

## AN ANSWER TO A SCURRILOUS PAMPHLET

### Textual and Historical Introduction

*An Answer to a Scurrilous Pamphlet, Lately Printed, Intituled, A Letter from Monsieur de Cros, to the Lord [William Cavendish, fourth Earl of Devonshire]*, printed in 1693, is the first prose work which Swift published. The evidence for his authorship is indirect but persuasive. The pamphlet formed part of a controversy which followed the anonymous publication of Sir William Temple's *Memoirs of What Past in Christendom, from the War begun 1672 to the Peace Concluded 1679* in 1692.<sup>1</sup> The particular passage in Temple's *Memoirs* which precipitated the controversy occurs in his narrative of the events which had taken place in the summer of 1678, during his third embassy to Holland.<sup>2</sup> Temple was the senior of the three ambassadors sent by Charles II in 1675 to act as mediators at the Congress of Nijmegen.<sup>3</sup> In the long drawn-out proceedings, the French and Swedes were negotiating with the Dutch, the Spanish, the Empire and allied states

<sup>1</sup> (London: by R. R. for Ric. Chiswell, 1692). Actually published on 30 November 1691 (*The Term Catalogues*, ed. Arber, II, 379). The attribution to Temple was made, in flattering terms, as early as *The Works of the Learned* (November 1691), pp. 177-78.

<sup>2</sup> For this and what follows, see Homer E. Woodbridge, *Sir William Temple: The Man and his Work* (New York: The Modern Language Association of America, and London: Oxford University Press, 1940), pp. 169-82.

<sup>3</sup> See David L. T. Woolley's Introduction to *Swift, Temple, and the Du Cros Affair, Part I: "An Answer to a Scurrilous Pamphlet" (1693) and "Lettre de Monsieur Du Cros, à Mylord \*\*\*\*\*" (1693)*, The Augustan Reprint Society, nos 239-240 (Los Angeles: William Andrews Clark Memorial Library, 1986), pp. iii and ixn2. This Introduction is based on David Woolley's pioneering essay, "The Authorship of *An Answer to a Scurrilous Pamphlet*," *Reading Swift* (1985), pp. 321-35, which drew on the largely unprinted archives of the major politicians and diplomats involved in the proceedings. The following account is indebted to both of these.

including Denmark to settle the general war which Louis XIV's expansionist policies had initiated with the French invasion of Holland and the Spanish Netherlands in March 1672.<sup>4</sup> At first, Charles II was committed to supporting Louis in this attack on the Dutch. His personal pro-French attitude had found expression in the Treaty of Dover, signed on 1 June 1670, whose secret clauses stipulated Charles's conversion to Roman Catholicism but also secured him an annual pension by Louis. The separate Anglo-Dutch peace Treaty of Westminster, however, removed England from the war in 1674.<sup>5</sup> Thereafter, matters went rather less well in the field for Louis than the efficiency and highly organized state of his army seemed to guarantee at the outset. The Dutch were not crushed, and the brilliant French marshal, Henri de Latour d'Auvergne, Vicomte de Turenne (\*1611), was killed in action in 1675,<sup>6</sup> a loss which occasioned "unspeakable

<sup>4</sup> Richard Faber, *The Brave Courtier: Sir William Temple* (London: Faber and Faber, 1983), pp. 41-47.

<sup>5</sup> The Third Anglo-Dutch War (1672-74) was part of the larger Franco-Dutch War (1672-78) fought by France, Sweden, and England, among others, against the United Provinces. Although England, the Dutch Republic, and Sweden had entered into the Triple Alliance against France in 1668, the secret Treaty of Dover with France forced Charles into joining the French attack on the United Provinces on 28 March 1672 (O.S.). However, since the Royal Navy was frustrated several times in its attempts to blockade the Dutch coast and Charles lacked the funds to continue the war, the Treaty of Westminster of 19 February 1674 ended hostilities between England and the United Provinces after less than two years (David Ogg, *Europe in the Seventeenth Century*, 8th ed. [London: Adam and Charles Black, 1967], p. 433).

<sup>6</sup> Andrew Michael Ramsay, *The History of Henri de La Tour d'Auvergne, Viscount de Turenne, Marshal General of France* (London: James Bettenham, 1735), p. 485. A French edition of this largely hagiographic biography, published in the same year, was in Swift's library (PASSMANN AND VIENKEN III, 1582-84). For a recent discussion of this "Turennapaedia," see Georg Eckert, *"True, Noble, Christian Freethinking": Leben und Werk Andrew Michael Ramsays (1686-1743)* (Münster: Aschendorff, 2009), pp. 516-49. Swift mentioned Turenne in "The Description of a Salamander" (*Poems*, ed. Williams, I, 83, l. 19).

astonishment in the *French Camp*.<sup>7</sup> However, Louis was able not only to count on a powerful military establishment but also on a superb diplomatic corps, to whose task it now fell to secure the north-eastern frontier which Louis had failed to establish by fighting. The objective of French foreign diplomacy was to exploit the differences between the confederates by consistent, coherent, and directed action and to negotiate separate treaties favourable to France. By a series of secret agreements, Louis successfully kept Charles disengaged from the negotiations. In the treaties which made up the “French Peace” at Nijmegen, signed at the end of 1678 and in 1679, Louis gained Franche-Comté and the series of towns fortified as a barrier to French expansion.<sup>8</sup> At the same time, Sir William Temple sought to engage Charles in the negotiations at Nijmegen, indeed, to make him the arbiter of a general peace in Europe. His objectives were to bind England to Holland in order to prevent the States from concluding a separate peace with the French, and, by forcing a general peace at the Congress, to ensure that the French met, and satisfied, the united opposition of the confederates. But, as Sir William later ruefully admitted, the professionalism of his diplomatic opponents, eventually outmanoeuvred the English side:

I must again conclude the Conduct of *France* to have been admirable in the whole course of this Affair [the negotiations at Nijmegen], and the *Italian Proverb* to continue true, *Che gle Francesi pazzi sono morti* [The *French* Fools are dead]. On the contrary, our Councils and Conduct were like those of a floating Island, driven one way or t’other according to the Winds or Tides. The King’s dispositions inclin’d him to preserve his Measures with *France*, and consequently to promote a Peace which might break the present Confederacy. The humour of his People and Parliament was violent towards engaging him in a War; the Ministers were wavering between the fears of making their Court ill, or of drawing

<sup>7</sup> *Memoirs of What Past in Christendom*, pp. 113-14; see also Sir William Temple, *Letters to the King, the Prince of Orange, the Chief Ministers of State, and Other Persons* (London: Tim. Goodwin and Benj. Tooke, 1703), p. 142.

