a translator must not be underrated. As much as his criticism, his renderings of Verlaine, Baudelaire, and Mallarmé, for instance, contributed to the introduction of French poets to the English and American publics. The quality and the quantity of the works translated by him rank him high as an intermediary between French and English literatures.

The Symons Papers in the Princeton University Library include many of his unpublished translations from Stéphane Mallarmé. For Arthur Symons tried to brave the difficulties of Mallarmé's verse, no easy task, as we know, to translate. Its hermetic form, its rare conjunction of sound and image, its metaphysical and cosmic density, its grandeur and resonance, all make any attempt to transfer its poetry into another language a risk abounding in hazards. Yet again and again between 1899 and 1900, as well as some twenty and thirty years later, Symons worried at the task until he had translated the whole of Mallarmé's poetic work. Apart from a fragment of "Héroïade" and the poems "Soupirs," "Brise marine," and "Angoisse," which he published before 1900 in The Savoy, The Symbolist Movement in Literature, and elsewhere, Symons brought out no more of his versions. The first remark to be made is that certain critics, such as the Canadian Mariana Thompson, and the American Ruth Z. Temple, have shown themselves rather severe concerning the four translations which were known to

1 The Symons Papers, consisting of a considerable portion of the author's personal papers but including comparatively few pieces of correspondence, were purchased by the Library in 1954. The papers are supplemented by collections of books, manuscripts, and letters presented by the late A. E. Gallatin and the late J. Harlin O'Connell '14, as well as by material acquired by the Library from other sources. The Editors are pleased to present this study by a French scholar based on unpublished items in the papers.—Ed.
2 The poems of childhood and youth excepted, along with vers de circonstances, he also translated the prose poem "Autumn Lament" and fragments from "Crise de vers.
4 The Critic's Alchemy, New York [1958].
them. Nevertheless, it was the very reverse with William Butler Yeats and with Mallarmé himself, both of whom paid homage to so great a feat. As for the unpublished translations, it may be added that, although they cannot, alas, always be favorably compared with the happier translations of others or with Symons' own published efforts, they in no way deserve to be entirely dismissed. In an attempt to provide a reasonably valid idea of the interest of this unpublished matter, several examples will be given. These examples are taken from as great a variety as possible, as much for the dates of their composition as for the "difficulty" they illustrate. In order to avoid the temptation of comparing them with an "ideal," abstract interpretation, Symons' versions will be followed by the published translations of other authors, thus establishing a truer mean.

There is, for example, this quartet from the poem "Les Fleurs," of March, 1864:

Et tu fis la blancheur sanglotante des lys
Qui roulaient sur des mers de soupirs qu'elle effleurait
À travers l'encens bleu des horizons pâliss
Monté rêveusement vers la lune qui pleure!

which has been rendered by Symons, especially in his last line, with meticulous concern for the spiritual, nocturnal impulse:

And you made the sobbing lilies lurid
That touched the tossing seas that surged on a reef
Across the incense of the horizons pallid
Windily drifting toward the Moon in grief.

John Gray, in Silverpoints (1893), with much poetical charm and delicacy, gave:

Thou mad'st the lilies' pallor, nigh to swoon,
Which, rolling billows of deep sighs upon,
Through the blue incense of horizons wan,
Creeps dreamily toward the weeping moon.

While John Payne, publishing his The Latter Days in 1913, attempted like John Gray to convey something of the poetical magic of Mallarmé's lines, though less successfully than the latter. He uses, more particularly, exterior processes such as a poetical vocabulary and an archaic turn of phrase:

The whiteness, eke, thou mad'st of lilies sad and frail,
That swaying on the sea of sighs, bore its deeps,

Athwart the incense blue of the horizons pale,
Upoaroth dreamingly toward the moon that weeps.

The one-time British Museum librarian, Arthur Ellis, was bold enough to bring before the public Stéphane Mallarmé in English Verse (1927), where is to be found the following version, more laborious and less adapted to the original:

And thou didst make the sobbing lilies' whitenesses,
That scarcely touching float o'er moaning seas of sighs
And mount through incense-blue of pallid distant skies
Most wistfully toward the Moon, grief's votaress.

Symons' version stands up very well in comparison with these others, though it emphasizes perhaps a little too much, and with slightly excessive realistic sharpness, the image of the sea in line two: Mallarmé's evocation is more subtle and remote.

The esoteric "Le vierge, le vivace et le bel aujourd'hui" (1889) presents a trickier problem to the translator, for it requires a particularly close link between décor, sense, form, and subtle interior muscularity: the fourteen rhymes in "i," the repeated assonance of this shrill vowel, evoke the monotony of vast spaces, solitary, silent, white with hardened ice. "No sonnet has been more commented upon, more paraphrased," says Madame E. Noulet; "none has been more misunderstood ... more mistranslated." Foreign translators could give but a faint echo of such dense, subjacent verses as these:

Fantôme qu'à ce lieu son pur éclat assigne,
Il s'immobilise au songe froid de mépris
Que vêt parmi l'exil inutile le Cygne.

In an attempt dated by Symons February, 1931, we read this phrase, which endeavors to retain the concern for economy of expression that was Mallarmé's:

Phantom assigned to this place by its Purity,
In the scornful splendour of his dream unshaken
The Swan endures its Exile's Immobility.

This is, of course, only an approximation: the word "inutile," important to Mallarmé, who endows it with a special sense, has not been rendered, and the position of the word "Cygne" at the very end of the poem, has not been respected. In a certain measure, however, the sense is not too incomplete, nor too distorted, and there is also poetry in the English, which is an accomplishment.
One might regret the introduction of a certain romantic lyricism, in place of the learned complexity, the grandeur, and the irreducible resonance of Mallarmé’s lines.

Arthur Ellis does not give satisfactory results; his lines are heavy and unnecessarily prolonged:

A phantom his mere splendour to this haunt hath giv’n,
To that cold dream of scorn O see him stiffening
Which vestre—banishment most bare— the Swan in hea’n.

T. Sturge Moore, in the second volume of the collected edition of his Poems (1939), inserted “The Swan,” a “Variation on Mallarmé.” The result is praiseworthy. Moore seems to have remade Mallarmé’s poem in English. The sense of the tercet is as charged with meaning as it is in the original; the images are not always the same, but at least those of Moore have a certain amount of family resemblance to those of the French poet:

Poor phantom, white mid white! Yea, thou shalt don,
While my scorn stiffens dream that hood-winked thee,
Icy cerecloth, exiled and useless Swan.

Roger Fry, who translated all the Poems of Mallarmé (1986), gives so rich and clear a version that it makes away with the atmosphere of the original: it is much more the translation of a scholar than that of a poet:

Fantom that to this place his brightness assigns him,
He is stilled in the icy dream of contempt
Which clothes in his useless exile the Swan.

Another very famous poem, “Le Tombeau d’Edgar Poe” (1876), offers a density of expression hazardous to transpose with the same felicity. Here are the two last tercets:

Du sol et de la nue hostiles, ô grief!
Si notre idée avec ne sculpte un bas-relief
Dont la tombe de Poe éblouissante s’orne,
Calme bloc ici-bas chut d’un désastre obscur,
Que ce granit du moins montre à jamais sa borne
Aux noirs voûts du Blasphème épar in the futur.

It will be remembered that Mallarmé himself provided an “essai d’une interprétation objective” of this poem for Mrs. Sarah Helen Whitman. It is reproduced here for guidance: #15

Of the soil and the ether (which are) enemies, o struggle!
If with it my idea does not carve a bas-relief
of which Poe’s dazzling tomb be adorned,

(a) stern block here fallen from a mysterious disaster,
Let this granite at least show forever their bound
to the old flights of Blasphemy (still) spread in the future. #2

Here is other evidence of the superficiality of Mallarmé’s knowledge of the English language. #3 It would seem that he has not employed the words “stern,” “bound,” “spread,” in their strictest sense; they do not appear to me to be the equivalents of the French words chosen by him. It may be permissible, therefore, to distrust others of his terms, such as “struggle” for “grief.” In any case, Mallarmé gave only an outline of literal translation solely out of courtesy—his intention was not to give a poem in English. Symons offers us this:

From the soil and from the cloud hostile, O grief!
If our imagination had moulded no Bas-relief
To give magnificence to the Tomb of Poe:

An immense block fallen from an obscure disaster
Must warm, this granite reef which hides the Master.
Black Blasphemy in its flights: no farther go.

