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The following thesis is centred on Charles Howard, 3rd Earl of Carlisle (1669-1738) and the life that he lived at Castle Howard in North Yorkshire, the country house which he built at the turn of the eighteenth century. The thesis argues that Carlisle was not isolated from social and cultural spheres whilst living in Yorkshire, a view that has been put forward by the existing historiography. Via the arrival of books, letters, and news to Castle Howard, the Earl remained connected to social and political events as well as cultural movements despite being geographically remote from London and other urban centres. In many instances, his family, close friends, and agents acted as intermediaries, sourcing, recommending, and sending north all types of textual material. The Earl’s participation in epistolary, news, and book exchange networks – at regional and national levels – meant Castle Howard was an active site of textual exchange and engagement in the first four decades of the eighteenth century. Such a reading challenges, more generally, the traditional interpretation that country house residents were disconnected from the nation’s Capital as well as the local communities that they neighboured.
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You know the spider and how he constructs his web. All the threads spread out in rays, each of which, however long, has its source, its roots or birthplace, . . . at the centre. From there each filament starts and moves outward. The most industrious creature himself then sits at that spot and has his residence there. He remains in that place . . . but keeps so alert and watchful that if there is a touch on the finest and most distant thread he feels it . . . and instantly takes care of the situation. Let the father of the family do likewise. Let him arrange his affairs and place them so that all look up to him alone as head, so that all are directed by him and by him attached to secure foundations.

Alberti, *Della Famiglia*, Book III.¹

On 8 June 1721, the architect and dramatist, Sir John Vanbrugh, wrote to his friend and patron, Charles Howard, 3rd Earl of Carlisle, who was suffering from one of his common fits of gout:

[I] am sorry you should own any Stroak of Philosophy to a fit of the Gout. But I, without the Gou[t] to incline my Philosophy, have every day of my Life Since twenty years old, grown more and more of opinion, that the less one has to do, with what is call’d the World, the more Quiet of mind; and the more Quiet of mind, the more Happyness. All the other delights, are but like debauches in Wine; which gives three days pain, for three hours pleasure.²

Because of this illness, from the 1720s until his death in 1738, Carlisle was increasingly confined to Castle Howard, his Yorkshire country seat which had been built by Vanbrugh at the turn of the century. Though he was a four-day’s journey from the whirl of London society, Carlisle was by no means cut off from what Vanbrugh called “the World”.³

Challenging the view that Carlisle passed an isolated existence at Castle Howard, this


² CH J8/1/543.

³ This term was used regularly in Joseph Addison’s *The Spectator*. In the guise of Mr Spectator, Addison wrote, for example: ‘The best way of separating a Man’s self from the World, is to give up the desire of being known to it.’ *The Spectator*, No. 264, Wednesday, 2 January 1712. Printed in Joseph Addison, *The Spectator*, ed. with an introduction and notes by Donald F. Bond, 5 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965), vol. 2, p. 526.
thesis argues that the 3rd Earl was connected, via his engagement with different kinds of texts, to a variety of social and cultural spheres. In the chapters that follow, we will see how Carlisle’s family, friends, and agents were instrumental in sourcing, recommending, and sending different types of textual material to him once he had relocated to Castle Howard. How does this approach change our understanding of country houses? What can we learn about the position of the country house within networks of information exchange in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries? It is my hope that answering these questions will add to the growing interest in the history of textual networks as well as serve to open up new vistas in the field of country house history.

**Historiography**

According to Charles Saumarez Smith, the author of the most influential study on Castle Howard, the 3rd Earl’s life at his Yorkshire estate was ‘circumscribed’. In Smith’s account, Carlisle led a life which was ‘devoted to a small amount of hunting, when his health permitted it, an occasional evening of cards with the domestic chaplain, annual visits to York for the races, and visits to London only when absolutely necessary’. In contrast to the lavishness of his surroundings, Carlisle’s lifestyle, he continues, became one ‘of modest domesticity, of gossip and conversation’. As he became ‘old and lame’, many a winter’s evening was passed alone.

Smith’s particular interpretation of Carlisle’s life at Castle Howard is reinforced by the consensus view that the country house was a site of retirement from public life and thus a space cut off from urban activities. This interpretation intersects with another

---


5 Smith, *BCH*, p. 115.
prominent strand of country house historiography, that which derives from Mark Girouard’s influential study, *Life in the English Country House* (1978), in which he argues that country houses were social, cultural, and political symbols of power. The projection of country houses as autonomous entities, isolated – symbolically and topographically – from London just as much as they were from the local communities in which they were situated is implicit within Girouard’s ‘country house as power house’ analytical framework. To build and live in a country house was a way to distinguish oneself, but establishing such a distinction also meant being geographically and socially dislocated.

The implication that townhouses were constructed for public life whilst country houses were built for private retreat or retirement has further strengthened the disconnection between town and country living. The reading of England’s great aristocratic houses as residences to which the country’s élite retired derives from the fact that the ancient villa – which is seen both architecturally and culturally as a precedent for the country house – was also celebrated as a site of retirement. Pliny the Younger, in particular, celebrated the benefits of the villa, writing in detail of the pleasurable living experience that they provided. Pliny’s lifestyle at his Laurentine villa was, according to Roy K. Gibson and Ruth Morello, ‘largely defined by [the] absence of disruptive

---

8 Mark Girouard, *Life in the English Country House: A Social and Architectural History* (London: Yale University Press & Book Club Associates, 1978). Dominating the historiography for over three decades now, Girouard’s ‘country house as power house’ narrative continues to influence historical understanding of England’s great aristocratic rural residences. The ‘power house’ label derives from title of his first chapter. He states early on that ‘people did not live in country houses unless they either possessed power, or, by setting up in a country house, were making a bid to possess it’, p. 2.

7 Much has been made of the following quote by Thomas Coke, 1st Earl of Leicester: ‘It is a melancholy thing to stand alone in one’s own Country. I look around, not a house to be seen but my own. I am a Giant of Giant’s Castle, and have ate up all my neighbours – my nearest neighbour is the King of Denmark.’ Quoted in R. Wilson & A. Mackley, *Creating Paradise: The Building of the English Country House, 1660-1880* (London & New York: Hambledon & London, 2000), p. 50. For the view that country houses became increasingly detached from local communities in the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries see P. Mandler, *The Fall and Rise of the Stately Home* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997), p. 7-9.


influences (noise, spoken criticism, emotional upheaval), and a freedom from the uncomfortable moral compromises required by urban life’. In this regard, villas were distinct from both city residences and rural farmhouses because they were, in the words of James S. Ackerman, designed both for their owner’s enjoyment and for relaxation. Ackerman’s description of the ancient villa as a ‘fantasy’ residence which was ‘impervious to reality’ further highlights why comparisons have been drawn between these residences and England’s country houses. According to Girouard’s power house model, country houses were primarily built as the playgrounds of the élite in order to demonstrate their social, political, and cultural ascendancy.

As in Pliny’s day, the dichotomy between urban and country living was, in Carlisle’s lifetime, intertwined with discourse regarding the relative merits of active versus contemplative living. At a suitable distance from the city, country houses were presented in some quarters (e.g., the seventeenth-century country house poem) as ideal locations for a contemplative, retired lifestyle. Whilst seventeenth-century defences of retirement tended to project the day-to-day life of a retired man as contentedly devoid of activity – ‘the happy man has no worries, no commitments, no labour’ – for those who supported the idea of an active life, having no commitments and being apart from what

---

11 James S. Ackerman, The Villa: Form and Ideology of Country Houses (London: Thames and Hudson, 1990), p. 9. Ackerman stresses, however, that the villa was not wholly divorced from urban culture but rather a counterbalance to it. For instance, most villas were built with money that had been made in the city.
Vanbrugh termed “the World” was a sure way to discontentedness. It is this latter view (i.e. that non-urban living equalled unhappiness) which has largely coloured the way people perceived (and still perceive) country house living.

That people only begrudgingly resided in the countryside is a rhetorical trope which regularly featured in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century literary discourse. It appears, for example, in a number of Vanbrugh’s satire-driven plays. In The Relapse (1696), for instance, the protagonist, Loveless, informs his country-living wife, Amanda, that the city offers numerous ‘delights, of which a private life [in the country] is destitute’ (II.i, 16-17). On discovering that Loveless and his wife are former country dwellers, another character, Lord Foppington, later asks Amanda: ‘Far Gad’s sake, madam, how has your ladyship been able to subsist thus long under the fatigue of a country life?’ (II.i, 176-78).

Whether this sentiment was actually felt by all country house residents in the early modern period is questionable, yet historians have tended to privilege the view that aristocrats’ lives were unfulfilled, both culturally and socially, when they were in the country. Studies regarding the growth of the absentee landlord, for example, have reinforced the notion that a full and enjoyable life was one based in the city.

Such a view has been further strengthened (and gendered) by proposals that the eighteenth century witnessed the rise of a male-dominated public sphere. That country house management became ever more reliant upon servants and domestic appliances at

---

15 Ibid, p. 27.
17 See Jürgen Habermas’s seminal study on the emergence of the public sphere: The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society, trans. by Thomas Burger, with the assistance of Frederick Lawrence (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1989).
around this same time has also been highlighted by historians. These two social developments have promoted the notion that country houses in the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries were settings where aristocratic women led increasingly isolated, private lives, not only removed from the public sphere but also divorced from the running of the family estate. This impression, though challenged in recent years, has contributed to the overall understanding of country house living as disconnected from the social and cultural spheres that were based in London and other urban spheres.