<sup>8</sup> Thomas Peregrine Courtenay, *Memoirs of the Life, Works, and Correspondence of Sir William Temple, Bart.*, 2 vols (London: Longman, et al., 1836), II, 472-79.

upon them the heats of a House of Commons, whom the King's Expences made him always in need of.<sup>9</sup>

In July 1678, Temple was at The Hague awaiting a messenger from London with the ratification of a treaty of defensive alliance, which he had negotiated between England and Holland.<sup>10</sup> This alliance was designed to strengthen the position of William of Orange and the war party in Holland, and to weaken the powerful camp which wished to sign a separate peace with France at more or less any price, on the grounds that the war was hopeless, that France could not be stopped, and that it did not wish to harm Dutch mercantile interests.

However, during the previous year, Charles had reneged on his secret agreement with Louis by giving permission for the marriage between his niece Mary and the Staadt-Holder William, which Temple, with the support of Lord Treasurer Danby, had arranged to strengthen the confederacy against France.<sup>11</sup> Meanwhile, the French negotiators at Nijmegen demanded that their ally Sweden should receive back territory it had lost after its shock defeat by the Elector of Brandenburg in 1675, before any further agreement on a general peace could be reached. At this critical juncture of affairs, Charles sent not the ratified treaty but an obscure diplomatic adventurer and confidence trickster, Joseph August Du Cros ([1640]-1728),<sup>12</sup> with instructions to Temple to repair immediately to Nijmegen.<sup>13</sup> The King, Sir

<sup>9</sup> *Memoirs of What Past in Christendom*, pp. 351-52.

<sup>10</sup> *Letters to the King*, pp. 385-86, 392-94.

<sup>11</sup> *Memoirs of What Past in Christendom*, pp. 292-97. See also *The Entering Book of Roger Morrice, 1677-1691*, eds Mark Goldie, *et al.*, 7 vols (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2007-9), II, 59.

<sup>12</sup> For Du Cros's biography, see the undated nineteenth-century monograph by the German historian Harry Breßlau, *Joseph August du Cros: ein diplomatischer Abenteurer aus dem Zeitalter Ludwig's XIV* ([s. l.], [before 1921]), the same author's article on Du Cros in *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, V (Leipzig: Duncker and Humblot, 1877), 446-49, as well as the précis by Hermann Kellenbenz in *Neue Deutsche Biographie*, IV (Berlin: Duncker, 1959), 152-53.

<sup>13</sup> *Letters to the King*, p. 418. See also the letter, dated 27 May/6 June 1692, by Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz to Heinrich Avemann: "Postea a Rege ad Templum

William was told, had agreed with Louis on terms for the peace, and had, by the mediation of Du Cros,<sup>14</sup> persuaded the Swedes not to stand out for the restitution of their territory but to accept instead Charles's good offices in gaining this at a later date. In an act of calculated indiscretion, Du Cros made his instructions public, both at The Hague and Nijmegen. This development made Temple's errand useless, as he relates in a letter of 30 August 1678 (N.S.) to the Duke of Ormond:

*De Cros* came to me, and told me, the King had taken this Measure with *Monsieur Barillon*, and sent an Express over with it into *France*. That he was resolved upon the Peace, and to that purpose had hastned me away to *Nimeguen*; whether he (*De Cros*) hoped to attend me. I told him, he knew his own Times and Motions; and that I should govern my self in mine, by my Orders and his Majesty's Intentions, as far as I understood them. And so we parted.<sup>15</sup>

The situation was a galling one for Temple on several counts. For one thing, it marked the end of his diplomatic career. His policy of supporting the Dutch in the war against France did not have Charles's support, even in appearance, thus destroying his credit as negotiator. For another, it removed the last possibility for Charles to be taken seriously as a mediator, the important mover in the European balance of power that Temple wished him to be.<sup>16</sup> Finally, there were other, more private considerations which were rooted in Du Cros's personality.

---

Noviomagi agentem nova mandata attulerat quibus Regem animo mutato remisisse a fervore apparebat" (Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz, *Sämtliche Schriften und Briefe*, ed. Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften [Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1923-], I, viii, 281 [no 163] [cited as AA by series, volume, and page]).

<sup>14</sup> Temple told Lord Treasurer Danby in a letter of August 1678 that he had been kept completely in the dark about Du Cros's overtures (*Letters to the King*, pp. 407-8). As David Woolley points out, King Charles torpedoed "the proposed Anglo-Dutch treaty at the very moment Temple was sweating to put it together" ("The Authorship of *An Answer to a Scurrilous Pamphlet*," p. 325).

<sup>15</sup> *Letters to the King*, p. 466.

<sup>16</sup> *Letters to the King*, p. 414.

Joseph August Du Cros was descended from a Gascon family of lawyers and educated as a monk. Having vainly tried his fortune in France as an *abbé*, he later pursued a career as a French double agent in the pay of the French envoys Henri de Massue, Marquis de Ruvigny and Paul Barillon, concurrently with his employment as a diplomatic contact man for various German princes.<sup>17</sup> He also converted to Protestantism and married, as his first wife, Clara Urry, or Urie (1650-1702), the daughter of Sir John Urry, a professional soldier, who took an active if ambiguous part in the Civil Wars in England and Scotland, and who died as a royalist general in 1650.<sup>18</sup> In 1678, Du Cros was claiming diplomatic status as the agent of a minor potentate, the Duke of Holstein-Gottorp,<sup>19</sup> himself but a pawn in the European power game.<sup>20</sup>

Du Cros's meddling offended the ceremonious Temple.<sup>21</sup> His false professionalism appeared a threat to Sir William's own hard-won status, personal credit, and expertise as a diplomat. He had encountered Du Cros earlier and clearly was not prejudiced in his favour. Writing to Sir Joseph

<sup>17</sup> In a letter to Landgrave Ernst von Hessen-Rheinfels of 21/31 March 1692, Leibniz described Du Cros as "autrefois moine de l'Ordre de S'Dominique, puis fut employé par les Suedois en Angleterre, et s'estoit insinué auprez de M<sup>r</sup> Barillon, et par après envoyé par le Roy de Dannemarc en Pologne ... et qui se trouve maintenant depuis quelques jours en nostre Cour" (AA, I, vii, 297 [no 146]).