Naturally, these lines have not quite produced in English that impression of obscurity which the French reader experiences above all others, nor that of erudite condensation of expression which is the result of a bold technique. These, alas, are regrets engendered by every examination of symbolique poems. Arthur Ellis, since he has, to my mind, somewhat “dulled” Mallarmé’s lines and has more than once depoetized them, has tended thereby to simplify them. That competent translator, André Koszul, has been more than generous in his review of Ellis’ translations:

It is, in fact, curious to note that Mallarmé thus translated becomes, not exactly more intelligible—although all translation being interpretation, Mr. Ellis has often enough made apparent how, for his part, he would underlie the intentions of these “hermetic” texts—but more natural, inasmuch as

#15 This “translation” is a rendering of a text which differs from that of the poem in its definitive form. The various are: “et de l’éther hostiles,” “si mon idée,” “bloc à jamais chut,” and “aux véaux voûts de Blasphème.”

English poetry has for so long ventured into this thoroughfare of suggestions, so uneasily reducible to the rational discourse cultivated (to excess, many readers will doubtless aver) by Mallarmé esoterism.

Mr. Ellis’ version contains in these two tercets the same misapprehensions that are found in Symons (From earth; O grief), and furthermore it does not appear to rank with it on a purely poetic plane:

From earth and clouds’ fell enmity, O grief,
Therefrom should our thought mould no bas-relief
To grace the splendour of the tomb of Poe—
Calm block that’s fall’n from some Star’s overthrow,
May this, at least, this adamantine reef
Warn Blasphemy ‘No farther shalt thou go.’

The eminent Mallarmé scholar, Gardner Davies, has granted me the privilege of acquainting myself with this unpublished translation of his own:

O strife of ground and heaven enemies!
If our idea therewith can carve no frieze
To ornament the dazzling tomb of Poe,
Calm block at least obscure disaster spiced,
May this granite at least their limit show
To Blasphemy’s black flight his still strewn ahead.

Dense precision is here obtained, here the interpreter’s good fortune in knowing Mallarmé’s own “rendering” has enabled him to give to the first line the meaning suggested by the French poet himself. Mr. Davies is, as we know, a patient and qualified exegete whose analysis can be accepted with respect; the exigencies of a text strictly scrutinized and patiently reproduced may satisfy the intelligence more than the ear.

Among the translations Symons published in his Symbolist Movement figures that of “Soupir,” which Miss Temple esteems “very good indeed.” His version certainly meets the requirements one has the right to expect of a poem transferred to another tongue. Symons had this well in view—we recall how he made the rule of Rossetti his own. (“The only true motive for putting poetry into a fresh language must be to endow a fresh nation, as far as possible, with one more possession of beauty.”) In this instance he does indeed truly present a poem in English, which was the most scrupulous homage he could offer to Mallarmé. Other translators have, like Roger Fry, shown themselves more servile to the word for word method, more often than not at the risk of that prosaicism which is the worst metamorphosis that could befal a poet! The beginning of “Soupir” must haunt all memories:

Mon âme vers ton front où rêve, ô calme sœur,
Un automne jonché de taches de rousseur,
Et vers le ciel errant de ton œil angélique
Monte, comme dans un jardin mélancolique,
Fidèle, un blanc jet d’eau soupir vers l’Azur!

Symons gave new life to these lines:

My soul, calm sister, towards thy brow, whereon scarce
Grieves
An autumn strewn already with its russet leaves,
And towards the wandering sky of thine angelic eyes,
Mounts, as in melancholy gardens may arise
Some faithful fountain sighing whitely towards the blue

Miss Temple affirms that “azur is diminished by Symons’ blue,” which is hardly correct, since “the blue” has already been employed in English poetry in the sense of “the azure,” “the firmament.” Miss Temple adds, “Also, the atmosphere of Symons’ poem is noticeably more ‘decadent.’ I am not sure that this is a real fortune.” But she completes this by establishing that, after all, Mallarmé himself was a “poet of the Decadence, with affinities for its precious Louis XV rococo as well as for its mood of melancholy languor.” An odd definition, surely, of the word “Decadence!” Symons, she continues, “suggests that the line of Keats ‘One faint eternal evendite of gems’ might have been written in jeweled French by Mallarmé,” concluding rapidly, “This is the Pro-Rapha in aspect of Keats and of Mallarmé.” Here is research for references and quantitative analysis which carries us far from “Soupir”! If Mallarmé was a poet of the “Decadence” (which may in a certain measure be true), then it is hardly surprising that Symons’ translation should itself be “decadent.” Of the nuance “curiously more ‘decadent,’” it would be vain to pursue an examination here and, fundamentally, that is not the problem. Symons, in English, gives a poem—Symonsian, it will be argued by some—but, in my opinion, it is of some merit that a translator should achieve that “resurrection” so desired by Hilaire Belloc in
his lecture On Translation. Symons’ translation is more meritori-
ous when it is compared with that of others. Announcing the lec-
ture to be given by Mallarmé at Oxford, “Les Leures et la Mu-
sique” (such was the original title), Louis Dyer published in The
Oxford Magazine, on February 21, 1896:

White freckled autumn strews thy dreaming brow,
The spirit within me, quiet sister, sighs
For heaven that shifts within the angel glance,
Upoars as in some lonely garden-plot
Bright water swerveless mounts towards azure skies!

which is a little halting in style, Arthur Ellis has the same habit of
form that has already been observed in the translations examined
above. The phrase “up to that” completely spoils any poetic effect
of the first line:

My soul, O sister, up to that calm brow of thine,
Where autumn dreameth, reween with stain of fallen leaf,
Up to the wandering heavi’n of thine angelic eye
Would mount, as in some garden dedicate to grief,
Constant, aspireth to the blue a fountain’s white.

Roger Fry is again literal, missing the easy flow of liquid rhythm
in the original:

My soul towards your brow where dreams, my calm sister,
An autumn scattered with freckles of russet
And the wandering heaven of your angelic eye
Mounts up as in some melancholical gardens
Faithful, a white jet sights towards the Azure!

In Symons’ personal papers, I found a suggestion of translation
for “L’Après-midi d’un Faune,” very irregular, yet catching here
and there the sensual charm and precious harmony of Mallarmé’s
lines:

Que non! par l’immobile et lase pâmoison
Suffoquant de chaleur le matin frais s’il lutte,
Ne murmure point d’eau que ne verse ma flûte
Au bosquet arrosé d’accords; et le seul vent
Hors des deux tuyaux prompt à s’élancer avant;
Qu’il disperse le son dans une pluie aride,
C’est, à l’horizon pas remué d’une ride,

The visible et serene souffle artificiel
De l’inpiration, qui regagne le ciel.

But not in the soft sweet swoon, evoking peace now,
In this suffocating heat, where my dispute is,
No waters make a murmur unless my flute is
Tuned to the music of the woods; and the wind wailing
Out of the double pipes before the sound is exhaling
And in flight dispersed in the rain with a loud strain
Seeing on the horizons flickered by no cloud-stain
The visible and serene breath of inspiration
Which regains the sky by its imagination.

The end is certainly weaker, but there is beauty in the third and
fourth lines, while for the same fragment Ellis has perhaps better
grasped the sense in its detail, leaving the general impression
unhappy and uneasy:

But not in all the swoon of languorous peace,
Stifling young morn, should morn noon’s sway dispute,
Murmur no waters save the while my flute
With music dews the woodland; wind’s one sigh,
From out the double pipes that fast would fly
Afore it spill its notes in arid rain,
See on horizons fleck’d by no cloud-stain,
Visible and serene, the breath that flies
Art’s rapture, heavi’ward, scouring earth, aspires.

In the final number of The Savoy (1896), Arthur Symons pub-
lished the translation of the end of “Hérodiade” (forty-nine lines);
 thirty years later he committed to paper a translation of the eighty-
five foregoing lines. The two passages, the published and the un-
published, are neither in the same vein nor of the same quality,
but it would not be without interest to quote some of the unpub-
lished effort here, as proposing a rendering acceptable to a certain
point of view:

Eau froide par l’ennui dans ton cadre gelée
Que de fois et pendant des heures, désolé
Des songes et cherchant mes souvenirs qui sont
Comme des feuilles sous ta glace au trou profond,
Je m’apparais en toi comme une ombre lointaine,
Mais, hurleur! des soirs, dans ta sévère fontaine,
J’ai de mon rêve épars connaître la nudité

96
... O magic mirror mine,
Wan water in thy frozen furtive frame,
How many helpless hours pursued by shame
And dreams and many a menacing memory
Mirrored deep down in thy profundity,
In thee I saw myself a shifting shade,
But, horror! at night, in thy fountain, undismayed
I knew my dream’s dishevelled Nudity!