The view that country house living was, for Carlisle, an isolating experience has been further buttressed by a biographical reading of the 3rd Earl. In many respects, Smith cannot be blamed for reaching the conclusion that Carlisle was secluded at Castle Howard. Persistently suffering from gout, he made few trips away from Yorkshire in the 1720s and 1730s, even refusing at one point to take the waters at Bath. As we shall see from their letters, his children frequently conveyed concern for their father and the loneliness that they believed he encountered at Castle Howard. Yet, at the same time, his accounts and personal correspondence reveal that, in the first four decades of the eighteenth century, a large amount of textual material regularly filtered into Castle Howard. This discovery suggests that Carlisle’s life in Yorkshire was not as isolated as has been previously suggested; nor was Castle Howard disconnected from London society or its local environs.

In order to better demonstrate the ways in which Carlisle remained connected to society, therefore, a new analytical framework is required, one that is based on the

---

20 CH 38/1/405, Robinson to Carlisle, 31 March 1730, Naples, p. 2v. The restriction in movement that gout caused Carlisle was apparent in 1714. Despite being a member of the regency committee which oversaw the running of the country in the interval between Queen Anne’s death and the arrival of George I from Hanover, Carlisle missed the new King’s arrival in England due to a bout of the illness.
transmission of textual material. Not only will this approach provide us with a better understanding of Carlisle’s existence at Castle Howard, it will also enable us to consider the social and cultural role of country houses more generally.

Methodological Considerations

In recent years, scholars have begun to use the idea of ‘networks’ as a conceptual tool with which to explore the creation and consolidation of different communities. To take but one example, this approach has been used with success by intellectual historians of the early modern period looking to better understand the circulation and exchange of ideas across western Europe. Some historians have even begun visualizing the networks that they study, using flow charts and other schematic diagrams to comprehend the interconnections between information exchange. Challenging the pre-existing notions of detachment and isolation, these advances in the history of cultural networks signal a new way in which the country houses of England can be examined.

Indeed, a networks-based approach has been recently employed by the country house historian, John Stobart, who has traced connections between aristocratic residences and consumer networks in the eighteenth century. For Stobart, this alternative framework is useful because it speaks to the paradox that whilst England’s great residences

---

21 A conference hosted by the University of Oxford (September 2011) in conjunction with the Cultures of Knowledge: An Intellectual Geography of the Seventeenth-Century Republic of Letters project provides a good indication of the ways in which different scholars are using networks to further understand their individual areas of study. Abstracts and recordings of the papers presented at the conference are available online at: http://intellectualgeography.history.ox.ac.uk/. For an introduction to the topic see in particular Miles Ogborn’s paper ‘What is Intellectual Geography?’.


23 Stobart has been leading the ‘Consumption and the Country House’ project, based at The University of Northampton (http://consumptionandthecountryhouse.ning.com/). The idea of country houses and networks has also been alluded to by Friedman. She writes that Wollaton Hall was ‘the product of a particular constellation of social, intellectual, economic and artistic forces that combined to give the house its distinctive form.’ These forces, she continues, ‘were not only highly personal and localized but also in constant flux, producing very different houses elsewhere for other patrons and at other moments’, House and Household, pp. 3-4.
have been presented as sites of cultural display (their residents bringing into these houses all types of expensive and luxury items), those who lived in them are seen as living detached lives, separate from élite as well as non-élite cultural spheres. Aware of this disjunction, Stobart shows how country houses and their residents were connected to networks of buying, selling, and advertizing which stretched across the country, linking cities to the provinces, country houses to shops, and traders to aristocratic clients. Identifying connections between individuals, spaces, and objects, a networks framework, as Stobart has demonstrated, offers country house historians a new way to consider the social and cultural positioning of these great properties. In the present thesis, consumer networks have been replaced by networks of textual exchange. Connections will be drawn, instead, between individuals, spaces, and texts. By examining how books, letters, and the news arrived at Castle Howard, I mean to show how country houses were significant centres of information exchange.

The historical significance of textual networks has been emphasized most prominently in studies that have adopted the republic of letters model and, in particular, by students of the Enlightenment period and those in the field of the history of science. Within these networks, various spaces of intellectual engagement (e.g. the coffee house, the salon, the laboratory, the institutional library) have been identified as key nodes embedded within pan-European channels of textual exchange. Recent studies have shown,

---

24 Whilst positioning the country house as the embodiment of social and cultural capital, Stobart recognizes that his approach emphasizes outcome rather than systems of supply and processes of consumption. Stobart also notes that most studies of country houses and consumer culture tend to divorce residents from their houses. See J. Stobart, ‘Gentlemen and Shopkeepers: Supplying the Country House in Eighteenth-Century England’, Economic History Review, 64.3 (2011), pp. 886-88.

for example, how the sociable but polite conversation which took place in the domestic, intimate space of the Parisian salon was dependent upon the arrival of letters. ‘Incoming mail’, Dena Goodman has demonstrated, ‘was quarried for news, gossip, information, ideas. Outgoing mail, too, was central to salon life. The salon was the distribution point, the nexus of intellectual exchange.’ Most notably, Jürgen Habermas has identified the collective act of reading and discussing the news in London’s coffee houses as one way that individuals started to come together, forming, in Brendon Dooley’s words, ‘an alternative public sphere where validity claims could be discussed without reference to status.’

‘Newspapers’, Goodman has observed, ‘became the occasions and topics of the conversations that took place in the coffeehouse, filling the same role as letters did for salon conversation.’ Other academics have shown how these locations were also sites for the sharing and reading of books. Markman Ellis has examined the role of the coffee house library, for example, suggesting that reading books in these urban spaces was a ‘random, abusive, perplexed, inattentive, casual, and pleasure-centred activity.’

The bringing together of country house history with a textual networks-based methodology is of interest, therefore, because it draws out previously unidentified connections between country houses and these other well-recognized sites of intellectual exchange. As the following chapters will show, Carlisle’s intellectual life at Castle Howard was enabled by the same early eighteenth-century developments that facilitated

30 Pointing out that members of the republic of letters were primarily based in tolerant, metropolitan cities, Anthony Grafton acknowledges that country houses, as ‘islands of civility’, were also perfect sites from which members of the scholarly community could interact with each other. Anthony Grafton, ‘A Sketch Map of a Lost Continent: The Republic of Letters’, Republic of Letters: A Journal for the Study of Knowledge, Politics and the Arts, 1.1 (2009), http://roll.stanford.edu/node/34, p. 7.
the emergence of the coffee house and salon as spaces of intellectual engagement: the increasing availability of books, access to more efficient and widespread postal networks, and the explosion of news culture. I should clarify, however, that I am not proposing, at present, that country houses were sites in which we can witness the emergence of the Habermasian public sphere. I am interested, rather, in the initial positioning of country houses within textual networks of exchange and dissemination and how this approach offers a new framework through which to examine the cultural and social role of these residences in the early modern period.

A textual networks framework not only helps country house historians engage with their subjects in a new and interesting way. Whilst comparable in function to the salon or coffee house, the ways in which country houses differ from these sites of intellectual engagement and sociability invites intellectual historians to see country houses as alternative sites within circuits of information exchange. In contrast to the setting of the coffee house or the salon, seventeenth- and eighteenth-century country houses offered a different environment in which textual networks converged. Though coffee houses are considered more public than the exclusive, intimate spaces in which salons were normally held, both were essentially city-based. Country houses were, in contrast, at a distance from urban society. Positioned within the same types of textual networks, however, these residences can be seen as rural outposts of urban culture.

Another crucial distinction between country houses and these other sites of intellectual engagement is evident when one becomes aware of the prominent role that Carlisle’s family played in sending material to Castle Howard. The passage by Alberti that opens this introduction offers a useful metaphor with which to visualize the complex familial web of connectedness that linked the Earl at Castle Howard to a variety of social and cultural spheres. Like the attentive spider at the centre of its web, Carlisle remained
connected to the world beyond the estate’s boundaries by a number of ‘threads’ (i.e., textual networks). Via these interconnected threads (or networks), news, ideas, and opinions travelled to and from Castle Howard. Alberti’s comparison between the spider and the head of the family is apt for, as we shall see, it was via family members that Carlisle most readily remained connected. As head of the Howard dynasty, Carlisle took up his position at Castle Howard and looked to his family to help him maintain his social and cultural connections. As the following chapters will demonstrate, his children and their spouses acted as his chief intermediaries, sending to Yorkshire from London a wide variety of textual material with the intention of keeping the Earl both informed and entertained.

Those country house residents like Carlisle who were retired, educated aristocrats, with children married off and money to spend, were in a perfect position to participate in networks of textual exchange. The repetition of the phrase “idle hours” in a number of letters sent to Carlisle from his family, indicates a third important feature of country house living which made these residences ideal sites of intellectual exchange. In 1729, Carlisle’s middle daughter, Anne, Viscountess Irwin, noted in a postscript to her father “I have sent you Lordship the new play which possibly may divert you for an idle Hour”. Referring to those hours in Carlisle’s day when he was not preoccupied with other business, Irwin’s comment brings to mind the leisurely periods of time that the Earl had to fill at Castle Howard. His son-in-law, Sir Thomas Robinson, employed the same turn of phrase when, in 1735, he sent a poem and a pamphlet to the Earl. Writing that “they are both esteemed to be well done”, Robinson continued, “& I hope will amuse some of the Idle hours att Castle Howard.”

Interpreting the use of “idle hours” as an expression of Irwin’s and Robinson’s belief that Carlisle maintained an inactive and boring life at Castle Howard obscures the complexity of the phrase, particularly when it is considered in light of the notion of *otium* (‘leisure’) and *negotium* (‘business’). Idle hours were, in fact, a direct consequence of removing oneself from the demands of city-living. They signal the relinquishment (either permanent or temporary) of professional or public duties. Idle hours were not, then, inherently a cause for concern. Issues only arose when these idle hours were not filled appropriately. Idle idleness (i.e., pointless *otium*) was something to be avoided. Indeed, Pliny advised those who encountered such idle hours in their villa to prudently structure their leisure time: ‘the *otium* . . . which he describes is carefully presented as a life of relaxed alternation between physical [e.g. hunting] and intellectual activities.” The concept of “idle hours” thus appears contradictory, for they were a necessary precondition for meaningful leisure time pursuits. They were both the germ and the cure.