<sup>18</sup> Sources and references are presented s.v. "*'Tis a Petticoat*, continues he" (p. 20, ll. 33-36).

<sup>19</sup> In his letter of 27 May/6 June 1692 to Heinrich Avemann, Leibniz described Du Cros as a "legate" of the Duke of Holstein-Gottorp: "Fuerat ille Gottorpiensis ad Carolum II. ablegatus" (AA, I, viii, 281 [no 163]). Du Cros had been made envoy-extraordinary of the Duke of Holstein-Gottorp some time between 23 January and 30 March 1677 (see Breßlau, *Joseph August du Cros*, p. 9 and n2).

<sup>20</sup> The most accessible modern account of the Congress will be found in Paul Otto Höynck, *Frankreich und seine Gegner auf dem Nymwegener Friedenskongress* (Bonn: Ludwig Röhrscheid, 1960), particularly pp. 24-64, 138-56.

<sup>21</sup> According to Leibniz, who, however, was presumably fed by Du Cros himself, Temple was so enraged that he offended Du Cros "with unkind words": "Ea occasione Templius Ducrosio ut apparet infensus, inmitibus verbis virum lacescit" (AA, I, viii, 281 [no 163]).



Williamson, Secretary of State since 1674, from The Hague, 12 May 1676 (N.S.), Temple reports:

[The Pensioner] replied, That [he] himself had read a Letter from the Princess of *Courland*, wherein she says, that *de Cros* (who, it seems, had been formerly a Servant to the Prince her Husband) had writ him a Letter, upon his coming to *Copenhagen*, wherein he told him, That he came thither with a Commission, and Instructions, from his Majesty, to negotiate a separate Peace between that Crown and *Sweden*. I excused my self from believing, That either his Majesty would enter into any separate mediation; or, if he did, that he would chuse a Person for it, who would tell his Commission where it was not necessary.<sup>22</sup>

At that moment, Temple was profoundly irritated by what he justifiably felt to be Charles's betrayal, and the King's failure to distinguish between his honest, principled service and advice, and the worthless busy-bodding of Du Cros. His exasperation is seen in all his accounts of the affair: in his official correspondence;<sup>23</sup> in his letters to his Irish connection, James Butler, the great Duke of Ormonde;<sup>24</sup> and finally in his *Memoirs of What Past in Christendom*, whose paragraphs were constructed from his letters,<sup>25</sup> not to forget the occasion of the reply from Du Cros himself.

Following hard on Du Cros's crass, humiliating, and destructive intervention in Holland on Saturday, 16 August 1678 (N.S.), Temple received orders to exchange the ratification of the now useless treaty. As a result, he decided to retire from his service:

For my own part, I was never so amazed as to receive this Ratification of the Treaty, and Orders to exchange it. For, upon Mr. *de Cros's* Journey, and all he said at the *Hague* and *Nimeguen* upon it; as if it were on purpose to spread it both here and there; I did believe the King had taken his absolute Measures with *France*; that he was resolved not to ratify the Treaty here; and sent me away to *Nimeguen*, only to

<sup>22</sup> Quoted from the expanded edition of *Letters to the King*, in *The Works of Sir William Temple, Bart.*, 2 vols (London: A. Churchill, *et al.*, 1720), II, 399 (not in the edition published by Swift in 1703).

<sup>23</sup> See, for example, his letter to Secretary Williamson, 5 August 1678 (N.S.), *Letters to the King*, pp. 411-15.

<sup>24</sup> 30 August and 23 September 1678 (N.S.), *Letters to the King*, pp. 463-78 and 501-3.

<sup>25</sup> Ample evidence for this is provided in numerous lemmata of the commentary.

have me gone from hence, for the Reasons *Monsieur Colbert* gave for my Orders to go; *A cause que je ne faisois que du mal icy*. Besides, Mr. *de Cros* told them and others here, that all the Measures concerning the Peace were agreed by his Majesty, your Lordship, *Monsieur Barillon*, and him ... How all this was to agree with my Treaty here, and Powers to negotiate with the Confederates, made, I confess, my Head turn round, and seemed to hang together like Ropes of Sand ... *Monsieur Olivecrants* [one of the Swedish ambassadors at Nijmegen] alone told me ... that this whole Intrigue of *de Cros* was an arrant Comedy. For my own part, I wish it were so, but the Effects are more than ridiculous, and I doubt have shaken his Majesty's Credit more than was to be wished at this time ... I have ... very plainly said to the *Dutch* Ambassadors and others, that it was downright *fourberie* of *de Cros* ... Well, I can say no more, but that it has so broke my Head, that I think it will not be right again: And I must beg of your Lordship, that you will please let his Majesty know that I grow old and infirm, and am not fit for these sudden Commands.<sup>26</sup>

Although perhaps minor in itself, the affair caused Sir William intense personal pain. Lady Giffard's *Life* testifies to this, and it goes without saying that Swift would have been familiar with all its details:

One de Cros was sent from our Court into Holland with an arrant, that damped all the good humor y<sup>e</sup> Treaty had given them their [there], & the life it had put into all their affairs, but this I cannot take upon me to relate no more then S<sup>r</sup> W T astonishment at such sudden & surpriseing changes wch the true spring off was not then discern'd but had happen'd soe often that it begun to give him a distast to the thoughts of all publick employments.<sup>27</sup>

When Temple's *Memoirs of What Past in Christendom* appeared late in 1691, ostensibly without authorization, three lengthy paragraphs reverted to the issue:

Then arrived from *England* one *De Cros*, formerly a *French* Monk, who some time since had left his Frock for a Petticoat, and insinuated himself so far in the *Suedish* Court, as to procure a Commission (or Credence at least) for a certain petty Agency in *England*. At *London* he had devoted himself wholly to *Monsieur Barillon* the *French* Ambassador, tho' pretending to pursue the Interests of *Sueden*. About a week after I had sent a Secretary into *England* with the Treaty Signed, This Man brought me a Packet from Court, Commanding me to go immediately away to *Nimeguen*, and there to endeavour all I could (and from His Majesty) to persuade the *Suedish* Ambassadors to let the *French* there know, That they would, for the

<sup>26</sup> Letter to Lord Treasurer Danby, 16 August 1678 (N.S.), *Letters to the King*, pp. 439-42.