The objection may be raised that there are, in sum, several liberties—additions—“pursued by shame,” “menacing,” “undismayed”—yet always with a sense of beauty in mind. These are words that, when not brought in for the rhyme, are meant for the ear. The two first lines are typical Symons illustrations of the Swinburneian liking for alliterations (compare “The wind that wanders, the weeds wind-shaken” of Swinburne). Since, though, all translations may be more or less boiled down to a choice between “infidelities,” perhaps “les belles infidélités” of Symons here may be, if not excusable, at least tolerable, when compared with those of Roger Fry—which have not the excuse of being “belles”:

... Oh mirror!
A cold water frozen with ennui in your frame,
How often, for how long, unvisited
Of dreams, and seeking my remembrances which are
Like leaves beneath your ice’s profoundness
I to myself appeared a far-off shade.

Sometimes we find in Symons lines that might have been pronounced by Macbeth rather than by Hérodiade:

... This hand stained by its sacrilege,
Canst thou not touch me? For there shall come an hour
Which shall not end without woe upon the tower.

Another example of apparent poetic achievement in which only one word mistranslated gives a different timbre to the lines is where the nurse in Mallarmé asks:

... et pour qui, dévoré
D’angoisses, gardez-vous la splendeur ignorée
Et le mystère vain de votre être?

... For whom then do you, torn
With anguish, keep the sinister splendour of your scorn
And the vain mystery of your being?

Symons, moreover, showed a fondness during this period of the mid-twenties (after his terrible illness) for words like “sinister,” “shame,” “Hell,” “snake,” etc.

The end of “Hérodiade” was translated in 1895, just at the time when his friend W. B. Yeats was staying with him. Nearly thirty years later, Yeats still found pleasure in reminiscing over their incomparable companionship, their long evenings spent in discussion of their art:

[Symons] was making those translations from Mallarmé and from Verlaine, from Calderon, from St. John of the Cross, which are the most accomplished metrical translations of our time. ... I can remember the day in Fountain Court when he first read me Hérodiade’s address to some Sibyl who is her nurse and it may be the moon also. ... ⁹

To mine own self I am a wilderness.
You know it, amethyst gardens numberless
Enfolded in the flaming, subtle deep,
Strange gold, that through the red earth’s heavy sleep
Has cherished ancient brightness like a dream,
Stones whence mine eyes, pure jewels, have their gleam
Of icy and melodious radiance, you,
Metals, which into my young breasts drew
A fatal splendour and their manifold grace!
Thou, woman, born into these evil days
Disastrous to the cavern sibyline,
Who speakest, prophesying not of one divine,
But of a mortal, if from that close sheath,
My robes, rustle the wild enchanted breath
In the white quiver of my nakedness,
If the warm air of summer, O prophetess,
(And woman’s body obeys that ancient claim)
Behold me in my shivering starrv shame,
I die!

Remarkable resurrection! The “joyau magnifique, [sorti] du sanctuaire de ma pensée,” as Mallarmé once wrote to Casalis, is here revived in the lucid lyricism of the multiple symbol of frozen nudity, white purity, and inaccessibleazure. The two critics already mentioned are sterile in their severity, profoundly unjust, even. Mariana Thompson declares, “Arthur Symons has tried to render

⁹ The Trembling of the Veil, London, 1902, p. 106. 98
the quality of coldness essential to the poem, but his translation so often strays from the text that the English reader can have but an incomplete idea of the Mallarmé masterpiece. Symons gives merely an approximation, and, in displacing the words from their initial framework, loses the symbolism of the poem. It would seem that the intellectual character of Héroïade escaped Symons.”

While Ruth Temple affirms in all conscience, “His version misses the ice and diamond temperature of the original, but it made a profound impression on Yeats, whose French was slight.” It is entirely the reverse—in the translation we have primarily a poem, the harmony of which (to my way of thinking) is close to creating the same impression made on the French reader by Mallarmé’s lines. It is a veritable miracle of concord:

... si le tiède azur d’été,

Me voit dans ma pudeur grelotante d’étoile,

Je meurs!

If the warm air of summer...

Behold me in my shivering shabby shame,

I die!

But, beyond the coincidence, beyond the happy verbal issue, Symons does not tarnish Mallarmé’s metaphysical idealism. Within the means offered him by the English language and the advantage that was his of being impregnated with seventeenth-century English poets and with William Blake, he has kept the mystical density of the “ascension intérieure.” It was precisely this that so affected Yeats, whose alleged insufficient knowledge of French is used to depreciate the competence and the value of his judgment. It has equally been inferred that Mallarmé, on his side, was far from being infallible in English. But both Yeats and Mallarmé possessed what we, however conscientious as critics we may be, do not have—that royal gift of poets which “transmutes all that it touches, and every form moving within its presence is changed by wondrous sympathy to an incarnation of the spirit which it breathes,” as Shelley had it. Arthur Symons was himself a poet, and was as near to that “secret alchemy” of Shelley’s dreams as it is humanly possible to aspire to be. We know the travail “Héroïade” cost Mallarmé, what “cruele labeur nocturne” when he came to grips with the “sujet effrayant” that exhausted him. He tells how
dear he held “Héroïade”: “Je m’y était mis tout entier. . . . Pour moi, j’ai plus travaillé cet été que toute ma vie, et je puis dire que j’ai travaillé pour toute ma vie.” When he read Symons’ translation thirty years later he wrote:

Oui, mon cher Poète, j’ai reçu, lu et je sais cette inappréciable traduction d’Héroïade; il me semble et là, vraiment, je suis presque touché, que j’ai écrit en Anglais. Comment avez-vous pu transposer, certes de la Poésie, mais le ton même? L’amant est que c’est moi qui suis très fier. Je le disais l’autre jour à Whibley. Je prétends l’admirable Mademoiselle Moreno de réciter ce fragment d’Héroïade en Anglais. Le reste sera achevé au cours du printemps; vous l’aurez.19

Certainly, part of the homage he paid to his translator was dictated by his exquisite amity,20 but how can we help recognizing in these lines the accent of sincere and sure satisfaction? Mallarmé was himself no mean translator, though not exempt from inexactitude or oversight.21 He could well understand, in concrete fashion, the terrible difficulties confronting any interpreter; modestly comparing himself with Charles Baudelaire, he made the following avowal in his “scènes des poèmes d’Edgar Poe”:

À défaut d’autre valeur ou de celle d’impressions puissamment maniées par le génie égal, voici un calque se hasarder sans prétention ou que rendre quelques-uns des effets de sonorité extraordinaire de la musique originelle, et ici là peut-être, le sentiment même.

Long before Mallarmé, another great poet, Joachim du Bellay, in his Défense, et Illustration de la Langue Françoyse (1549), had treated nicely of obstacles confronting the translators who

se prennent aux poètes, genre d’auteurs cercles auquel, si je savois ou voulais traduire, je m’adresserais aussi peu, à cause de cette divinité d’invention qu’ils ont plus que les autres, de

19 Unpublishd letter, January 18, 1887, Symons Papers, Princeton University Library. See Plate VII.
20 Goethe, also, wrote to Nerval on the latter’s version of Faust: “Je ne me vois jamais mieux compris que dans votre traduction.” Nerval, too, was a poet.
21 See Stéphane Mallarmé, Ouvres Completes (Paris, Bibliothèque de la Pléiade [1946], pp. 187-241 and 196-250. See also my article in Revue de Littérature Comparée, cited in footnote 4. On March 1, 1871, Mallarmé wrote to Camille Men¬

dide: “Je ne connaissais de l’anglais que les mots employés dans le volume des Poésies de Poe et je les prononçais, certes bien, pour ne pas manquer au vers. Je suis, le dic¬

tionnaire et la divination aident, faire un bon traducteur, surtout de poète. . . .”
Jonathan Couch and His
Manuscript History of Cornish Fishes

BY HENRY L. SAVAGE '15

Many years ago a lovely lady, who spent each winter in Italy, told the writer that a Russian officer had once invited her to lunch at a Roman restaurant where, he assured her, there was "nodings bot feesh." The reader, I fear, will bring that charge against the manuscript now to be described. True, it serves "nodings bot feesh," but behind its composition lies a bibliographical and biographical story worth the telling.