Idle hours, therefore, were actually required for Carlisle’s successful participation in textual networks. The implication by Irwin and Robinson that the Earl encountered “idle hours” at Castle Howard can be understood as their mutual awareness that a degree of free time necessitated the cultivation of life-affirming leisure pursuits. Part of this agenda required engagement with intellectual material: in Pliny’s mind, for example, conversation should only take place in the villa with one’s books. In consequence, by providing textual material to the Earl – in the form of books, letters, and news – Irwin, Robinson, and other family members and friends were facilitating the cultivation of his “idle hours” at Castle Howard into productive periods of *otium*.

**An Introduction to Carlisle’s Life**

---

33 Gibson & Morello, *Reading the Letters of Pliny the Younger*, p. 171.
Born in 1669 at Naworth Castle (Cumbria), as a young boy, Carlisle was sent across the Pennines to Morpeth Grammar School where he received preparatory training in reading, writing, and grammar. Accounts indicate that in the 1680s he was still living away from home, first at boarding school and then probably at university. In 1688, aged nineteen, Carlisle left for a tour of the Continent. Two of the commonplace books that he wrote during the fifteen months he spent travelling around Europe provide evidence of his early intellectual concerns. In Notes on Italy, Carlisle recorded general information about the country, its history, and its cities. Topics included notable families, artists, poets, orators, members of the clergy, the Jesuits, the Papal court and its history, and Italian architecture. He also noted down information about two well-known antiquarians whom he presumably encountered in Rome: “Mr Auseu[,] a French man[,] a great Antiquaire” and “John Piter Bellori[,] Antiquario del Papel, a great virtuoso, he hath a very good closet.” Highlighting his awareness of contemporary scholars and their publications, at one stage in his notebook Carlisle included the following details:

Monsignor Fabretti[,] a virtuoso at Rome[,] is about putting out a book of all the triumphal arches at Rome. Monsieur Ciampini that keeps the Academy, has put out a book of all the Mosaic work of Europe.

---

35 Part of the Howard family’s landholding, Morpeth is located in Northumberland, less than fifteen miles north of Newcastle-upon-Tyne. The courtesy title of the Earls of Carlisle was Lord Morpeth.
36 Whilst neither Eton School, nor the Universities of Oxford or Cambridge have any record of his attendance, members of Carlisle’s close family attended all three of these institutions. Carlisle’s son, Lord Morpeth, went to Eton. His ancestor Lord William Howard, at around the age of fourteen, attended Cambridge. His uncle, Frederick Christian, went up to Christ Church College, Oxford at the age of thirteen. And one of the 3rd Earl’s younger brothers, William, matriculated at the age of eighteen from Pembroke College, Oxford.
37 Two other commonplace books belonging to Carlisle are archived at Castle Howard. They are CH J8/35/3: Observations upon Medals in French & English (c. 1688-1690) and CH J8/35/4: Remarks out of several Books in Latin, French, & English (c. 1688-1690). For transcriptions and analysis of all of these notebooks see Quentin Wilson, The Literary Remains of Charles Howard, 3rd Earl of Carlisle (1669-1738): A Critical Edition with Introduction and Notes, unpublished PhD thesis, Department of English & Related Literature, University of York, 2006, pp. 17-45, pp. 46-69, pp. 70-93, and pp. 94-125. Wilson notes that we can see in Remarks out of several Books ‘clear signs of that interest in family pedigree, political institutions, Roman history and myth, heraldry, advances in religion and science, and above all, the importance of personal, public and private “virtue” which were to find fuller expression in his later life and writings.’ Wilson, LR, p. 21.
38 CH J8/35/1. The item was previously dated 1692 but Wilson has pointed out that as Carlisle returned from the Continent in early 1691 it is likely to have been compiled at an earlier date. Wilson, LR, p. 72.
39 Transcribed in Wilson, LR, pp. 79.
Pietro Santi virtuoso has stamped several pieces of Bas rieleif[,] amongst others Ovides toomb.\textsuperscript{40}

A second travel notebook, \textit{Notes on the Principal Families in Rome}, provides evidence of the instruction that he received during his travels.\textsuperscript{41} The book contains two other, more mature hands (as well as Carlisle’s adolescent scrawlings), one of which was presumably the young aristocrat’s governor, Rasigad, who had accompanied him to Europe.\textsuperscript{42} The intellectual experiences that Carlisle encountered during his Continental tour had a lasting influence on his intellectual interests. For example, later in life his book collection contained two publications concerning Cardinal Mazarin, the French Chief Minister (active between 1642 and 1661), whom he had written about in one of his commonplace books.\textsuperscript{43}

Upon returning from his Grand Tour, Carlisle resided at Naworth Castle with his wife, Lady Anne Capel, whom he had married just months before his departure for Europe.\textsuperscript{44} As we shall see in Chapter One, this medieval residence housed several book collections that the Earl must have encountered, if not as a child then certainly as a young adult. Elected in 1691 as MP for Morpeth, Carlisle was keen to prepare himself for political office. Alongside quires of paper, ink, quills, and a map of England, the first books that we know he purchased included \textit{Lex parliamentaria: or a treatise of the law and custom of parliaments} (London, 1690, 2\textsuperscript{nd} ed.) for 2s. 6d. and Sir William Temple’s \textit{Memoirs

\textsuperscript{40}ibid, pp. 89.
\textsuperscript{41}CH J8/35/2.
\textsuperscript{42}Wilson, \textit{LR}, pp. 95–96. Smith proposes that Carlisle’s governor, Rasigad, was the Monsieur Rasigade who was naturalized in 1702 and became a friend of Lady Mary Wortley Montagu. Smith, ‘Charles Howard, 3\textsuperscript{rd} Earl of Carlisle and the Architecture of Castle Howard’, pp. 14–15.
\textsuperscript{43}J8/35/1: \textit{Notes on Italy}. CH 1698 FG 06: Cardinal Mazarin’s letters to Lewis XIV. . . [London, 1691] and CH 1715/16 ED 13: Jean Silhon’s \textit{Esclaircissement de quelques difficultez touchant l’administration du Cardinal Mazarin} (Rouen, 1651).
\textsuperscript{44}Located fifteen miles north-east of the city of Carlisle, it would have taken a week to travel between Naworth and London at the turn of the eighteenth century. Castellated in 1335, the property had been the Howard family’s country residence for a century.
of what past in Christendom from the war begun 1672 to the peace concluded 1679 (The Hague, 1692) for 3s. 6d. 45

Over the next decade the couple had seven children, five of whom survived to adulthood. 46 In 1693, the 2nd Earl of Carlisle died and his son was elevated to the earldom and the House of Lords. Subsequently, Carlisle, his wife, and children, moved to Carlisle House in London’s Soho Square. 47 An entry in the household accounts from September 1693 records two payments made for "Coachhire to Carlisle House" and then "to help them remove the goods", indicating the imminent arrival from the north of the Earl, his family, and their own belongings. 48 Despite his new life in the nation’s Capital, Carlisle continued to spend time in the north of England, at one stage causing his kinsman, the Duke of Norfolk, to write: “I little thought you could have made your self so thorough a Countrey-gentleman”. 49 Referring to Carlisle’s first born son, Norfolk’s letter ends, “I hope my Lord Morpeth is in good health, & that wee shall not loose you [to the country] for ever.” 50

Located just south of Oxford Street, Soho Square (previously King’s Square) was one of the most fashionable areas of late seventeenth- and early eighteenth-century

45 CH H/1/1/2.
46 Previous dates of birth given for Carlisle’s children are incorrect. Lord Morpeth is first mentioned in the household accounts on 14 February 1694, “Payd for A Chair for Lord Morpeth” (CH H1/1/2) indicating he was born before 1694. Lady Lechmere, previously thought to have been born in 1701, is first mentioned in the accounts on 9 October 1694, "payd for things from the Apothecary for Lady Betty" (CH H1/1/2). Viscountess Irwin is believed to have been born around 1696/7. She is first referred to in the accounts on 4 August 1700, "payd for play things for Lady Anne (CH H1/1/3). Previously thought to have been born in 1695, Lady Howard’s birth is referred to in the accounts on 2 March 1697, "payd for en’tring the birth of lady Mary" and then on 20 March, "payd for the birth of Lady Mary" (CH H1/1/2). Colonel Howard’s birth is recorded in the accounts on the 6 January 1699, though he was previously thought to have been born in 1705: "payd for the birth of Mr Charles Howard" (CH H1/1/3). Carlisle also had three other children. Two died as infants – Catherine (1700-1704) and Harriet (1703-1704) – and an illegitimate daughter (b. c.1717).
47 An anonymous engraving from the 1720s shows the house to be of a traditional early Georgian terraced design, with three floors and a fourth attic storey. BM Adams (London) 26.28 Crace XXIX. 1. Located in the south-east corner of Soho Square, the front façade looked onto a garden which had a sculpture of Charles II at its centre. The length of the house extended along Sutton Street which ran east from the square. The stables were positioned at the back of the property, adjoining Hog Street.
48 CH H1/1/2, 25 September 1693.
50 ibid, p. 2r.
London. Burlington House was to the south-west, Drury Lane to the east. To the south-east was Covent Garden and then the river. Motivated by his entry into London’s élite society, it was whilst living at Carlisle House that the Earl began participating in epistolary, news, and book exchange networks in earnest. As Chapter One will show, a library catalogue that he had compiled at Carlisle House in 1698 offers the first substantial insight into Carlisle’s book-reading habits.\footnote{Accounts show that his wife was also acquiring books whilst living in Soho Square. On 24 April 1698, £2 1s. 6d. was “payd for 5 bookes covered with green vellum and gilt for my Lady Carlisle”. CH H/1/1/3.} Although few of the letters that he wrote or received during this decade survive, Chapter Two argues that it was during this active and peripatetic period of his life that he became increasingly dependent upon epistolary exchanges with family members, friends, colleagues, and agents. As Chapter Three will discuss, the 1690s additionally saw Carlisle begin to purchase news on a regular basis. In addition, it was in London that the new Earl established many of the social connections which were to remain important to him for the rest of his life. Indeed, many of these connections later facilitated his access to books, news, and other textual material following his move from London to Castle Howard in the first decade of the eighteenth century. It was via his membership in the Kit-Cat Club, for example, that he met the architect Vanbrugh and the publisher Jacob Tonson, both of whom became life-long friends.\footnote{Vanbrugh, in particular, remained in regular correspondence with the 3rd Earl, right up until the former’s death in 1726. His letters communicated personal news just as much as they conveyed issues concerning the building of Castle Howard.} Vanbrugh, in particular, remained in regular correspondence with the 3rd Earl, right up until the former’s death in 1726. His letters communicated personal news just as much as they conveyed issues concerning the building of Castle Howard.