<sup>27</sup> *The Early Essays and Romances of Sir William Temple Bt*, ed. G. C. Moore Smith (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1930), pp. 19-20.



good of *Christendom*, consent, and even desire the King of *France* no longer to defer the Evacuation of the Towns, and consequently the Peace upon the sole regard and interest of the Crown of *Sueden*. I was likewise Commanded to assure the said Ambassadors, that after this Peace His Majesty would use all the most effectual endeavours He could, for restitution of the Towns and Countries the *Suedes* had lost in the War.

It was not easie for any man to be more surprized than I was by this Dispatch; but the Pensioner *Fagel* was stunned, who came and told me the whole Contents of it, before I had mentioned it to any man; and that *De Cros* had gone about most industriously to the Deputies of the several Towns, and acquainted them with it; and that the Terms of the Peace were absolutely consented, and agreed, between the two Kings; that he had brought me orders to go strait to *Nimeguen*, and that I should at my arrival there, meet with Letters from my Lord *Sunderland*, the King's Ambassador at *Paris*, with all the Particulars concluded between them.

How this Dispatch by *De Cros* was gained, or by whom, I will not pretend to determine; but upon my next return for *England*, the Duke told me, That He knew nothing of it, till it was gone, having been a Hunting that morning; My Lord Treasurer said all that could be to excuse himself of it; and I never talked of it to Secretary *Williamson*; but the King indeed told me pleasantly, *that the Rogue De Cros had outwitted them all*. The Account I met with at Court was, That these Orders were agreed and dispatched one morning in an hours time, and in the Dutchess of *Portsmouth's* Chamber by the intervention and pursuit of Monsieur *Barillon*. However it was, and what endeavours soever were made immediately after, at our Court, to retrieve this Game, it never could be done; and this one Incident changed the whole Fate of Christendom; and with so little seeming ground for any such Counsel, that before *De Cros's* arrival at the *Hague*, the *Suedish* Ambassadors at *Nimeguen* had made the very same Declaration and Instances to the *French* Ambassadors there, that I was posted away from the *Hague* upon the pretence of persuading them to resolve on.<sup>28</sup>

Given his chance, Du Cros did not let the opportunity slip either to attempt to blackmail some of the principals involved or to profit by a pamphlet.<sup>29</sup> But he was also genuinely stung to the quick by Temple's portrait. His concern

<sup>28</sup> *Memoirs of What Past in Christendom*, pp. 335-37.

<sup>29</sup> In his Introduction to *Swift, Temple, and the Du Cros Affair, Part I*, David Woolley assumes that Du Cros first encountered his unflattering portrait not in the English original but in a French translation of Temple's *Memoirs* (p. v). This assumption can now be confirmed by a letter which Du Cros wrote to Leibniz from Hamburg in May 1692 and in which he refers to the precise page 382 of the French translation published at The Hague in 1692 (AA, I, viii, 255 [no 151]; Woodbridge, *Sir William Temple: The Man and his Work*, p. 336).

for the loss of his reputation shows most clearly in a letter he wrote from Hamburg to the philosopher Leibniz in May 1692:

[Mons. Temple] me traite en la maniere que vous pourrés lire dans ses *Mémoires* et dans la letre que j'ai écrite à Monsieur le Comte de Devonshire sur ce sujet ... j'ai voulu vous envoyer Monsieur la copie de cette letre à Mylord Devonshire laquelle je fairai aussi imprimer, elle pourra servir cependant à faire juger combien le procedé de Mons. Temple est plein de malice.<sup>30</sup>

In the light of new evidence, the copy of Du Cros's letter to the Earl of Devonshire, which was enclosed in his letter to Leibniz, turns out to be a first draft of the printed *Lettre de Monsieur de Cros* (1692).<sup>31</sup> Leibniz not only encouraged Du Cros to publish his remarks on Temple's *Memoirs*,<sup>32</sup> he also wrote to many of his acquaintances, telling them about Du Cros's concern, and forwarded Du Cros's letter to the Earl of Devonshire to numerous correspondents throughout Europe.<sup>33</sup> At the same time, Du Cros buttonholed a young diplomat, George Stepney, who had been appointed by Charles II to a series of posts in Germany in the middle of 1692. As one of Stepney's letter books, in which eight letters concerning the affair are

<sup>30</sup> AA, I, viii, 255 (no 151); also published, with facsimile and transcription, in Kirsten Juhas, "Du Cros, Leibniz, and *An Answer to a Scurrilous Pamphlet*: New Light on Sir William Temple's French Adversary," *Swift Studies*, 25 (2010), 7-55 (pp. 13-16).

<sup>31</sup> Juhas, "Du Cros, Leibniz, and *An Answer to a Scurrilous Pamphlet*," pp. 7-55. Du Cros's draft letter to the Earl of Devonshire, which provides new relevant insights into the genesis of the source text for *An Answer to a Scurrilous Pamphlet*, is now in possession of the Gottfried Wilhelm Leipzig Bibliothek/Niedersächsische Landesbibliothek Hannover (MS XXX Bl. 68-73).

<sup>32</sup> See Leibniz's letters to Avemann, dated 27 May/6 June ("Ego hortatus sum ut in Apologia condenda pergat" [AA, I, viii, 281 {no 163}]), and to Lorenz Hertel, 29 May/8 June 1692 ("J'ay exhorté Mons. du Cros à achever son Apologie, et je l'ay assuré qu'il y aura mille Anglois qui en seront bien aises, contre un qui en sera fâché" [AA, I, viii, 4 {no 3}]).