It is quite appropriate that this "fishy" manuscript should be the gift of a great fisherman whose knowledge of the ways of salmon and trout rivals that of the author of the manuscript. Carl Otto v. Klenbusch '06 has through the years been a generous donor to the library of his alma mater, but I am willing to hazard the guess that there is a warmer glow of generous satisfaction in his heart when he can give her some treatise on the sport in which he is such a master.1 *Tam Marti quam Mercurio.*

The manuscript, entitled "A Natural History of Cornish Fishes," is the work of Dr. Jonathan Couch (1789-1870), who is both author and scribe, and of whom more anon. It consists of 565 pages, some of which have been numbered in pencil and forty-nine of which are blank. The leaves measure 14 1/4 by 8 7/8 inches. Inserted are a lithographic portrait of Jonathan Couch, thirty-seven water-color drawings, memoranda, clippings and tear sheets from periodicals, several letters addressed to Couch, and other material. The manuscript is divided into three parts: "Introduction," the main text, and "Supplement." It is bound in full calf by Bayntun of Bath.

One who looks at the manuscript for the first time might easily come to the opinion that two different scribes had been at work upon it. The writing on the recto pages is in a larger and more legible hand than that used on the verso. The reader cannot fail to be struck with this seeming difference: that on the recto almost copybook in its carefully formed letters and orderly arrangement

---

on the page; that on the verso an attenuated and rapid cursive. One might assume that Dr. Couch had employed a scribe to copy down on the recto pages what he himself had written in an earlier manuscript, or had dictated to him in propriæ voce, but had added later notes and observations in his own hand on the verso.

Yet a careful comparison of several of the individual letters on either page will convince any doubting Thomas that one and the same hand is at work throughout the whole manuscript. To that evidence must be added the assurance conveyed by statements made on both recto and verso pages which prove Jonathan Couch to have been his own amanuensis. Thus on page [481], a recto page, we have Couch’s own words: “Thus have I been able to finish a corrected & enlarg’d Copy of my History of Cornish Fishes, this 29th Day of October 1839, Jonathan Couch.” While on several of the verso pages, one comes upon such phrases as “I cannot find it in the Looe River,” “the largest Mackerel I have heard of,” clear proofs of Couch’s authorship. It is, of course, quite evident that most of the notes on the verso pages were added after 1837, for some of them are dated 1832, 1834, 1836, while between pages [568]-[569] and [767]-[777] there are printed inserts on “Fluctuations in the Herring Fishing” dated 1855 and on the export of pilchards dated 1847 and 1848. These late insertions on the pages devoted to notes, many of which were perhaps hastily added, doubtless help account for the seeming dissimilarity of hands.

The belief that one and the same hand wrote both the text on the recto and the addenda on the verso pages is strengthened by the presence in the manuscript of water-color drawings of fish carrying Couch’s signature and pen-and-ink sketches, two of which carry Couch’s initials, so that there is reason to believe that all were drawn by no one else than Jonathan Couch. These last are so vivid and lifelike that they alone would be ample warrant for placing the manuscript in the Library’s Department of Special Collections.

The water-color illustrations number thirty-seven. They have been mounted on blank leaves, and the dates written on them in Couch’s own hand show them to have been added to the manuscript after he had written the manuscript. Of themselves they would not raise Couch to a place among the masters of animal portraiture. They are anatomically correct, and therefore well observed, but they are amateur work. Their colors are vivid, because of the artist’s care to catch the subtle changes in coloration as one hue on a newly-caught specimen fades off. To secure this effect so essential to accurate representation of any specimen, the author seems willing to sacrifice something of its structural form (see Plate VIII).

Couch’s artistic reputation, however, will stand not upon his water colors but upon the more than one hundred pen-and-ink sketches which he dashed off wherever sufficient space on the pages of his text allowed such indulgence. One is continually surprised by the appearance on a page of some member of the finny tribe, drawn beautifully to scale with hatching of fine pen strokes to indicate shading, whose goggle eyes and capacious mouth express its temperament or nature. In short, these little sketches, two or three inches long by one-half or one inch high, possess a vitality that is lacking in the similar drawings of Dürer or Audubon. At times the artist’s love and depicting nature has pulled him away from the animate to the inanimate; he deserts his beloved fish and shows us the Cornish landscape, the background of his labors. Note on page [425] the miniature of the ruins of the old chapel at Polperro (clone in 1838) rising among the rocks with the sea as its background, or turn to the drawing on page [82] of the churchyard at Tallow with its old gravesones, both done with a sharpness of line and a deftness of stroke that mark the master. Twice his interest in living creatures has led him out of the water on to the land, and we have on pages [125] and [267] two vivid sketches of wild hares.

A secondary reason for including the Kienbusch manuscript among raræ aves (or raræ pisces) of our collections is because of its illustrous progeny, for it is one of the progenitors of Couch’s four-volume A History of the Fishes of the British Islands, London, 1876-78. In it (and in certain of his periodical publications as well) one can see in embryo the most authoritative of all books dealing with British ichthyology. But if its progeny be illustrious, its own descent is somewhat obscure.

The manuscript was presented to the University Library in May, 1936 by Mr. Kienbusch, who had purchased it from an English bookseller. It contains the angling bookplate of a former owner, Alfred Harmsworth. The Dictionary of National Biography (XII, 194) is in error when it states that in the library of the Linnean Society there is a Couch manuscript with pen-and-ink and colored figures, dated 1856, entitled “A Natural History of Cornish Fishes.” Mr. T. O’Grady, General Secretary of the Linnean Society, tells me that the Society owns only one Couch manuscript, “The Natural History of the Fishes of the United Kingdom with
particular reference to the Fisheries," and that in the front of this manuscript there is a note by Couch dated September 23, 1886, saying that the volume was employed by William Yarrell (1784-1859) in the composition of his History of British Fishes published in 1859. The Linnean Society manuscript was certainly one of the sources of Yarrell’s two-volume work, for Couch himself says so, but there were other unpublished writings by Couch that Yarrell used, since Yarrell speaks of the Couch “manuscript notes.” There is every possibility that our manuscript was among them. According to Mr. O’Grady, twelve manuscript volumes left by Couch were offered by his son to the Society in 1878 but were refused. They are probably the twelve-volume “Journal of Natural History” which the Dictionary of National Biography records Couch as having compiled over the years. He suggests that our manuscript may have been one of the twelve. The suggestion is entirely possible, for the verso pages of our acquisition certainly show that Couch’s own observations and the living testimony of his fish friends play a major role in its tout ensemble. If such be the case, however, it can easily be seen that Couch had ceased to annotate the volume that dealt with fish by 1856. But the suggestion remains only a possibility. Our manuscript may have been compiled by Couch and kept on his shelves for protracted and continued annotation without his having any idea of making it one volume in his twelve-volume series. There is nothing in our manuscript to indicate that it was part of a set. Quite evidently it was compiled for use in the completion of some specific purpose. True indeed it was that an aged and paralytic father, and the fact that he had fallen in love with a local girl, his future wife, made him a not unwilling resident of his native village, yet his filial duties would not, and his marital need not, have made him a permanent one.6

One might even believe that a return to Polperro was compulsory: he had gone as far as the English system of education could carry him. As a Dissenter—he was debarred from matriculating at either Cambridge or Oxford. This deprivation was, however, probably a blessing in disguise. Cambridge and Oxford were at that time not notable for

4 Jonathan Couch, The History of Polperro ..., "with a Short Account of the Life and Labours of the Author ..., " by Thomas Q. Couch, Truro, 1871, p. 4.
5 It is worth noting incidentally that Jonathan Couch was the grandfather of Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch (1863-1944).
intellectual activity—and least of all in the field of zoology. Attendance at either one of them might have produced a Couch who would not have accomplished what the real Couch did—write the definitive work on British ichthyology.