Having aligned himself with the Whig cause, Carlisle saw his power at Court increase in the final years of the seventeenth century. For a time at least, he became one of the party’s key aristocratic figures.\footnote{In 1701, for example, he was made both a Gentleman of the Bedchamber and a member of the Privy Council, subsequently travelling to Het Loo in the Low Countries with William III.} Despite his appointment in 1701 as First Lord
Commissioner of the Treasury, the Earl always remained on the periphery of the Junto, watching as others around him (such as his good friend Lord Wharton) rose to political prominence.\textsuperscript{54} It was around this time that the building of Castle Howard, which had begun in 1700, increasingly drew the Earl away from London.\textsuperscript{55} It was also at this stage that Carlisle hired another architect, Nicholas Hawksmoor, to join Vanbrugh on the building project in Yorkshire.

At some point in the first decade of the eighteenth century, Carlisle began renting out Carlisle House, consequently moving his family back to the medieval castle at Naworth.\textsuperscript{56} An unhappy Lady Carlisle hinted at her thoughts about country living to her friend, Lady Giffard: “My Lord Carlisle still pursuing his resolution of going into the north, whatever becomes of me, I am to the end of my dayes most affectionately your humble servant.”\textsuperscript{57} Whilst his wife detested Naworth because of its remoteness from London, Carlisle clearly had different priorities. Writing to his London agent, the Earl proposed that “I have thoughts of staying in the Country for three or four years, therefore should be willing to let my house in Town for three, or five years”.\textsuperscript{58} The couple were unable to reconcile their differences and, in 1705, the Earl and his wife formally separated.

It was around this time that the Earl moved permanently to Castle Howard. Letters to his London agent document Carlisle’s relocation to Yorkshire and the gradual

\textsuperscript{54} For a general guide to the Whig Party at Court see Reed Browning, Political and Constitutional Ideas of the Court Whigs (Boston Rouge & London: Louisiana State University Press, 1982), particularly Chapter VII, “The Structure of Court Whig Thought”.

\textsuperscript{55} We know, for example, that around this time Carlisle made trips to Henderskelfe, the site of Castle Howard, in the summer of 1698, the spring and summer of 1699, the spring, late summer, and autumn of 1700, and the first month of 1701.

\textsuperscript{56} Smith notes that Carlisle’s fall from power and subsequent reduced income, combined with building costs, required the Earl to rent out Carlisle House and move to Yorkshire. With an annual income of about £8,000, Carlisle was, financially speaking, some way below England’s wealthiest aristocrats at the turn of the eighteenth century. Smith, BCH, pp. 76-84.

\textsuperscript{57} Quoted in Wilson, LR, p. 204.

\textsuperscript{58} CH J8/33/5, Carlisle to Ridley, 13 August n.d., Henderskelfe, p. 1r.
movement of his possessions from Soho Square northwards. As we shall see in Chapter Two, this set of correspondence also records various disagreements between the estranged couple regarding the ownership of an assortment of luxury items.

During these early years at Castle Howard, gout had not yet taken hold of the Earl and trips to London still occurred. He was present at Westminster Hall, for example, for the trial in 1710 of the Tory Anglican polemicist, Dr Henry Sacheverell. The Earl’s enjoyment of his role as local figurehead in Yorkshire is, nevertheless, evident. According to the diarist J. Macky, the York assemblies were held twice a week in the mid-1720s, ‘and were under the Misfortune . . . of being distinguished; the Mondays the Tories, and Thursdays the Whig Assembly’. Macky noted, however, that ‘My Lord Carlisle hath been so good, as to endeavour to remove the Names of Distinction from the two Assemblies, by carrying mixt Company to both’.

In 1715, Carlisle had a second library catalogue compiled, this time of his book collection at Castle Howard. As we shall see in the first chapter, this document provides crucial evidence of the Earl’s reading habits at Castle Howard as well as how the books were stored. The intellectual matters that preoccupied his mind once he had settled in Yorkshire can also be gleaned from the literary work that he wrote at the house. Three essays on God, nature, and man (c. 1734), for example, clearly reflect a certain Deistic conviction. In the poem, Reason a Goddess Clear, & Bright (c. 1730 onwards), he dwelt

---

59 These letters, written from Carlisle to his London agent, Nicholas Ridley, have the accession numbers CH J8/33/1-52.
60 In the September of 1705, for example, Carlisle visited Blenheim Palace (which was still under construction) with the Dukes of Grafton, Wharton, and Kingston, Lords Hartington, Granvill, and Godolphin, and two other gentlemen. BL Add 19607, f.11: Hawksmoor to Henry Joynes, Clerk of the Works at Blenheim, 7 September 1705. Quoted in Lucy Jessop, Architecture and the Government Minister, 1688-1714, unpublished PhD thesis, Courtauld Institute of Art, University of London, 2004, p. 65.
upon the same concepts of reason and revelation that he had considered in these philosophical essays.\textsuperscript{63} In his analysis of Carlisle’s literary remains, Quentin Wilson has observed that the Earl’s earliest poetic work, \textit{The Introduction to an Epistle from Antiochus to Stratonice} (1717 onwards), was an exercise in imitating other contemporary literary pieces, in particular Lewis Theobald’s \textit{The history of the loves of Antiochus and Stratonice} . . . (London, 1717) and Alexander Pope’s \textit{Eloisa to Abelard} (London, 1717).\textsuperscript{64} It is the result, therefore, of Carlisle’s intellectual engagement with multiple texts at Castle Howard.

A number of scholars have interpreted the Earl’s pastorally-set \textit{A Milk White Heifer} (c. 1725-31?) as an expression of Carlisle’s feelings about his failed marriage, his future aspirations, and his lifestyle at Castle Howard.\textsuperscript{65} Seeking out a stray milk white heifer, the protagonist (i.e., Carlisle) encounters a nymph who promises him all worldly desires – riches, power, and pleasure – if he only abandon his search. He is saved from these temptations when he encounters Celia, with whom he falls in love. Smith interprets the work as a ‘psychosexual projection’, ‘a literary fantasy’ which is set within the grounds of Castle Howard, and which reveals Carlisle’s ‘various preoccupations, first with money, then with power, and, third, with sensual pleasure’.\textsuperscript{66} Taking into account the Earl’s life events, Ruth Larsen sees the poem as ‘an imagined response to the absence of an idealized wife’.\textsuperscript{67} Highlighting the possible influence of Virgil’s \textit{Aeneid} and Book II of Spenser’s \textit{The Faerie Queene}, Wilson suggests the poem is Carlisle’s attempt at ‘interpreting his life as a

\textsuperscript{63} CH J8/35/5. In his analysis of this poem, Wilson asks: ‘Is Carlisle expressing an early eighteenth-century, Deist-influenced Christianity in a neo-classical idiom? Has an issue between rival claims of Reason and Revelation been imaginatively resolved by squaring the circle and interpreting Reason itself as the ultimate self-disclosure of the Almighty? Or is this a more conventional poem in which Carlisle’s distress over “Celia” results in his inability to understand creation or function appropriately within it “Till Reason her sound Dictates did display”?’ Wilson, LR, p. 437.

\textsuperscript{64} CH J8/35/8. Wilson, LR, p. 168-69, p. 172. This classical story follows Stratonice, who had married the elderly Seleucus, King of Syria. Upon finding out that his son, Antiochus, was in love with his step-mother, Seleucus grants their marriage.

\textsuperscript{65} Wilson, LR, p. 198.

\textsuperscript{66} For Smith’s analysis of the poem see \textit{BCH}, pp. 151-55.

Trojan hero’, one who is ‘reminded of his true destiny and his responsibilities by divine intervention. The failed marriage is understood not as moral failure, but something set aside that destiny might be fulfilled’.

Whilst the poem might speak to issues of broken marriages and dynastic concerns, it is of particular interest for the present study because Carlisle conveys his feelings about country living: ‘My choice I make, an easy safe retreat/ Where bounteous Nature do for life provide/ And anxious cares do not perplex the mind,/ Is what I wish, & what I most desire’ (155-58). Castle Howard, then, offered him a place of quiet retreat from the complexities of city life.