<sup>33</sup> A copy of Du Cros's letter to the Earl of Devonshire that Leibniz sent to his friend Lorenz Hertel at Wolfenbüttel on 29 May/8 June 1692 is held by the Herzog August Bibliothek, Wolfenbüttel (Cod. Guelf. 363 Novi, Nr. 71).

preserved, shows,<sup>34</sup> Stepney alerted Temple on 6 June 1692 (O.S.) about Du Cros's intentions to make an issue of his appearance in *Memoirs of What Past in Christendom*: "I presume you will allow me the Liberty of acquainting you that M<sup>r</sup> Du Cros of whom you make mention in your late memoirs is greatly Scandaliz'd at the account you give of him ... and that he is resolv'd (come what will) to be invective against you."<sup>35</sup> On 21 June 1692 (O.S.), Du Cros himself sent Temple a theatrical declaration of war.<sup>36</sup> Sir William replied to Stepney on 24 June (O.S.), before he had received Du Cros's letter. Speaking rather *de haut en bas*, he seemed to belittle Stepney's disinterested assistance, characteristically asserting:

I have not lived so as to be sensible of such injuries, as you mention from your friend, any more than to have deserv'd 'Em from any Body, but do much acknowledge your kindness in all you intended by this dispatch or else I shou'd not have given you and my self this trouble, after having been long ill, and much longer dis-used this kind of Commerce, even with my nearest friends.<sup>37</sup>

In his self-defence, Temple reiterated to Stepney what had already been emphasized in the publisher's Preface to *Memoirs of What Past in Christendom* (sig. A2r), "that the Book you mention was so far from being published by me or with my knowledge."<sup>38</sup> Accordingly, at Cleves, Stepney drew on this argument to persuade the enraged Du Cros "to Let fall his resentment for what had pass'd into the press without [Sir William's] knowledge." However, in his final letter on the subject, dated 17 September (O.S.), Stepney admitted defeat, all his efforts to pacify Du Cros having been to no avail. At the same time, he regretfully informed Temple that his opponent had progressed from hand-written letters into print,<sup>39</sup> adding the

<sup>34</sup> Public Record Office, London: State Papers Foreign, Archives of British Legations, SP 105/50 (*Correspondence*, ed. Woolley, I, 114-15 and nn); first printed in *Swift, Temple, and the Du Cros Affair, Part 1*, ed. Woolley, pp. xi-xvii.

<sup>35</sup> *Swift, Temple, and the Du Cros Affair, Part 1*, ed. Woolley, p. xii.

<sup>36</sup> *Correspondence*, ed. Woolley, I, 113-14.

<sup>37</sup> *Swift, Temple, and the Du Cros Affair, Part 1*, ed. Woolley, p. xiv.

<sup>38</sup> *Swift, Temple, and the Du Cros Affair, Part 1*, ed. Woolley, p. xiii.

<sup>39</sup> See also Leibniz's letter to Antonio Magliabechi, Hannover, 25 September/5 October 1692: "Du Crosius Gallius scripsit contra Templii Angli olim Legati

warning that Du Cros was busy distributing copies of his printed letter “about all Courts where he [had] any Interest or acquaintance,” and that “so many Copies [were] already given out, that ... there [was] no possibility of Suppressing them.” To enable Sir William to judge for himself, Stepney enclosed a copy he had procured, with apologies, “that you may read your self, rather than hear from others the little he has to say against you.”<sup>40</sup>

The printed *Lettre de Monsieur de Cros* is a quarto of 26 pages and the first of five printed items in the controversy:

*Lettre de Monsieur de Cros, A Mylord \*\*\*. Afin de servir de réponse, aux impostures de Monsieur de Chevalier Temple, cy devant Ambassadeur d'Angleterre, a la Haye & a Nimegue. En attendant une relation plus ample & plus particulaire, de l'affair, dont il s'agit, avec des remarques sur ses memoires, pour faire voir, combine grossièrement il se trompe, dans la plupart des choses les plus importantes, qu'il rapporte, sur ce qui s'est passe depuis 1672, jusqu'en 1679* (Cologne, 1692)<sup>41</sup> (copy in Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris).

This was followed by an octavo of 63 pages in the following year:

*Lettre de Monsieur Du Cros, à Mylord \*\*\*\*. Afin de servir de réponse, aux impostures de Monsieur le Chevalier Temple ... sur ce qui s'est passé depuis 1672, jusqu'en 1679* (Cologne, 1693) (copy in British Library).<sup>42</sup>

In the same year, an anonymous 33-page English translation of the pamphlet came out. The same setting of the text is found with variant title pages. Abel Roper, who is referred to in the first title page, was presumably the original proprietor of the copy, and the second title page would be designed for wider distribution:

---

commentarios rerum ab anno 1672 ad 1679 gestarum ... mihi MS. nunc editum misit” (AA, I, viii, 459 [no 274]).

<sup>40</sup> *Swift, Temple, and the Du Cros Affair, Part 1*, ed. Woolley, pp. xvi-xvii.

<sup>41</sup> For the ‘veracity’ of the Cologne imprints, see Woolley, “The Authorship of *An Answer to a Scurrilous Pamphlet*,” p. 321n1. To judge by the date, it is this ‘Cologne’ edition that Stepney sent to Moor Park.

<sup>42</sup> See the facsimile reprint in *Swift, Temple, and the Du Cros Affair, Part 1*, ed. Woolley.

*A Letter from Monsieur de Cros (Who was an Ambassador at the Treaty of Nimeguen, and a Resident at England, in K. Charles the Second's Reign) to the Lord — Being an Answer to Sir W<sup>m</sup> Temple's Memoirs, concerning what Passed from the Year 1672, until the Year 1679* (London: Printed for Abel Roper at the Mitre, near Temple-Bar, 1693) (Wing D2437).

*A Letter from Monsieur de Cros (Who Was an Ambassador at the Treaty of Nimeguen, and a Resident in England, in K. Ch. the Second's Reign) Which May Serve for an Answer to the Impostures of Sir W<sup>m</sup> Temple, heretofore Ambassador from England at The Hague, and at Nimeguen; till Such Time as a More Ample and Particular Relation be Made of the Business in Hand: Together with Some Remarks upon his Memoirs, to Make Appear How Grosly he is Mistaken in the Greatest Part of the Most Important Matters he Relates concerning What Passed from the Year 1672 until the Year 1679* (London: Printed in the Year 1693) (Wing D2436).