No, Polperro was better situated for Couch’s doings than the metropolis or the two seats of the Muses close to it. Fish live in the water, and on either side of his house ran a fresh-water river (the Looe and the Fowey) to empty itself into the ocean which lapped the sea wall of Polperro’s almost landlocked harbor. Water, water everywhere—a natural laboratory for an ichthyologist.

Jonathan’s strong Methodist faith naturally prompted him to do all the good he could to his neighbors, so that his medical services were at the call of all who needed them. What he wrote of his first medical preceptor was equally true of himself: “He never squeezed the poor, never sought money for its own sake.”

“He was at the head of all attempts to benefit Polperro, both spiritually and materially. Earnest in instructing his neighbours in the interpretation of their Bible, and in enforcing its teachings, he also gave extempore lectures occasionally, in which he would explain the common phenomena of nature in very simple language. . . . Their social advancement was ever his care, for he was not only interested in the structure and habits of the finny race, but also in the economic value of the fisheries, and was much consulted whenever legislation, or inquiry, was thought necessary.”

The respect and affection of the inhabitants of Polperro and its neighborhood for their doctor grew with the passage of the years. His son, in the memoir written for his father’s History of Polperro, says that he was unfortunate in not having neighbors of kindred tastes to quicken his industry (one wonders whether it was in need of quickening) and sharpen his attention. Thomas Couch, however, was a bit blind to the state of affairs at Polperro. His father really possessed a numerous set of “neighbours of kindred tastes” in the fishermen of his native town. On his return from London they wondered why their bespectacled doctor haunted the harborsides was so curious about the circumstances of the catch and the kind of fish taken in it. Perhaps they were slow to comprehend that his questions were teaching them to become accurate observers. From their observations their interest grew, so that nothing pleased them more than to bring him some rare or strange fish, or to relate some fact illustrative of piscine habits. Couch, on his 6 Couch, The History of Polperro, p. 6.
7 Ibid., p. 19.
8 Ibid., p. 10.

part, was careful, as the verso pages of our manuscript show, to note down any significant fact they communicated with a mention of the name and the credibility of his informant.

It will be illuminating for the reader to see how the terse statements on the recto and the later annotations on the verso pages of the manuscript, culled from their stories and his own anatomizations, reappear in the cadenced prose of the printed book. The bare factual statements of the manuscript are amplified into a limpid prose of long but well articulated sentences that have sprung from a topic sentence in the manuscript as from a springboard. Take for example Couch’s several descriptions of the conger eel:

This fish is very retentive of life, and possesses great muscular power in every part of its body; so that it is able to draw itself through an aperture or over the side of a boat, if only sufficed to fix its tail conveniently. To prevent this, fishermen beat it with a club; a blow on the vent or tail soon disables it. (Manuscript, p. 73)

In every part of its body this fish possesses great muscular strength and agility; and these it puts forth in a manner that is highly characteristic when the object is to deliver itself from restraint. When taken on board the boat and left undisturbed, the sensitive powers of its tail are employed in searching out the nature and limits of its prison; and then the organ is stretched out to lay hold of the gunwale; by fixing its holdfast on which a reversed muscular contraction is put in force, and the whole body is turned overboard; to prevent which, however, when the fish is first taken, it is usual to inflict a smart blow with the bat or bludgeon on the root of the tail, or on the vent; either of which is effectual in disabling the victim. (Fishes of the British Islands, IV, 348)

Thomas Couch tells us that his father lacked access to books upon his subject, and from failure to know how much was already known, had to go over a good deal of unnecessary ground. One sympathizes with a savant thus cribbed and confounded, yet an inspiring milieu and absence of a library may retart but do not prohibit sound scholarship. The sea provided a better laboratory for an ichthyologist than any metropolis could have done, and the reports of the old fishermen gave him for his magnum opus more than any library could do. And as time went by, and his careful notes piled up, the fame he never sought sought him. In 1844 he
was admitted Fellow of the Linnean Society; in 1866 he was elected 
corresponding member of the Zoological Society. The famous 
wood engraver, Thomas Bewick, sought him out for literary and 
pictorial aid on a contemplated book on British fish. The aid he 
gave the ichthyologist William Yarrell has already been mentioned. 
"From his quiet retreat he held intercourse with many of the fore-
most natural philosophers of his time." * Ohne Hast, ohne Rast! 
Slowly the material piled up. Facts and notae bene recording the 
amusements and experiences of a lifetime devoted to fish and 
fishing were shaped into the smoothly flowing narrative of the 
* Fishes of the British Islands * by Couch’s conscientious care. 
On the title-page of our manuscript there is written the couplet: 

Tho pleased to see the Dolphins play 
I mind my compass & my way. 

Jonathan Couch amused and interested himself by learning the 
ways of fish, but his knowledge did not remain locked in his own 
head. He sought to share it as he shared his other possessions. His 
landfall was A History of the Fishes of the British Islands, and the 
Kienbusch manuscript was an indispensable gadget in the compass 
that steered him to it. 2

2 I acknowledge gratefully my indebtedness to T. O’Grady, General Secretary of 
the Linnean Society of London, and to Alexander O. Victor, Curator of Maps in 
the Yale University Library.

Library Notes &
Queries
WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE 
TO PRINCETON

RECENT REQUESTS

Several recent requests have made substantial additions to the 
Library’s endowed funds. The importance of funds of this sort, 
with their assurance of continuity, is obvious.

From the estate of Mrs. Lathrop C. Harper of New York the 
Library has received fifty thousand dollars in trust. The income of 
three-fourths of this sum is to be used for the purchase of “books 
more than one hundred years old” in memory of Lathrop C. Har-
per. The remaining one-fourth is to be held until the accumulated 
income amounts to fifty thousand dollars, which is then to be used 
for the same purpose. Mr. Harper was a distinguished rare-book 
dealer of New York and had served as a member of the Advisory 
Council of the Princeton University Library. The bequest is one 
of several to assist various libraries and historical institutions, car-
rying out his wish and that of Mrs. Harper. Each of the volumes 
purchased from these funds in the several libraries will carry a 
similar memorial bookplate.

Princeton was the principal beneficiary under the reciprocal 
will of Mr. and Mrs. Frederick J. H. Sutton. Mrs. Sutton died in 
July, 1958, surviving Mr. Sutton by only a few months. Frederick 
J. H. Sutton ’85, of Amenia, New York, had been interested in the 
Library for many years, and, in addition to other bequests to the 
University, the Library received his books and the sum of ten thou-
sand dollars “as a fund for the purchase of outstanding books.” 

The Library is to receive in perpetuity income from a trust 
established under the will of Ulric Sloane, Jr., ’85 of Columbus, 
Ohio. This sum, currently estimated at three thousand dollars per 
year, is to be used for purchases in the broad field of religion and 
philosophy with one hundred dollars per year dedicated specifically 
to the purchase of books relating to St. Thomas Aquinas, a par-
ticular interest to Mr. Sloane.
Under the will of Elisabeth H. Reed of Waterville, Maine, the Library has received approximately thirty-four thousand dollars to establish a fund in memory of Asher E. Hinds, her nephew and a member of the Department of English at Princeton from 1922 until his death in 1943. The income from this fund will be used "for the purchase of books commonly regarded as coming under the general field of English or English literature, with special emphasis on English literary criticism." As these books appear in the literature collections of the Library, they will be identified by an appropriate bookplate.

**PRINCETON'S MONGOLIAN GANJUR**

The Gest Oriental Library contains, in addition to its 140,000 volumes of Chinese books, smaller collections of Japanese, Korean, Manchu, Tibetan, and Mongolian works. The items in the last three categories were obtained in Peking along with the Chinese books, but they have never been adequately studied and catalogued, for rather obvious reasons! Recently David M. Farquhar, a scholar in the field of Mongolian studies and an authority on the Mongolian collections in the United States, visited the Gest Library and prepared a description of its Mongolian works, among which he found several items of interest. In particular, the fact that Princeton possesses a Mongolian Ganjur deserves to be more widely known. To quote briefly from Mr. Farquhar's description of this work:

*Ganjur* (Tibetan bKa’-g_yur). 108 volumes plus 1 volume of colophons, indices and supplements. One of the largest, most important and rarest Mongolian collections, it is the Mongolian translation of the Tibetan Buddhist scriptures. While most of the translation was done already in the 17th century, the printed work bears the date 1721. It is most closely related to the Peking edition of the Tibetan Kanjur... which it closely resembles in format. There is only one edition.