It is not known what exactly motivated Carlisle’s move north, although the fiscal pressures resulting from the building of Castle Howard and the breakdown of his marriage were likely factors. Another potential motive was the faltering, in his mid-thirties, of his political career. Though a rising star under William III, the King’s death in 1702 brought Carlisle’s role in national government to an abrupt halt. Queen Anne failed to appoint the 3rd Earl, along with a number of other leading Whigs, as a member of her first ministry. In later years, when the Whigs were back in power and there were calls for his return to national politics, Carlisle refused to venture to London. Proposing in 1717 that the Earl might become “President of the Councell in the same manner lord Nottingham and the Duke of Devonshire were”, the Duke of Kingston remarked in a letter to Carlisle:

---

68 Wilson, LR, p. 213. For his comparison of the poem with the Aeneid, see LR, pp. 207-23. For his comparison of the poem with Spenser’s work, which is itself influenced by Virgil, see LR, pp. 225-32.
69 In country house history, the faltering of a political career is traditionally linked to an aristocrat’s ‘retirement’ to his country house. Kenny writes, for example: ‘[i]n spite of the activity that was focused about the country estate, there is a sense in which country life was a retreat: as a minor eddy removed from the mainstream of society, the magistracy of the limited locality offered an excellent balm for pride wounded in the political arena and a valid justification for absence.’ Kenny, The Country-House Ethos, p. 26.
My Lord, tho’ interest is what, I and every body know, never guides you, yet I wou’d not make the proposal I am going to make if I thought ‘twou’d . . . take you entirely from what you are fond of which is being sometime in the Country. I am sensible nothing can amends for the loss of the liberty of living after a mans own particular inclination, nor can a good man answear doing it always when his Country requires other of him.  

Despite his time away from national government, Carlisle’s political skills were clearly still sought-after. A letter from his eldest daughter, Lady Lechmere, in 1720, highlights the frustration that she felt regarding his desire to stay at Castle Howard. Calling for his return to a Court divided by allegiances to George I and the Prince of Wales, Lechmere wrote: “I Wish you had any thoughts of coming up: & contributing your part, in this disorder’d state of affairs”. She continued: “the want of you is a great disadvantage to them, for there has been nothing done, since you went away; nor as I find, is likely to be, unless you were here.”  

The Earl’s second daughter, Viscountess Irwin, was likely to have differed in opinion from her sister. Twelve months after Lechmere insisted he return to public life, Irwin reassured their father that,  

you are exceedingly in the right to enjoy . . . [the] . . . uninterrupted quiteness which the moment you come here I’me sure you must lose, for tis impossible for you to avoid interrupting your self in the publick affairs . . . however glad I shou’d be to see you I cant help thinking you are much in the right to prefer Castle Howard att present to this place.  

---  

71 CH J8/26/2, Kingston to Carlisle, 23 September 1717, n.p., pp. 2r-2v. Kingston is referring to the position of Lord President of the Council, an administrative role in the Privy Council which had previously been undertaken by Daniel Finch, 2nd Earl of Nottingham and William Cavendish, 2nd Earl of Devonshire.  
72 In May 1715, King George I briefly reinstated Carlisle as First Lord of the Treasury, but only for five months. The Earl held a number of official governmental posts throughout his life but they were not positions of national importance like those he had assumed under William III: from 1694 to 1712, and again from 1714 till his death, he was Lord Lieutenant for both Cumberland and Westmoreland; between 1701 and 1706 he acted as Earl Marshal of England (until his kinsman, the 8th Duke of Norfolk, had reached his majority and could therefore undertake political duties); in 1715 he was appointed Constable of the Tower of London and, in 1717, Lord Lieutenant of Tower Hamlets, holding both posts until 1722; and in 1723 he was appointed Constable of Windsor Castle and Warden of Windsor Forest, but exchanged the former role in 1730 for Master of the King’s Foxhounds.  
73 CH J8/1/347, Lechmere to Carlisle, 21 January 1720, [London], pp. 1r-1v.  
74 CH J8/1/170, Irwin to Carlisle, 24 December [1720], n.p., pp. 1r-1v.
Sharing her father’s strong attachment to Castle Howard, Irwin regarded London-living as dissolute, loose, and extravagant. Writing to Carlisle in 1729, she remarked:

I can but think London is a kind of Mistress; desolute in principle, loose in practise and Extravagant in pleasure and if a man keeps such a Lady he will surely be undone[,] while the Country like a Wife is chaste in its Entertainments strict in principle & usefull in practice, and which of these is to be prefer’d for Life I think admits of no debate.75

As he got older, Carlisle openly shared his middle daughter’s sentiment. In a draft copy of a letter that the Earl sent in 1736 to the future George III, he expressed his preference for what country living could offer. Recalling Vanbrugh’s 1721 letter that opened this Introduction, Carlisle wrote to the Prince of Wales that “a quiet mind in a quiet body gives me now the greatest satisfaction”.76 Life in Yorkshire, then, fulfilled Carlisle’s desire for a quiet mind and a quiet body, particularly in his final years. The following chapters will demonstrate, however, that this sentiment did not necessitate complete disengagement from “the World”. As I will argue, one could retire from public life and reside in a country house but also remain connected to local and national society. In Carlisle’s case, this connection occurred via the arrival of books, letters, and news. Indeed, texts arrived at Castle Howard right up until the 3rd Earl’s death in 1738.

**Structure and Sources**

The books, letters, and news that Carlisle encountered at Castle Howard were selected as the focus of this thesis because they convey, in their very material form, the ways in which information filtered in and out of country houses. Evidence of the 3rd Earl’s interaction with these different types of texts is drawn primarily from his personal archive which

75 CH J8/1/194, Irwin to Carlisle, 6 February [1729], London, p. 1v.
76 CH J8/1/656, Carlisle to the Prince of Wales, draft, c. April 1736, p. 1r.
remains at Castle Howard. The sources that are most fruitful in this regard include his household accounts (CH H1/1/1-13) and financial papers (CH J8/3 and CH J8/4) which cover, intermittently, the period 1691 to 1738; building accounts (CH G2/1/1-4 and CH G2/2 Bills, 1700-40); his personal correspondence (CH J/8/1, CH J/8/33-34, and CH J/8/37); two library catalogues (CH H/2/3/8 and CH H2/3/1); and a number of his books that remain in the Castle Howard library today.

Though Carlisle’s intellectual interests figure throughout the three chapters, such references are a by-product of the selected methodological approach, for they are inextricably linked to the texts that were delivered to and from Castle Howard. The epistolary, news, and book exchange networks that Carlisle participated in bring to the fore the diversity of textual material that the 3rd Earl encountered in his country house. These networks also serve to refocus attention on material that has been overlooked by previous scholars of Castle Howard and by country house historians more generally. That we can build up a picture of the Earl’s life in Yorkshire via the books that he read, the letters that he received, and the news that he encountered is indicative of how his participation in these textual networks came to shape and influence his experiences.

Accordingly, the three different textual networks under investigation have each been allocated a chapter. To begin, Chapter One investigates the book exchange networks to which the 3rd Earl was connected. As a young man his book collection was initially located at Naworth Castle, but in the early 1690s it was moved to Carlisle House in London. By 1715 he had installed his books at Castle Howard. Around 400 of these remain at the house today. These extant books, along with his two library catalogues, 77

---

77 In 2006 the Yorkshire Country House Partnership funded a project which reviewed the libraries of the member country houses, including Castle Howard. Those books that once belonged to Carlisle were identified during the course of this project. David Griffiths & Elizabeth Harbord, *Yorkshire Country House Partnership: Final Report* (York: University of York Library, 2006).
household accounts, and personal letters, have been vitally important when reconstructing the 3rd Earl’s engagement with books.

Living in Yorkshire, the Earl had three options if he wanted to acquire new books for his collection: wait until he made a trip to London or to a regional town like York or Newcastle; order volumes from a bookseller via one of his agents and have them delivered to Castle Howard; or, thirdly, have friends or family members send items to Yorkshire. A fourth option, that of inheriting books, brought about a different set of decisions for Carlisle. Whether or not he chose to include texts that once belonged to other members of his family offers another opportunity to analyze the Earl’s bibliographic interests.

Before examining the different ways that books arrived at Castle Howard, I discuss the variety of locations in which books were kept at Castle Howard. I then provide a quantitative and qualitative overview of Carlisle’s book collection. Following this section, the chapter then focuses on the different book exchange networks in which Carlisle participated. I first consider his participation in the book trade, both in the north of England and in London. Secondly I show how his friends, family, and agents played important intermediary roles by suggesting and sourcing books for the Earl. The chapter ends with a consideration of the books that he inherited from three different family members.

Chapter Two considers Carlisle’s epistolary relationships. Just over 900 letters from friends and family of the 3rd Earl are archived at Castle Howard today. The

correspondence between Carlisle and his agents—consisting of around 400 items—also survives in the archives. As these two groups of letters most readily reveal Carlisle’s lifestyle at Castle Howard they feature most predominantly in the chapter. More letters than those which survive were certainly penned to and from Carlisle during his lifetime: the household accounts record payment for items during periods from which no correspondence remains. It is not surprising that the letters which have disappeared were from the most active periods of his life—the 1690s and first two decades of the eighteenth century—a time in which he moved with frequency around the country for both work and pleasure. It follows, therefore, that the survival of letters from the 1720s and 1730s is indicative of the increasingly sedentary lifestyle that Carlisle adopted at Castle Howard. It also reflects his reliance on others to connect him to the world beyond the estate’s boundaries. As the majority of letters that survive were written to the Earl, it is acknowledged that what follows is largely reliant on other people’s observations.