Each of these includes four additional pages of “An Advertisement concerning the Foregoing Letter,” sneering at Temple’s egotism and style.

In February 1693, *An Answer to a Scurrilous Pamphlet*, an octavo pamphlet of 48 pages, appeared anonymously:

*An Answer to a Scurrilous Pamphlet, Lately Printed, Intituled, A Letter from Monsieur de Cros, to the Lord —* (London: Randal Taylor, 1693) (Wing T635).<sup>43</sup>

Its publisher Randal Taylor, “near *Stationers-Hall*,” had been in business since the Restoration with a sizeable annual output.<sup>44</sup> Although nothing is known about his affiliation with either Sir William Temple or Swift, and although he never published anything else by either of them, his business relationships form a nexus which includes the names of all of Swift’s chief printing and publishing agents throughout his subsequent career, *viz.*

<sup>43</sup> For the date of publication, see *The Term Catalogues*, II, 442. Charles Hatton bought a copy on or before 23 February 1693 (*Correspondence of the Family of Hatton, 1601-1704*, ed. Edward Maunde Thompson, 2 vols [London: Camden Society, 1965 [1878]], II, 190-91). There is a facsimile reprint in *Swift, Temple, and the Du Cros Affair, Part I*, ed. Woolley.

<sup>44</sup> This and the following information is provided by Michael Treadwell, “London Trade Publishers, 1675-1750,” *The Library*, 6th ser., 4 (1982), 99-134. Taylor’s turbulent career as Beadle of the Stationers’ Company from 1674 to 1692 is discussed by Cyprian Blagden, *The Stationers’ Company: A History, 1403-1959* (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1960), pp. 161-62.

Benjamin Tooke, Sr and Jr, John Nutt, John Morphew, and Benjamin Motte. In other words, if it was indeed Swift who sent *An Answer to a Scurrilous Pamphlet* for publication in 1693, he chose a long-established bookseller from outside Temple's regular circle and then, in effect, 'stayed with the firm' when his own literary career commenced in 1701. A few printing errors, which include one in the French epigraph from Vaugelas on the title page, and three in the French distich (p. 25) quoted from Du Cros's *Lettre*, suggest that the author did not see proof. Its page references show that *An Answer to a Scurrilous Pamphlet* is based on the octavo edition of Du Cros's *Lettre*.<sup>45</sup>

Finally, with the imprimatur of 21 April 1693 by Edward Cooke, a 40-page pamphlet, which really consists of two, concluded the controversy:

*Reflections upon Two Pamphlets Lately Published: One Called, A Letter from Monsieur de Cros, concerning the Memoirs of Christendom, and the Other, An Answer to that Letter. Pretended to Have Been Written by the Author of the Said Memoirs. By a Lover of Truth* (London: Printed for Richard Baldwin, near the Oxford-Arms in Warwick-Lane, 1693) (ESTC R220579).<sup>46</sup>

Although continuously paged, the first pamphlet of 32 pages is an answer to Du Cros's *Lettre*. Page 33 is a separate title page, *Reflections upon an Answer*, which introduces a commentary on *An Answer to a Scurrilous Pamphlet*. The text of this latter part begins: "WHEN the foregoing Papers were finished, and just ready for the Press, I was surprized to hear that Sir W. T. himself had thought fit (contrary to what I had conjectured in the first

<sup>45</sup> One example will have to suffice. When *An Answer* refers to "p. 9 that *the only Heroe of his Piece shall be Truth*" (p. 6, ll. 9-10), *Lettre 1* (1692) has the phrase, "Le seul Heros de mon ouvrage sera la verité" on p. 3, while in *Lettre 2* (1693) it occurs on p. 9. The English translation of Du Cros's pamphlet, the *Lettre*, has "The only Hero of my piece shall be Truth" on p. 5.

<sup>46</sup> See the facsimile reprint with an Introduction by J. A. Downie, *Swift, Temple, and the Du Cros Affair, Part II: "A Letter from Monsieur de Cros" (1683) and "Reflections upon Two Pamphlets" (1693)*, Augustan Reprint Society, nos 241-42 (Los Angeles: William Andrews Clark Memorial Library, 1987).



pages of those) to take public notice of Mons *De Cros's* Letter; That it was now just come out, and crying about the Streets" (p. 35).<sup>47</sup>

On appearance, *An Answer to a Scurrilous Pamphlet* was commonly attributed to Sir William Temple himself, at the beginning of *Reflections upon Two Pamphlets* (p. 1), for example, and in contemporary gossip.<sup>48</sup> Abel Boyer, who knew something of the Temple circle, made the same attribution a few years later.<sup>49</sup> The first paragraph of *Reflections upon an Answer*, too, seems to imply Temple's authorship (p. 35), and the whole pamphlet shows an intimate knowledge of Sir William's *Memoirs*, actions, and opinions. After having read ten lines of *An Answer to a Scurrilous Pamphlet*, however, the writer of *Reflections* became suspicious and eventually "thoroughly convinced it was a Counterfeit (tho a witty one, and perhaps an innocent one too)" (p. 35). He "took notice of the *Exordium* as a little too common and thredbare for [Temple]," referring specifically to the topos, 'importunity of his Friends,' as the reason for writing (p. 35). Also, *An Answer to a Scurrilous Pamphlet* is said to make Sir William "publicly own the *Memoirs*," which the writer of *Reflections upon an Answer* "could never hear he [had] yet done," and "defend them in all parts," which he does not think Temple would have been prepared to do for an unacknowledged

<sup>47</sup> Published in May 1693 (*The Term Catalogues*, II, 457).

<sup>48</sup> *Correspondence of the Family of Hatton, 1601-1704*, ed. Thompson, II, 190-91. Also, when *An Answer to a Scurrilous Pamphlet* came out in French translation at The Hague in 1693, it was entitled *Reponse de Mr Le Chevalier Temple*, and a reprint of this was appended to the third edition of Sir William's *Mémoires* in French (The Hague, 1694) (*Swift, Temple, and the Du Cros Affair, Part 1*, ed. Woolley, pp. vi and xnn11-13).