The discovery of the Princeton Ganjur makes a total of two such works in the U.S. (the other is at Harvard University). There is one copy in Paris, one in the Library of the Oriental Institute, Leningrad, and several copies in the Library of the Mongolian Scientific Committee, Ulan Bator, Mongolia.

There used to be a MS. copy written in gold (and apparently antedating the printed edition) in Japan, but it was almost totally destroyed in the Great Earthquake... The Princeton Ganjur is far superior to the Harvard copy: it is more carefully printed and much better preserved. Furthermore, it has the valuable colophon volume (Volume 190) which is missing in the Harvard set... The Mongolian xylographs frequently are very handsome; this set of the Ganjur is typical of them at their best. Each of its 190 "volumes" consists of between 150 and 300 loose sheets, about twenty-eight inches by nine inches. These are of an excellent quality, heavy white paper, printed in red on both sides. Title-pages have elaborately designed, printed borders. Titles of chapters are given in both Chinese and Mongolian, and in some cases in Tibetan as well. The volumes are protected by wooden cover-boards that are bound in yellow brocaded silk-satin. The use of yellow silk, red ink, and border designs of dragons all indicate that this was an imperially sponsored publication. Recessed into the inside of each of the 218 cover-boards (top and bottom), behind red or green silk curtains, are block-printed illustrations of Buddhist figures and scenes, which, although printed in red, have in many cases been filled in by hand with bright colors and gold. This book form imitates that of Tibet rather than the customary form of the Chinese book. It is, of course, the Lamaist form of Buddhism, of which these books are the sacred writings, that forms the great cultural link between Tibet and Mongolia.

The existence of a complete and well preserved copy of this vast and rare work in the United States will be of greatest interest to Mongol scholars everywhere. It will also interest Buddhologists, who already are aware of the Gest Library's important holdings in Chinese Buddhist literature.4 The only large and important Buddhist collections in which the Library lacks are the Tibetan Kanjur and Tanjur, recently reprinted by the Tibetan Tripsitaka Research Institute, Kyoto, Japan, in 150 volumes, and which the Library hopes to be able to acquire within the next few years.

It is tantalizing to speculate what similar discoveries might be made among the Gest Library's Manchu works, which constitute the largest "unknown quantity" remaining to be investigated.

---


2 See "An Important Addition to the Gest Library's Buddhist Collection," in this issue of the *Chronicle*, pp. 118-122.
A BOOK FROM THE WESTOVER LIBRARY

In the Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society for April, 1958, Edwin Wolf, and, has published the results of his investigation of the scattering of one of the great libraries of colonial America, that of William Byrd of Westover in Virginia. The article, entitled "The Dispersal of the Library of William Byrd of Westover," is followed by a catalogue of the 258 surviving Westover books that Mr. Wolf has succeeded in locating. One of these is now in the Princeton Library.

The Westover library, to quote Mr. Wolf's final paragraph,

was sold en bloc to Isaac Zane in 1778. For his account about forty percent of the volumes were sold at auction [in Philadelphia] by Robert Bell from October, 1781, to October, 1782. During the next ten years, William Pritchard from his store and John Pemberton through personal effort sold another thirty-five percent. The rest remained in Isaac Zane's estate and were disposed of by his sisters in 1800 by gift to the Pennsylvania Hospital and thereafter through the agency of booksellers of whom Dufief was the most active. Indications are that the majority of the books went contemporaneously into the hands of Philadelphians. Of those which have been located by far the greater number are still in Philadelphia institutions, and most of those which have turned up recently have come from the Philadelphia area. But the centrifugal force has been growing. One volume has turned up in Paris and a set of Dryden in California. So, the greatest library of colonial Virginia has been scattered.

The survivor from the Westover library now at Princeton—or at least the only one that has been positively so identified—is a copy of James Ralph's A Critical History of the Administration of Sr Robert Walpole, London, J. Hinton, 1743, which belonged to President James Madison and which bears his signature on the title-page. According to Library records, the volume at one time contained the bookplate of William Byrd of Westover, but, alas, when the volume was unlovingly rebound in drab buckram some years ago, the bookplate was not preserved. To add insult to injury, the Library still has, in a collection of bookplates, a photostat of this very bookplate, made prior to the unfortunate rebinding and annotated by a more careful library antiquarian. Although the tangible evidence of the bookplate is now missing, the archival evidence is sufficiently conclusive to allow the inclusion of this book among the scattered vestiges of the Westover library. In his list of the volumes he has located, Mr. Wolf records it as No. 174. In the manuscript catalogue of the Westover library prepared in the 1730's by John Stretch (and preserved at the Library Company of Philadelphia), A Critical History of the Administration of Sr Robert Walpole is also listed, and assigned to Case A, Shelf 9. Furthermore, at least two other Westover books later owned by James Madison have survived (Wolf, No. 119, at the Historical Society of Pennsylvania; and No. 158, in the Library of Congress); and it is known that Madison purchased a number of other Westover titles from Pemberton when he was in Philadelphia for the Constitutional Convention in 1787, though none of this latter group has been located.

To those who appreciate the value of association copies it is gratifying to know that James Madison's copy of a book once in the library of the Byrds of Westover is now at Princeton. It is less gratifying to have this volume confirm Mr. Wolf's remarks:

... a bookplate as the main indication of provenance... is unfortunate. How much more permanent was Jefferson's cypher at signatures I and T! The carelessness and indifference of binders who rebound and rebacked destroyed scores of them... Furthermore, the Byrd bookplate was a "collectors' item" on its own, and many were removed from the volumes in which they proudly proclaimed Byrd's former ownership, and sold separately. The volumes themselves, if not destroyed, were relegated to the limbo of anonymity.

"ONE HUNDRED NOTABLE AMERICAN BOOKS"

From the first of February through the fifteenth of April the Library held in the main gallery an exhibition entitled "One Hundred Notable American Books," which was based on a list compiled in 1957 by several members of the English Department and published in the Winter 1958 issue of the Chronicle. At the time of the publication of the list the Library lacked in the editions listed (or had incomplete copies) of thirty-four of the titles. During the past year first editions of the following five of the missing titles have been acquired: William H. Brown, The Power of Sympathy, Boston, 1789 (gift of Christian A. Zabriskie); Henry W. Longfellow, Ballads and Other Poems, Cambridge, 1842 (William W. C. Harter '15 Fund); Henry George, Progress and Poverty, San
Francisco, 1879 (gift of Willard Thorp); Henry Adams, History of the United States of America, New York, 1889-91 (gift of Charles Scribner, Jr., '43); and Theodore Dreiser, Sister Carrie, New York, 1900 (Root Fund). The list as published in the Chronicle contained an error in connection with No. 15. William Byrd's history of the Dividing Line. This work was printed first in The Westminster Manuscripts: Containing the History of the Dividing Line between Virginia and North Carolina; A Journey to the Land of Eden, A. D. 1735; and A Progress to the Mines, edited by Edmund Ruffin, Petersburg, Virginia, 1841. A second edition, History of the Dividing Line and Other Tracts, edited by T. H. Wynne, was published in Richmond in 1866. The definitive edition is William Byrd's Histories of the Dividing Line between Virginia and North Carolina, with introduction and notes by William K. Boyd, Raleigh, 1949, which contains the first publication of "The Secret History of the Line." The compilers had selected the 1949 edition for inclusion in the list, but the 1866 edition was inadvertently listed in its place.

CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS ISSUE
IRA O. WARE, Professor of Modern Languages at Princeton University, has in press a book entitled Voltaire and Candide.
ROGER A. LOMBREDAUT, Professeur de Lettres at the S. H. A. P. E. International School, Paris, is shortly to publish a critical biography of Arthur Symons. He has also in preparation a second volume on the role of Symons as an intellectual bridge between French symbolist poetry and English literature.
HENRY L. SAVAGE '15 is Archivist in the Princeton University Library.
F. W. MOTE is an Assistant Professor of Oriental Studies at Princeton University.
DALE ROYLANCE is a member of the Department of Rare Books and Special Collections, Princeton University Library.

1 While this issue was in press the number of missing titles was reduced to twenty-seven by the acquisition of Nathaniel Hawthorne, Fanthome, Boston, 1888 (Simon Fund); and Gertrude Stein, Three Lives, New York, 1909 (gift of R. Gayler Stevens, Jr., '40).