After providing an overview of Carlisle’s life in letters, Chapter Two traces the local and national delivery networks through which he received his correspondence. Agents provided the Earl with regular updates concerning the condition of his estates, local news from parts of country in which they were based, and information about his business pursuits. Having established the role that they played as intermediaries, particularly in times of familial crisis, the chapter then examines the familial letters that


Reasons for the lack of extant letters written from Carlisle are ambiguous. Other depositories which hold small numbers of the 3rd Earl’s letters, including some in his own hand, are Cumbria Record Office, Carlisle; East Riding of Yorkshire Archives, Beverley; West Yorkshire Record Office, Leeds; Wiltshire and Swindon Archives; Cornwall Record Office, Truro; West Sussex Record Office, Chichester; Cambridge University Library; and the British Library, London.
were sent between Carlisle and his children. From his children and their spouses he mostly received accounts of parliamentary activities, news of other family members and friends, and details of events that they had attended, including at Court. Whilst the subject matter of these letters was not particularly unusual for eighteenth-century familial letters, they provide evidence of how some of Carlisle’s children maintained correspondence with him because they were bound by familial duty. To end, the chapter examines in detail two of the Earl’s epistolary relationships: that with his son-in-law, Sir Thomas Robinson, and with his middle daughter, Viscountess Irwin. Irwin and Robinson, as we shall see, played an important role in connecting the Earl to the cultural world of London.

Finally, Chapter Three examines the different types of news that the Earl encountered at Castle Howard. The history of news-reading in the early modern period is a new and interesting topic that allows connections to be drawn between country house residents and popular culture. The significance that news-reading played in Carlisle’s life was first brought to light by the discovery of weekly payments in his household accounts for a variety of different news items. As I later discovered, reading the news on a regular basis not only kept the Earl informed of local and national matters of importance, it also offered entertainment, topical advice, and notified him of social events and cultural currents. Issues of the London Gazette that we know Carlisle read provided him with international news from Madrid, Venice, Leghorn, Warsaw, Vienna, Frankfurt, Paris, Brussels, and the Hague, for example; reports from Plymouth told of the arrival of ships from Newfoundland and the East Indies; and, on the back pages of these issues, he would have encountered advertisements notifying him of a forthcoming lecture by Robert

---

81 Joad Raymond, has in particular, focused attention on the history of news distribution and consumption. Most recently, he has led the Leverhulme-funded project, News Networks In Early Modern Europe, based at the University of East Anglia (http://newsnetworks.uea.ac.uk/home).
Hooke, newly published books by John Hopkins and John Evelyn, and an upcoming music concert at York Buildings.82

Chapter Three begins by tracing Carlisle’s interaction with one specific news story, that of the eighteenth-century quack, Dr Joshua Ward. Having been given Ward’s medicine, Carlisle was keen to follow unfolding reports that the physician distributed his “Pill and Drop” in order to convert patients to Roman Catholicism. After looking at the ways in which news was delivered to Carlisle, three sections follow, each discussing different formats of news that the Earl received. The first section considers newsbooks and how Carlisle might have used early seventeenth-century issues as historical sources. I then discuss the Earl’s use of newsletters and periodicals and how these particular news items engendered a certain social and intellectual distinctiveness for their readers. In conclusion, the chapter considers how Carlisle’s personal and professional activities were reported in newspapers. Such reports were a useful tool for an increasingly housebound Carlisle, allowing him to maintain connections with both local and national readerships.

As a whole, the books, correspondence, and news that Carlisle received challenges a central aspect of the historiography concerning the Earl’s life in Yorkshire. The arrival of texts into Castle Howard demonstrates that the 3rd Earl was not living in a state of self-imposed isolation, nor was he shunning society. Rather, his regular and continuous participation in epistolary, news, and book exchange networks meant that he remained strongly connected to political activities, social events, and cultural movements right up until his death. Recalling Alberti’s spider web metaphor, this thesis argues that Carlisle created the ‘secure foundations’ at Castle Howard from which participation in society could take place. Once in Yorkshire the 3rd Earl kept an ‘alert and watchful’ eye, waiting

for a ‘touch on the finest and most distant thread’. By identifying these interconnections between textual networks, country houses, and the people who reside in them, the present study seeks to reinvigorate the study of the English country house.
CHAPTE 1

THE 3rd EARL OF CARLISLE’S LIBRARY AT CASTLE HOWARD AND NETWORKS OF BOOK EXCHANGE

Books are the Legacies that a great Genius leaves to Mankind, which are delivered down from Generation to Generation, as Presents to the Posterity of those who are yet unborn.

_The Spectator, No. 166, Monday, 10 September 1711._

1.1 Introduction

The present chapter examines the creation and use of the 3rd Earl of Carlisle’s library and how involvement in different types of book exchange networks connected the Earl at Castle Howard to wider cultural spheres. The house’s role as a node within networks of information exchange becomes evident when we treat the books that Carlisle encountered ‘not only as bibliographical artefacts, but also as part of a social history’. Identifying what people read and why certain books were collected is a useful methodological tool when establishing the formation, circulation, and consumption of information. As William H. Sherman has pointed out, developments in the burgeoning field of book history ‘have taught us to see libraries as embedded in broader networks of textual production and dissemination.’

In an innovative case study for _The Cambridge History of Libraries in Britain and Ireland_, Giles Mandelbrote examines the social and bibliographical interconnections between a number of early modern book collections on the Derbyshire-Staffordshire

---

border. Centring on the private library of Sir William Boothby, 1st Baronet (1637-1707), Mandelbrote traces a network of textual exchange between Boothby and his neighbours. In this short essay, Mandelbrote sets a precedent for establishing how the rural élite and their libraries were part of wider intellectual and social communities. Such social networks, he writes,

provided a framework for shared activity . . . and, whether circulating in manuscript or print, in volume or in serial form, it was publication which gave shape and meaning to the diffuse activity of individuals and organizations and provided the basic mechanism for the sharing of ideas and information.

Focusing on how and why publications ended up at Castle Howard, this chapter, like Mandelbrote’s study, draws connections between people, books, and spaces.

Carlisle’s earliest encounters with books occurred in the presence of his mother, Elizabeth Uvedale, 2nd Countess of Carlisle (1646-96), at his childhood home of Naworth Castle. The extensive antiquarian library of his distant ancestor, Lord William Howard (1563-1640), was also housed at Naworth. Despite growing up in a residence with multiple book collections, as an adult Carlisle was not a voracious reader nor an extravagant purchaser of books; rather, he steadily acquired publications from a wide variety of subject areas. That this chapter investigates a book collection which was neither the creation of a great collector nor a renowned gentleman-scholar is a departure from previous studies of country house libraries. Carlisle’s library should not be compared to

---

those vast early eighteenth-century collections which belonged to the likes of his political
colleagues, Robert Harley, 1st Earl of Oxford. That the collection was eventually housed
in the magnificent setting of Castle Howard is perhaps one of its most distinctive features.
There was nothing particularly extraordinary about the books that Carlisle added to the
collection, nor about the way that he acquired them. Far from being a hindrance to this
study, the ordinariness of Carlisle’s library is treated as a quality which is representative,
more generally, of aristocratic libraries in the early modern period.

The chapter begins by introducing where Carlisle kept his collection at Castle
Howard. I then provide an overview of its contents. The latter half of the chapter analyses
the different avenues through which Carlisle obtained his books. Specifically, I focus on
the Earl’s participation in both regional and national book trade networks; the role that his
family and friends played in recommending and sourcing books; and, finally, his
inheritance of books from three different family members. Described by one scholar as
‘intellectual palimpsests’, like most other book collections, the library that remains today
at Castle Howard was compiled over many generations by multiple different hands. Of
the 20,000 books in the collection now, less than 500 derive from Carlisle’s library.
Examining how the collection was shaped during Carlisle’s lifetime, the following study
offers a snapshot of an ever-evolving library.

Library of the Wizard Earl: Henry Percy, Ninth Earl of Northumberland (1564–1632), The Library, 5th
8 Nicholas Barker rightly advises that a distinction must be drawn ‘between the libraries of the great
collectors, and the family library of a country house.’ N. Barker, ‘The Rise and Fall of the Country House
Library’ in Treasures from the Libraries of National Trust Country Houses, ed., N. Barker (New York: The Royal
Oak Foundation & The Grolier Club, 1999), p. 7. For information about the Harley library, see C. E.
Wright & R. C. Wright, eds, The Diary of Humfrey Wanley, 1713–1726 (London: Bibliographical Society,
1966).
9 Barker, ‘The Rise and Fall of the Country House Library’ in Treasures from the Libraries of National Trust
Country Houses, ed., Barker, p. 3.
1.2 ‘The Pleasure of the Mind in Reading’: Sites of Book Use and Storage at Castle Howard

At Castle Howard in the early eighteenth century, reading appears to have taken place where it was most enjoyed, a point confirmed by Lady Lechmere in a letter to her sister, Viscountess Irwin:

I imagine you pass many Hours with a Book, under the protection of the Beaches, a fine Shade, & an agreeable prospect, adds much to the pleasure of the mind in Reading, if the subject be grave, the thoughts are led to a fine retirement from the dignity of the Objects that surround them, for what can be more Glorious when one lifts up ones Eyes, than the Consideration of the Heavens, & when they are cast down, what more delightfull then the Ground laid out, as if Nature had design’d it for a Paradise[.]10

The gardens at Castle Howard were certainly an ideal setting for peaceful study and reflection, something that its architect, Hawksmoor, wanted to take advantage of. In a 1724 letter discussing his proposals for a “Turret at the Corner of Wray wood”, the architect wrote: “I propose it one Roome . . . as your Lordship may see in each of the Scizza’s or Draffts. Either of these would make a very good Studdy, the small recesses taken out of the Wall would be very convenient for sundry purposes.”11 Whilst these passages provide insight into the reading and storing of books in the gardens at Castle Howard, the only evidence that we have of books being stored in the house are a handful of passing references in the building accounts. The plans of Castle Howard which Colen Campbell printed in *Vitruvius Britannicus* (London, 1715) show no sign of a library-room (Figure 1).12 There is also no suggestion of one in the preliminary sketches of the house by

11 CH J8/1/565, Hawksmoor to Carlisle, 7 January 1724, Greenwich, p. 1r.
Hawksmoor and its other architect, Vanbrugh. Amongst the hundreds of surviving letters written to Carlisle from family and friends, a room solely dedicated to the storage of books is never mentioned. The difficulty of tracking down details of a library indicates something of the role that books played in the house: their storage and display was clearly not a dominating preoccupation for the Earl.