<sup>49</sup> *Memoirs of the Life and Negotiations of Sir W. Temple, Bar.* (London: W. Taylor, 1714), p. 385: "In the Year 1693, Sir William Temple publish'd *an Answer to a scurrilous Pamphlet*." In his Preface, Boyer claims to have learned "several Particulars" from "Sir William Temple's intimate Friends" (sig. A4r-v). Thomas Birch, in *A General Dictionary*, his revised edition of Bayle's *Historical and Critical Dictionary*, draws heavily on Boyer's discussion ([London: G. Strahan, et al., 1734-41], IX, 509-15, s.v. "Temple, Sir William"), as does the compiler of Temple's life in *Biographia Britannica*, who endorsed Boyer's view (7 vols [Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1969-73 [1747-6], VI, 3915-23).

publication (p. 36). He is on firmer ground when pointing out that words such as “*Blunder, Hans-en-Kelder, A man of such a Kidney*” were “very unlike [Sir William’s] Expressions, and below his Stile” (p. 36), clinching his case with the remark that this “whole Pamphlet, tho it must be confess’d to be ingenious, and written with a great deal of Wit, yet that very strain of *Witting* it so much, and running things into Ridicule, makes it look very different from any thing we have yet seen of Sir *W. T*’s Writings” (pp. 36-37). In fact, as the writer of *Reflections upon an Answer* justly observed, in his essay *Of Poetry* published only three years earlier, Temple had attacked the modish vein of raillery and ridicule as “pernicious to Poetry, and indeed, to all Virtue and Good Qualities among Men.”<sup>50</sup>

Consequently, *An Answer to a Scurrilous Pamphlet* does not look like a piece of Sir William’s own writing. He certainly never acknowledged it. At the time of its composition and publication, Swift was living with Temple at Moor Park, and he, for one, never shunned raillery’s lash.<sup>51</sup> Besides, in November 1692, at the very time of the controversy, he considered his

<sup>50</sup> Essay IV in *Miscellanea: The Second Part* (London: by T. M. for Ri. and Ra. Simpson, 1690), p. 52. See also the valuable commentary in *Sir William Temple’s Essays “Upon Ancient and Modern Learning” und “Of Poetry”: eine historisch-kritische Ausgabe mit Einleitung und Kommentar*, ed. Martin Kämper (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1995), pp. 69-71, 307-11. In his letters as well as in the concluding paragraph of *Upon Ancient and Modern Learning*, Temple made the same point (pp. 40, 227 [ad 40.1435-42]), and he was to repeat it in “Heads, Designed for an Essay on Conversation” (*Miscellanea: The Third Part* [London: Benjamin Tooke, 1701], p. 324). In the light of this evidence, one is perhaps allowed not to make too much of a discarded, and never printed, passage from Temple’s essay “Some Thoughts upon Reviewing the Essay of Ancient and Modern Learning” (Preface to Temple’s *Miscellanea: The Third Part*, pp. □), which is found in Swift’s hand with Temple’s writing intermingled (*The Rothschild Library*, II, 609-10 [2253]), and which shows that Temple did on occasion try the kind of personal raillery found in *An Answer to a Scurrilous Pamphlet*.

<sup>51</sup> There is also to be noted a lively handling of a Swiftian characteristic, the neatly articulated insert of a burlesque tale, such as the account of the inept author who prematurely killed his hero in the first act of his tragedy (p. 6, ll. 13-30), or the introduction of the pithily articulate “poor Ant in the Epigram” (p. 21, ll. 29-33).

patron, as he told his uncle William Swift, “less forward than [he] could wish” in lending him support, adding as an explanation: “I suppose he believes I shall leave him, and upon some accounts, *he thinks me a little necessary to him [at present].*”<sup>52</sup> It therefore seems natural not only to associate *An Answer to a Scurrilous Pamphlet* with Swift,<sup>53</sup> but also to assume that Swift wrote it, as he later was to do with *The Battle of the Books*, in defence of his patron; and that he wrote and published it without Temple’s knowledge.<sup>54</sup> In either case, Swift wrote as the defender of some established, revered figure, whose accomplishments had been threatened or belittled by a worthless, despicable creature like Du Cros. Indeed, the spectacle of the worthy professional diplomat, Sir William, being slighted by Du Cros, the worthless sham, would have been sufficiently annoying for Swift to release his satirical energy.

There are additional considerations supporting this case. Individually, the points may be inconclusive; cumulatively, the argument from internal and external evidence is strong:

<sup>52</sup> *Correspondence*, ed. Woolley, I, 116 (our emphasis).

<sup>53</sup> The first to have done so, if cautiously and without the courage of his conviction, was Courtenay, who suggests, but subsequently discards, the hypothesis “that the pamphlet was *partially dictated* [by Temple]; and that Swift, the only person likely to be so employed, was permitted to disfigure with his scurrility the more dignified periods of Temple” (*Memoirs of the Life, Works, and Correspondence of Sir William Temple*, II, 212-13).

<sup>54</sup> Woodbridge, *Sir William Temple: The Man and his Work*, p. 227. Woodbridge’s view was endorsed by Pierre Marambaud (*Sir William Temple: sa vie, son œuvre* [Paris: Minard, 1968], p. 115: “L’éventualité la plus plausible a été proposée par le Professeur Woodbridge: Swift écrivit le pamphlet à l’insu de Temple, imitant par endroits le style de son protecteur”), and, more recently, by A. C. Elias, Jr, *Swift at Moor Park: Problems in Biography and Criticism* (Philadelphia: The University of Pennsylvania Press, 1982), pp. 66-68, J. A. Downie, *Jonathan Swift: Political Writer* (London, Boston, Henley: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1984), pp. 45-46, and Robert M. Philmus, “Andrew Marvell, Samuel Parker, and *A Tale of a Tub*,” *Swift Studies*, 14 (1999), pp. 71-98 (pp. 95-98).

The fact that *An Answer to a Scurrilous Pamphlet* is related to the second, octavo edition of Du Cros's *Lettre* (1693) argues strongly for a source inside Temple's circle, which would have access to Continental news and publications about the affair.<sup>55</sup> Since this second edition of the pamphlet appeared in February 1693, it was probably printed at the end of 1692, though dated the following year. At this stage of his life, Swift was fluent in French, so much so in fact that he was confident enough to translate the French in the volumes of Temple's *Letters* which he saw through the press, and he did so with pithiness and force.<sup>56</sup> In the same way, the writer of *An Answer to a Scurrilous Pamphlet* handled the French of Du Cros's *Lettre*.