New & Notable

ENGLISH NOVELISTS OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY
Robert H. Taylor '30 has presented to the Library more than forty books by English novelists of the nineteenth century. The gift is distinguished for the excellence of the condition of the volumes and for the considerable number of association items included in it. Anne Brontë is represented by two copies of The Tenant of Wildfell Hall, London, 1848: a first edition in boards and a mixed set in cloth. The second copy consists of the second edition of Volumes I and III and the first edition of Volume II. The second volume has the signature of the author on the front flyleaf and a number of corrections in her hand. Accompanying the volumes is a letter from H. Jopling stating that they had been given to him by his father, who had received them from the Brontës on the occasion of his marriage. (The Library already possessed in the Parrish Collection Anne Brontë's corrected copy of Agnes Grey, London, 1847.) For Charlotte Brontë there are four first editions, including a remarkably immaculate copy of Jane Eyre, London, 1847, and a copy of Villette, London, 1853, in an apparently unrecorded "trial" binding. Important acquisitions for the Library are three first editions of Samuel Butler: Erewhon, London, 1872, with a presentation inscription to H. G. Gurney; Erewhon Revised, London, 1901, with a presentation inscription to Jason Smith; and The Way of All Flesh, London, 1903.

Among the five books by George Eliot is a first edition of Adam Bede, Edinburgh, 1859, with a presentation inscription to Professor Richard Owen. Nine books by Thomas Hardy are present in Mr. Taylor's gift, especially notable being four presentation copies: Jude the Obscure [London, 1896], first edition, first state, with an inscription to Charles Whibley; Life's Little Ironies [London, 1894], first edition, the Kern copy, with an inscription to the Earl of Pembroke; the fifth edition of Tess of the D'Urbervilles [London, 1892], with an inscription to Charles Whibley; and The Woodlanders, London, 1887, first edition, with an inscrip-
tion to Sir Frederick Leighton. The eight first editions of Frederick
Marryat include two copies of Mr. Midshipman Easy, London,

Other books (all first editions) which should be mentioned are:
Emily Eden, The Semi-Attached Couple, London, 1860; Elizabeth
Gaskell, Ruth, London, 1853, with a presentation inscription to
Mary Ewart; H. Rider Haggard, She, London, 1887, with a presen-
tation inscription to Jeannie Jackson; Charles Reade, "It Is never
too Late to Mend," London, 1856, in an unusual blue cloth bind-
ing, with a presentation inscription to Frederic Bulley, President
of Magdalene College (the novel is dedicated to "the President,
Fellows, and Demnies of St. Mary Magdalene College, Oxford, by a
grateful son of that ancient, learned, and most charitable house");
Sir Walter Scott, Chronicles of the Canongate, Second Series, Edin-
burgh, 1828, with a presentation inscription to the Lady Davy;
Joseph H. Shorthouse, John Inglesant, Birmingham, 1880, with a
presentation inscription to Jessie Tawell; and W. M. Thackeray,
Vanity Fair, London, 1847-48, in parts.

Mr. Taylor's gift contains, in addition to the books, a small
 group of autograph items: two letters written by Hardy and a re-
cipt in his hand for payment for a contribution to Belgravia,
signed and dated January 19, 1879; a leaf of the autograph manu-
script of Charles Kingsley's The Water-Babies; and a letter from
Marryat to Clarkson Stanfield.

AN IMPORTANT ADDITION
TO THE GEST LIBRARY'S BUDDHIST COLLECTION

Princeton's Gest Oriental Library has often been called a "collec-
tor's library"—sometimes as a criticism of it, but more cor-
rectly, I feel, in praise of it. The core of the collection certainly
is a collector's library, and we can be glad that it is, for the col-
lector will never again have the opportunity to form such a magni-
nificent library of rare and beautiful editions. As such, it is un-
matched in the United States, and approached by very few Chi-
nese libraries in the Western world. ¹

But the Gest collection is much more than that. In recent years
great strides have been made in transforming it into a research
library, adding to it the relatively easy-to-acquire (but not always
inexpensive) standard editions and modern scholarly works which

¹ See Dr. Hu Shih's description of the collection, "The Gest Oriental Library at
Princeton University," The Princeton University Library Chronicle, XV, No. 3
(Spring, 1954), 119-141. Illus.

are necessary to facilitate the full utilization of the rare and the
valuable editions, and to sustain teaching and research. The ad-
vantag in having a magnificent collector's library to build upon
is well illustrated by the Gest Library's Buddhist collection, and
is called to our attention now by a recent important acquisition in
this field.

The Buddhist Tripiṭaka, the vast compilation of all the Bud-
dhist canonical works and supplementary writings, exists in its
fullest form in Chinese. This is true not only because most of the
Sanskrit and Pali originals no longer exist, except in Chinese trans-
lations made mostly in the first millennium of the Christian era,
but also because of the number and importance of the Chinese
additions to Buddhist literature, also dating mainly from that
same period. Chinese printings of the successive versions of the
Tripiṭaka commenced in the late tenth century, although the
printing of individual Buddhist works had started a century or two
earlier than that. In fact, printing itself gained much impetus
from Buddhism, which needed cheap and efficient means of pro-
ducing sutras, prayers, and charms for the masses of its followers.
The manuscript book undoubtedly was more pleasing aestheti-
cally, and in the Tang period (A.D. 618-906) the art of printing
progressed because of its attempts to make printed sutras as at-
tractive as the hand-copied ones. In consequence of this high
esthetic standard which printing was forced to meet, in the Sung
period (A.D. 960-1279) the printed book, even for the wealthy and
discriminating, came to replace the manuscript copy. Many his-
torians see in the elegant age of Sung the apogee of refinement in
Chinese cultural history, and in that age the art of block printing
reached heights of development that have never been surpassed.
Single pages of Sung-printed books are treasured by collectors, and
Sung editions are the pride of every library that is fortunate enough
to possess a few.

The Gest Library possesses more than a few. In fact, the entire
history of book printing in China was illustrated in an exhibition
of rare items from the collection, held in the main gallery of the
Princeton Library in the spring of 1955. But by far the greatest
body of Sung-printed books in the collection, and perhaps the
greatest single treasure of the entire collection, is a set of the
Tripiṭaka dating in part from the Sung period. Despite the fact
that it is a magnificent example of the art of book printing in the
Sung dynasty, it is valued not so much for that fact as for the fact
that it is one of the two sets in the world of the Chi-sha Tripiṭaka,
an important early edition of the Tripitaka that until about 1930 was not thought to exist at all, except for a few scattered volumes and pages. How and where this Gest set was acquired remains a mystery. At the time of its discovery in China in 1926 or 1927 by Commander I. V. Gillis, the bibliophile-agent for Guion M. Gest, who formed the Gest collection, no other set was known to exist. Gillis, acting in secrecy, shipped his rare find to Canada, then the temporary resting place of the Gest collection, and it remained unknown until it was studied and properly identified in 1950-1952 by Dr. Hu Shih, here at Princeton. An interesting accident of history is that after the Gest set had been shipped out of China, a second incomplete set was discovered in China in 1931. This find was heralded as the most important discovery of printed Buddhist scriptures in modern times, as it confirmed the belief that Buddhist texts and scholars in China to have that set photolithographically reproduced. Its approximately 5,900 volumes were printed in a greatly reduced format of 591 volumes. This Shanghai edition of the Chi-sha Tripitaka appeared in a printing of only five hundred sets in 1936. It was fully subscribed in advance, mostly by libraries and temples, and few sets of it ever appeared on the book market in China or abroad. Dr. Hu was lucky enough to acquire some of these sets some years ago, and during his active curatorship of the Gest collection at Princeton, used the photolith edition for comparison with and detailed study of the Gest set.