Figure 1. Colen Campbell, Vitruvius Britannicus: or, the British architect, with intro by John Harris, 3 vols (New York: Blom, 1967-78, facsimile reprint of the editions first published in London between 1715-1808). This plan is from vol. 1, pl. 63.

According to the building accounts, books were, in fact, stored in at least three separate locations at Castle Howard in the early eighteenth century. In different parts of the house and with distinct characteristics, these three spaces offered alternative settings in which to engage with books. In the spring of 1702 building work took place “In My Lords Apartment Altering one Chimney next the Librery two times” and then “Cutting 2 plates

---

in the Librerey". Less than a month later a man called Spoforth was paid £1 “for work in the Library”. Though its specific location is not recorded, it appears from these sources that a library was included in this early phase of construction in Carlisle’s private suite of rooms. It is likely that Carlisle was planning to keep his books in what Smith designates “My Lord’s Cabinet”, a room located at the east end of the house’s garden front (see Figure 2). This arrangement is typical of the location of other early modern country house libraries where books were housed in small closets or cabinets next to bedchambers. In this particular instance, Carlisle intended to store some of his books in a more private part of Castle Howard. With windows looking on to Ray Wood (and, eventually, the mausoleum and Temple of the Four Winds), this study-like room in the south-east wing offered Carlisle a secluded space in which he could conduct his reading.

In 1707, account entries listed under “all the Plastering Worke done att Hinderskelfe ffor the Right Honourable My Lord Carlisle By Isaack Mansfield” suggest that another space was being built to store books in a room with features that resembled the Grand Cabinet (see Figure 2). These records show that plastering work was completed “In My Lords Library”, “In plaine Lath Worke”, “In the 2 Circular Caps and Coves”, in the “Cornich in the two Caps”, and finally in the “Small Molding in the Middle pannill”. The Grand Cabinet, which was destroyed when the west wing was erected in the 1750s, had a

---

15 CH H1/1/4.
16 Smith, BCH, p. 62.
17 As well as the storage of books and precious or valuable objects, legal documents and estate papers were also often housed in country house closets. The space was used for a wide variety of functions: reading, writing, praying, and religious confession. ‘Domestic reading spaces, especially the bedchamber and book closet’, were, Heidi Brayman Hackel notes, in the early modern period, ‘critical sites of an emergent sense of privacy, but they were also frequently communal, even noisy, places.’ See Heidi Brayman Hackel, Reading Material in Early Modern England: Print, Gender, and Literacy (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), p. 34. Though the closet-study is most often discussed as a male space, it is important to stress that most elite women would have had an equivalent room in their own suite of apartments.
18 CH G2/1/1, “An account Booke of All the Mason And Carpenter Work done att Hinderskelfe”, (1702-11), f. 118v.
double-domed ceiling painted with the story of Endymion and Diana. 19 Located at the end of the suite of state rooms in the south garden front, it was in a more public part of the house. 20 Having books in this type of space illustrates the change in book reading habits that occurred at the beginning of the eighteenth century. Whilst Carlisle could retire to his private study, the Grand Cabinet offered a space in which visitors and guests could gather, converse, and be entertained, engaging with books if they so wished. With a large bay window, the room would have been a bright and open space, prefiguring the neo-Palladian libraries that featured in country houses in the 1720s and 1730s. 21 The ceiling decoration further supports the idea that this room was a space of aristocratic sociability. The story of Diana’s chaste love for the eternally beautiful Endymion, the youth put to sleep by Jupiter, evokes the Platonic ideal of love. Such symbolism recalls the gender-inclusive, pseudo-intellectual environment found in the salon culture of the Enlightenment. 22

19 MS/Atkyns/1: John Tracy Atkyns, Iter Boreale, Yale Centre for British Art, New Haven Connecticut (1732).
20 Visiting Castle Howard around 1724, William Freman observed that ‘the Hall is open on the sides to both the staircases, & to the top of the Cupola which rises high above the House there are three fine Visto’s one thro’ the depth of the House, & two very long ones thro’ the whole length which terminate in the same Room at end, one is a Library the other is a Parlour, both which rooms running cross the whole depth of the House take in each both Visto’s’. Sir John Soane’s Museum, MS A.L. 46A. William Freman, ‘Observations of a Traveller in England principally on the Seats and Mansions of the Nobility . . . from 1722-1745’, pp. 50-51.
22 For a look at salon culture in France and Italy see Goodman, The Republic of Letters and Dalton, Engendering the Republic of Letters.
Several years later, a third location for books was recorded in the building accounts. In 1715, £2 13s. was paid for a “Chimney Piece in the New Library”.\(^1\) Whether or not books remained in the Earl’s apartment or in the Grand Cabinet, the compilation of a book catalogue in 1715 suggests that this New Library was now Castle Howard’s main library-room. Indeed, it seems only right that once the majority of Carlisle’s books were placed in a permanent location, in presses made to fit a room’s dimensions and the size of the collection, he would hire someone to compile a new catalogue. Whilst the room in which his main book collection was housed has not been identified, the classification system recorded in the catalogue reveals how Carlisle’s books were organized. Smaller books were kept on the higher shelves, larger volumes on lower ones, and a number of

\(^1\) CH G2/2/43, p. 9.
over-sized works laid flat on bottom compartments.\textsuperscript{24} The pressmarks also allow us to
gauge something of the way that the shelves were located along the library’s wall space (as
represented in Table 1). The alphabetical prefixes adopted indicate that books could have
been stored in up to ten bays, each nine shelves high. That D, F, G, and J were not used as
prefixes complicates matters slightly. The exclusion of J is explainable as it is
interchangeable with I but there is no suggestion why the other letters were not used.
Perhaps they indicate shelves that were used to store objects other than books and
therefore not recorded in the catalogue. The bays were reasonably narrow with an average
of eleven items per shelf, though a number contained as few as six and as many as twenty-
seven.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. A reconstruction of the shelving at Castle Howard, devised from the pressmarks
in the 1715/16 library catalogue. The figures within the ‘shelves’ refer to the number of
books they each held. The black ‘shelves’ are those which have no books recorded in
them.

There is some evidence to indicate that the New Library was located on the
principal floor of the east wing (Figure 2). An inventory taken in the 1750s, two decades
after Carlisle’s death, records the presence of a library in this part of the house.\textsuperscript{25} The

\textsuperscript{24} See, for example, an entry in the 1715 catalogue which records ‘Caesars Commentary’s per Dr Clerk
Lying by Codgraves Dictionary’ (CH 1716 LC 04a).
\textsuperscript{25} CH F4/1, “An inventory of the household furniture, antiquities etc. belonging to the late Right
Honourable Earl of Carlisle at his Lordship’s seat or mansion”, f. 35. A vestibule corridor, directly beneath
the east-wing cupola, divided the suite of rooms.
room was bursting with furniture, not least a large bookcase that was “fill’d with Books, as by the catalogue”. As no library catalogue exists from the 4th Earl’s lifetime, there is every possibility that this reference records books organized as they were in 1715. If, indeed, this was where Carlisle housed his main collection, yet another type of space in which to engage with books – this time of a domestic nature – emerges at Castle Howard. 

There is reason to believe that the Earl resided in the east wing on a day-to-day basis, not least because the 2nd Earl of Oxford noted in 1725 that this was ‘the useful part . . . in which the family live’. It is not surprising to find that the Earl was drawn to this part of the house as he became increasingly infirm. The principal floor offered a self-contained suite of rooms (including a dressing room to the north, a closet, a bedchamber to the east, a water closet, and what was, perhaps, the New Library) suitable for an elderly Carlisle. More conducive to everyday living, the smaller rooms in the east wing would have been warmer than the larger, grand rooms on the south front. Being close to the servants’ quarters meant that they could easily assist him when needed. Carlisle’s steward, for example, resided in a suite of rooms on the ground floor of the wing. It is also feasible that this was where Carlisle’s children resided when they visited him. At various times in the building accounts bedchambers belonging to Lord Morpeth and Colonel Howard are referred to, as well as the bedchambers and drawing rooms of Viscountess Irwin and Lady Mary Howard. Purposefully perhaps, the upper floor of the

---

26 The room also contained, amongst other things: “2 Walnuttree Rush Bottom’d Chairs”, “an elbow chair cover’d with black leather”, “an oval walnuttree writing table with small drawers”, “an oval wainscot Table cover’d with blue velvet”, “a Foreign marble Table on a Set of mahogany drawers ornamented with Brass work”, “a mahogany Library Table with Drawers ornamented with Brass work with a Green Baze cover”, “a pair of Globes on the . . . Book Case”, and “4 Busto’s on the . . . book cases all antique marble”, CH F4/1, f.35.

27 Today, two matching bookcases remain in the rooms that were noted in the 1758 inventory as the library and a bedchamber. Kentian in design (of the style used at Raynham Hall, Ditchley Park, and Chiswick Villa), they likely date from the late 1720s/early 1730s. Furthermore, the 4th Earl’s inventory only takes account of one bookcase (in the library). If both bookcases were in place by the time the inventory was compiled then both should have been recorded. Whether they were brought to Castle Howard at a later date or moved from another part of the house we do not know.

east wing had five bedrooms (some of which had ante-rooms) as well as other rooms of a familial nature including a parlour and nursery. Located in what was, then, a highly domesticated part of the house, the New Library would have been a space in which Carlisle could congregate with his family and other close acquaintances, including, for example, his live-in chaplain, Mr Lewis. The inventory from the 1750s confirms that this was at one stage a personal and family-orientated space, for the room also contained “3 whole length Family pieces of painting” and “3 half length Family Ditto”.