Admittedly, the first paragraph of *An Answer to a Scurrilous Pamphlet* seems to suggest that Sir William Temple, "the Author of the *Memoirs*," wrote it. It contains one of Temple's stock phrases, "either at home or abroad," as well as one of his characteristic Gallicisms, "*en passant*" (p. 5).<sup>57</sup> It does not, however, actually *claim* that Sir William wrote the piece. On the contrary, it is intimated that he was *not* inclined to respond to Du Cros, even if members of his circle, which included Swift, had urged a reply. It is to "their Importunities" that *An Answer to a Scurrilous Pamphlet* is due (p. 5). This rhetorical strategy of hiding behind a 'mask,' whose only 'evidence' is innuendo, anticipates a technique that was to become a hallmark of all of Swift's major satires, from *A Tale of a Tub* to *A Modest Proposal* and *The Lady's Dressing Room*.

<sup>55</sup> *The Compleat Library: or, News for the Ingenious*, ed. Richard Wolley for John Dunton (November 1692) reported: "[*News of Learning*] from *Germany*. Mr. *Du Cros* is going to write against some passages in Sir *William Temples* last *Memoirs* that reflect upon him, and at which he is extreemly netled" (p. 476).

<sup>56</sup> *Correspondence*, ed. Woolley, I, 101; Archibald E. Irwin, "Swift as Translator of the French of Sir William Temple and his Correspondents," *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, 6 (1966), 483-98. It was only later in life, by the 1720s, that Swift's proficiency in French became somewhat rusty (David Woolley, "The Stemma of *Gulliver's Travels*," *Swift Studies*, 1 [1986], 51-54). See also Preface to Temple's *Letters* (p. □).

<sup>57</sup> For Temple's Gallicisms, see *The Early Essays and Romances of Sir William Temple Bt*, ed. Moore Smith, pp. 214-15.

Attribution of authorship on internal evidence is in this case complicated by general considerations. Many of the expressions and phrases were commonplace in polemical writing before and after 1693. Some of the key terms originate in Temple's *Memoirs* and were picked up by the combatants. Swift's own acquaintance with his patron's ideas and style was so intimate from 1689 onwards that it is difficult to instance words or passages in *An Answer to a Scurrilous Pamphlet* that unerringly point towards him. In a letter of 3 May 1692, Jonathan confessed to his cousin Thomas: "I never read [Sir William Temple's] writings but I prefer him to all others at present in England ... and the likeness of humors makes one fond of them as if they were ones own."<sup>58</sup> And, looking back over his years with Sir William at Moor Park, he told Lady Giffard, his employer's sister, in 1709: "Nothing of his ever printed in my Time was from the Originall; the first Memoirs was from my Copy, so were the second Miscellanea, so was the Introduction to the English History: so was every Volume of Letters, They were all copyed from the Originalls by S<sup>r</sup> W<sup>m</sup> Temples direction, and corrected all along by his Orders."<sup>59</sup> In consequence, it is no surprise that great stretches of Swift's prose, at least until the publication of *A Tale of a Tub*, should be so redolent of Temple's rhetoric that they read like borrowings, no matter whether unconscious or not.<sup>60</sup> For the best part of a decade, two of the foremost English prose writers were living and working together in their retreat near Farnham, jointly involved in the controversies occasioned by two of Sir William's publications. The conclusion we have come to is that *An Answer to a Scurrilous Pamphlet* is Swift's first prose work, a successful defence of his patron against the odious Du Cros's irritating intrusion into the well-

<sup>58</sup> *Correspondence*, ed. Woolley, I, 110.

<sup>59</sup> *Correspondence*, ed. Woolley, I, 270.

<sup>60</sup> We have incorporated phrases and phrasal coincidences found in *An Answer to a Scurrilous Pamphlet* and repeated or echoed elsewhere in Swift's writings as evidence for Swift's authorship in the relevant notes of the commentary.

merited peace of Moor Park.<sup>61</sup> It is a defence remarkable for its liveliness of tone, elegance of cadence, and sparkling wit.

But then, *An Answer to a Scurrilous Pamphlet* is equally remarkable for its complexity, comprising as it does at least three intertwining layers. The first ‘factual’ one narrates the events and circumstances, in Temple’s version of them, leading to the 1678 peace treaty between France and the Netherlands, and highlighting Sir William’s criticism of Du Cros in the *Memoirs*. The second consists of Du Cros’s version of these events and circumstances in his *Lettre*, written in answer to the *Memoirs* (in French translation) and rejecting Temple’s view out of hand. On the third, subdivided (*a* and *b*) level, *An Answer to a Scurrilous Pamphlet*, Swift presents himself as the advocate his patron. Here, he not only translates, *and* corrects, key passages from Du Cros’s *Lettre*, more particularly those in which Temple’s *Memoirs* was distorted (*a*), he also creates a meta-level of satirical mimicry, of serious and sarcastic commentary (*b*). On this, he freely utilizes elements of rhetoric and fiction many of which, such as fable and allusion, digression and changing perspective, suggest Swift’s hand and indeed bear comparison with his first masterpiece, *A Tale of a Tub*, which was largely written during the same decade.<sup>62</sup>

<sup>61</sup> Swift may be thought to have disowned *An Answer to a Scurrilous Pamphlet* for himself in saying of his *Discourse of the Contests and Dissensions between the Nobles and the Commons in Athens and Rome*, published in 1701, that this was “the first [piece] I ever printed” (*Memoirs, relating to That Change which Happened in the Queen’s Ministry in the Year 1710*, in *Prose Works*, VIII, 119). The obvious counterarguments are, first, that Swift is unlikely to have considered himself on oath when talking about the canon of his writings, and, second, that his memory was at times notoriously unreliable in later years. In some cases, Swift could not even remember, or pretended not to remember, to have authored pamphlets and poems which are indubitably his.

<sup>62</sup> Downie, *Jonathan Swift: Political Writer*, p. 45.