The blocks for the Chi-sha Tripitaka were cut over a period of ninety-one years, although work on it actually took a total of sixty-six years, as it was interrupted. The work commenced about 1231 and continued until 1322, near the end of the Southern Sung period. It was resumed in the Yuan or Mongol dynasty (1271-1368) in 1297, and was completed in 1322. The Gest set, containing 5,348 volumes of an original total of about 5,910, has about 700 volumes of Sung editions, and about 1,700 from the subsequent Yuan portion. The other 3,000 or so volumes are replacements added in the years 1608-1608, when the monastery that possessed the set at that time endeavored to fill in the missing volumes. Eight hundred sixty-eight of these replacement volumes are from other Ming period (1368-1644) editions of the Tripitaka, while more than 2,000 of them are manuscript copies made at the time from

- other Chi-sha sets then in existence. The Shanghai edition likewise is reproduced from a highly incomplete set, its gaps having been filled in by the best early printed editions available in China to the publishers in the early 1930's. In many ways the Gest set is superior to it, but in any event they complement each other in a way that makes each indispensable to the scholar using the other. Obviously, then, the single item which the Gest collection needed to make its most valuable treasure more useful to scholars was a set of the Shanghai reprint, possession of which would make it possible for a scholar to sit in one library and make comparative study of all the extant pieces of this vast work. Now, with the acquisition of this work, Princeton is the one place in the world where this can be done. Dr. Hu Shih, on returning to Taiwan last fall to assume the directorship of the Academia Sinica, decided to dispose of his set, and to make it available to Princeton, as the place where it most logically belonged.

Dr. Hu, in expressing the hope that his set of the modern printing of the Chi-sha Tripitaka should come to Princeton's gest Library, undoubtedly was thinking not only of the fact that the only other copy of this work in the original exists here also, but that the incomparable riches of the Gest collection form the core of what must become one of the world's great Oriental libraries. In the field of Buddhist writings alone, the Gest collection is unmatched in this country, having two other sets of the Tripitaka (i.e., the Ming Nan-tang, the "southern edition" of the Hung-wu reign, 1368-98; and the Japanese Taisho Tripitaka published in the years 1924-49), an extensive set of reprints of important works published in China in the late nineteenth century in 685 volumes, and many individual sutras and other Buddhist writings. A number of these latter are rare Ming editions, or otherwise works of considerable importance. The Gest collection also has the only complete set in the United States of the Mongolian Ganjur, the most important and rarest collection of Mongolian translations of Buddhist writings, and several important Tibetan Buddhist works. And, in making it possible for his set of the Shanghai edition of the Chi-sha Tripitaka to come to Princeton, Dr. Hu simultaneously made a further generous gesture for which the Buddhist scholar (as well as the student of the history of Chinese printing) will have great reason to be grateful to him, for his copy of the work contains, in his clear and elegant calligraphy, innumerable marginal notes, representing the results of Dr. Hu's long and intensive

comparative study of the two sets while he was curator of the Gest collection in the years 1950-1952. Most of these notes have not been used by Dr. Hu in his published scholarly writings, and they greatly enhance the already immense value of this most recent addition to the Gest Library's Buddhist collection.—F. W. MOTE

A COLLECTION OF ORCHID BOOKS

Flower prints and books have two aspects: the first in the science of botany as the basis for a technical classification of a species and the second for their obvious decorative merit. A collection of books and prints on one floral species, the orchid, recently received by the Library as the bequest of Gordon L. Harris ’16, well demonstrates both functions. The extent and variety of Orchidaceae of the nineteenth century as represented in this “orchid library” recall the tulipomania of the seventeenth century and anticipate the rose cult of modern floriculture.

John Lindley’s Serotum Orchideum, London, 1888, James Bateman’s The Orchidaceae of Mexico & Guatemala, London [1848], and Frederick Sander’s four volumes of Reichenbachia, St. Albans, 1888-94, are all extensively produced folio albums of hand-colored lithographs, displaying an exotic garden of nineteenth-century Orchidaceae, many of which have now been lost to cultivation. The earliest book in the collection, Lindley’s Serotum Orchideum, has lithographed plates after a frequently found flower painter known only as Miss Drake. Lindley’s book, a “Wreath of East Indian Orchidaceae,” marks the opening of Himalayan travel by adventurous botanists, and with other books in the collection is a floral reminder of the prevailing romantic taste for the exotic. Among the numerous flower books of the nineteenth century, Bateman’s Orchidaceae of Mexico & Guatemala is outstanding both for sheer size and for the beauty of its plates. The fine hand-colored lithographs are again paintings by Miss Drake, and are supplemented by two delightful vignettes by George Cruikshank, one of which caricatures the librarian’s nightmare represented by this seventy-four-centimeter elephant folio (see reproduction). The paintings in this folio are particularly fine both scientifically and artistically, and the technical quality of the lithographed plates could hardly be surpassed. The newly perfected medium of lithography was ideally suited to such lavish botanical illustration as is represented in this group of orchid books. With other, more illustrious, lithographed technical illustration of the period, Audubon’s Quadrupeds or Edward Lear’s Parrots, they are examples of a highly successful collaboration of scientist, artist, and printmaker.—DALE ROYLANE

A MEMORIAL TO RICHARD F. FENNELLY ’60

The sudden death of Richard F. Fennelly ’60 at the end of last summer in an airline disaster moved his friends and classmates to establish some sort of memorial. His interests lay in athletics, the classics, and especially in photography. His untiring photographic work for The Daily Princetonian, of which he was chairman of photography, and his interest in photographic journalism have inspired the annual award by The Daily Princetonian of a prize and a silver cup to the undergraduate who has most significantly contributed to journalistic photography on the campus. In addition a substantial fund was raised by undergraduates to buy contemporary photographic books as a memorial to Richard Fennelly. So far, more than fifty books and prints have been purchased. These have been placed in the Graphic Arts Room. They represent the very best contemporary books on and by photographers, the history of photography, and books illustrated by great photographers. The books include Peter Pollack’s The Picture History of Photography, the Newhall’s Masters of Photography, books by Carrier-Bresson, Strand, Bischof, Schultheiss, and Ivis. The Li-
brary was also fortunate in acquiring for the collection an early print of a portrait by David Octavius Hill taken about 1845. Hill, one of the earliest photographers, remains one of the greatest portrait photographers of all time. A selection of these books and prints, with photographs taken by Fennelly himself, was exhibited in the Graphic Arts Room during January and February.

Biblia

DEVOTED TO THE INTERESTS OF
THE FRIENDS
OF THE PRINCETON LIBRARY
Volume XXX, Number 2
Winter 1959

THE COUNCIL

Henry E. Gerstley '30 has been appointed a member of the Council, to fill the vacancy resulting from the death of Saxe Commins.

MEMBERSHIP

At the meeting of the Council of the Friends of the Princeton Library on December 10, 1958, Richard M. Huber '45, Chairman of the Membership Committee, reported that membership in the Friends had increased from 805 in December, 1957 to 852 in December, 1958.

CONTRIBUTIONS

Since the previous report in the Chronicle the Library has received a total of $1,210.00 as contributions from Friends. Mrs. Roy Arthur Hunt and Kenneth H. Rockey '16 contributed toward the purchase of the autograph manuscript of Bulwer-Lytton's novel Eugene Aram. From Willard Thorp came an addition to the capital of the Margaret and Willard Thorp Fund. A contribution from Jack Weller '56 was credited to the Operating Account.

The latest issue of Needs (No. 10) has brought in so far contributions totaling $1,077.00.
GIFTS

Elmer Adler has given the quintessentially decorated birth certificate of one Tobias Steier, 1835, printed in Allentown, Pennsylvania, by H. Ebner and Company. From Carlos Baker has come the typescript of his novel, *A Friend in Power* (1958). Sinclair Hamilton '08 has added more than fifty items to the Hamilton Collection of American Illustrated Books. Among these is a file of the scarce humorous periodical *The John-Donkey*, January 1 to August 12, 1888, which contains illustrations by F. O. C. Darley, Herman W. Liebert has presented a copy of the first edition of Christopher Smart's *On the Power of the Supreme Being*, Cambridge, 1754. Charles G. Osgood has given four letters written by Woodrow Wilson '79 and two manuscript items of Henry Van Dyke '73. Kenneth H. Rock '16 has added approximately 150 volumes to the Rockey Angling Collection. His recent additions to the collection have included many books on the subject of skin diving. An original copperplate for Fevertre de Saint-Mimin's engraved "physiognotrace" portrait of Thomas Jefferson, 1804, the gift of Charles Scribner, Jr. '43, will be the subject of an article in a future issue of the *Chronicle*. A copy of the first American edition of Mark Twain's *The Adventures of Tom Sawyer*, London, 1876, which precedes the American first edition, has been given by Robert H. Taylor '30. Louis C. Wese has presented fourteen European and South American gold coins.
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