Books were also stored at Castle Howard in other less well-defined spaces. In 1707, for example, “Lath work” was carried out in an unidentified “Small roome ffor Boocks”. Several years later, the 4th Earl’s inventory recorded that along the “vestibule Corridor” of the east wing – that is, the main corridor that ran through what I propose was Carlisle’s apartment – was “a large wainscot Chest fill’d with old acts of parliaments” and “4 Deal presses with folding doors for Books”. The closet in this apartment also contained “a mahogany Book Case with a Glass plate Door on a mahogany Frame the Glass 35 by 28 ½ inches” and a “Book case with Looking glass Doors. [T]he two plates 32 by 12 ½ inches each”. Books were thus stored in a variety of different places at Castle Howard.

1.3 Overview of the Contents of Carlisle’s Book Collection

That the 3rd Earl was neither a collector nor a scholar is a point confirmed by a distinctly unimpressed journalist following the auction of some 550 items from the Castle Howard library in 1944.

After all the excited anticipation . . . it may come as something of an anti-climax to say that one’s chief 

29 CH F4/1, f.35.
30 G2/1/1, f. 119r.
31 CH F4/1, f.36.
32 CH F4/1, f.34.
impression was one of disappointment. It is clear . . . that the library was gathered more by book-buying than by book-collecting. It consists . . . of the literature that was contemporary with the founders and builders of the library, rather than of extravagant and selective purchases of books of an earlier date.  

During Carlisle’s lifetime the library was, by and large, practical in nature rather than ornamental: most items have commonplace bindings with minimal decorative embellishment, and there are no armorial stamps or bookplates that can be specifically linked to the 3rd Earl.  

Hand-written pressmarks in the front flyleaves, correlating to the two library catalogues that he commissioned in 1698 and 1715/16, are in fact the only indication that Carlisle ever owned particular works. Indeed, annotations or other types of marginalia that might have revealed something of his reading habits or engagement with particular texts are non-existent. That his collection contained few of the great folio editions popular amongst book collectors in the early eighteenth century, nor any of the historically valuable manuscripts or incunabula that he had inherited from previous generations further suggests it was not a show library.

Perhaps the most interesting feature of the collection’s history during Carlisle’s lifetime is that it actually shrank in size, an occurrence which diverges from the trend that

---

33 ‘Castle Howard Library’, Saturday, 11 March 1944 in TLS, p. 132. The books were sold by Messrs. Hodgson & Co. at their rooms in 115 Chancery Lane, London on 3-4 February 1944. The article offers an extensive list of the books sold. Many were from the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries but a number can be found in Carlisle’s library catalogues. There was another sale in July 1944, and a third one five years later, in July 1949.

34 It was not uncommon for eighteenth-century aristocrats to have their whole collection uniformly bound. When working on the libraries of the Earls of Oxford and Leicester, binders stayed for lengthy periods at Wimpole Hall and Holkham Hall. There is no indication that Castle Howard hosted such tradesmen in Carlisle’s lifetime. See Esther Potter, ‘To Paul’s Churchyard to treat with a bookbinder’ in Property of a Gentleman: The Formation, Organisation and Dispersal of the Private Library, eds, Robin Myers & Michael Harris, 1620-1920 (Winchester: St Paul’s Bibliographies, 1991), p. 35.

35 The pressmarks have been written in a variety of pens and pencils by someone other than Carlisle.

36 Of the few markings that are present none can be conclusively ascribed to Carlisle. More often than not they appear to come from different eras of the book’s history. For more about marginalia, see William H. Sherman, Used books: Marking Readers in Renaissance England (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 2008).

saw élite libraries dramatically expand over the course of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. It is a particularly remarkable discovery when one considers that the Earl had more time on his hands following his retirement from national government (and thus more time to fill with leisurely pursuits like reading) and had moved to a much larger property which invited the expansion of his personal possessions.

The Earl probably never owned more than 1,000 books over the course of his lifetime. To put this into some sort of context, aristocratic book collections regularly began to exceed 1,000 items well before Carlisle was born, with men like his distant kinsman Thomas Howard, 2nd Earl of Arundel (d. 1646) having some 4,500 volumes by the mid-1600s. Despite being in a lower social and economic bracket, Sir William Boothby (the man whose book collection was the subject of Mandelbrote’s study) had a library of 6,000 items at his death in 1707. In contrast, Carlisle’s 1698 catalogue contains just 753 entries and the 1715/16 catalogue only 549. Of interest, then, is the revelation that during the intervening eighteen years around 144 items were added to the library but 342 books were removed, omitted, or lost (see Table 2).


Calculating a specific total is impossible because of inconsistencies in the catalogue entries. Duplicate entries are common and there are also multiple cases where books are not recorded even when we know they were in Carlisle’s possession. In addition, the books that he acquired after the 1715/16 catalogue were not added to his catalogue.


Beal, “My Books are the great joy of my life”, p. 365.

Considering the detailed and extensive nature of the Earl’s record-keeping in other areas of his life (e.g. his building accounts), it is notable that I have only been able to identify the titles or genre of ten publications that he paid money for. Bought between the years 1691 and 1725, the works were recorded in the accounts as: “Lex parliamentaria”, “memoirs of Sir William Temple”, “the armes of the nobility”, “Colliers Essays”, “the 2nd part of the Earl of Clarendons History of the Civall warrs”, “King of Frances life”, “Sir William Temple’s works”, “3rd Volume of . . . Vitruvius Britannicus”. Two Common Prayer books were also acquired. Multiple books were often bought at the same time, but because exact figures were rarely noted down, the calculation of the total number of books that Carlisle purchased is impossible. Many entries simply refer to payments which were made to a stationer or bookseller with no indication of the goods that were bought.
Table 2. A graph showing the quantity and genre of books that were removed from/added to Carlisle’s book collection between 1698 and 1715/16.

Unfortunately, we do not know what happened to these ‘lost’ volumes. Were they brought to Castle Howard but omitted from the 1715/16 catalogue because they were in another part of the house? Left behind in Carlisle’s apartment, for example, or in the Grand Cabinet? An inventory of the 4th Earl’s books which were brought from London to Castle Howard after his death in 1758 indicates that the 3rd Earl did not leave any of the books at the family townhouse in Soho Square. The significant figure points to the likelihood that they were selectively removed rather than simply lost. Considering the financial troubles that he faced following his departure from central government office, it is possible that Carlisle sold them to the second-hand market, though how much revenue

---

Of these 342 books, history and theology texts made up the largest proportion at eighty and forty-five volumes respectively. Nearly seventy works of classical literature, law and trade, and political texts were also removed.
they would have raised is unknown. Possibly the move to Castle Howard encouraged the Earl to take stock of the collection, choosing to remove those items that were of no use to him anymore.

Although down-sizing a collection might suggest bibliographic indifference on the part of the Earl, Carlisle’s correspondence suggest that he remained interested in cultural affairs and developments after his move to Yorkshire. References to early eighteenth-century bibliographic culture are scattered throughout the Earl’s correspondence with his family. In the late 1730s his daughter, Viscountess Irwin, reported from London of a fire at the Temple which “destroy’d a vast number of Chambers with manuscripts & writings to a great Value”. Earlier in the decade, Sir Thomas Robinson had notified his father-in-law of another devastating fire, this time at the Cottonian Library which, he concluded, was a “great mortification of all Antiquarians, & lovers of true learning”. And following a tour of Oxfordshire, Carlisle’s youngest son, Colonel Howard, commented to his father, “Oxford gave me no great entertainment, there is little variety, & the Colledges have most of them a malencho[...] unfinished which I think they design for a library”.

The creation of the 1698 and 1715/16 library catalogues implies, furthermore, a certain level of interest in the documentation and use of the collection. These catalogues bookend the most active stage of Carlisle’s adult life, a period that saw the conception and construction of Castle Howard as well as the establishment and abandonment of a political

44 We know that later in his life the Earl sold a number of manuscripts which he had inherited from his ancestor, Lord William Howard, suggesting that he was aware of the second-hand book market. See below p. 93.
45 CH J8/1/273, Irwin to Carlisle, 11 January [1737], [London], p. 1r. Visiting Liege in 1730, Irwin wrote to her father that “the Rector of the English Jesuits . . . show’d me the whole Colledge Library & Garden; which by the rules of their order no woman is allow’d to enter”. CH J8/1/223, Irwin to Carlisle, 11 August [1730], Brussels, pp. 1v-2r.
47 CH J8/1/42, Howard to Carlisle, 15 June [1732?], London, pp. 1r-1v.
career. The first of the catalogues was compiled when the Earl was nearing thirty and at the beginning of a promising career in national government. On 16 April 1698, £2 was “given the man that help’d in the Library and writt the Letters and Catalogue of the bookes”. The care taken with the catalogue suggests that whoever compiled it was a person who was experienced in documenting library collections. Entitled A Catalogue of The Right Honourable Charles Earl of Carlisle’s Book’s in the Library In His Lordships House In So=Ho Square London, the work, which is bound in reverse calf, is laid out in a neat, clear, and organized manner (Figure 3).

48 CH H/1/1/3. The same handwriting is used throughout the work, though, occasionally at the end of each section, entries have been written in a rushed manner. See, for example, the final seven entries under section B.


50 CH H/2/3/8.
A short explanation following the title-page describes the classification technique adopted by the cataloguer and informs our understanding of the shelving system at Carlisle House.

Each pressmark has three components:

C. signifies the Classis which is mark’d at Top [of the press] with Gold Letters A, B, C, D, E, &c Reckoning them from the Left hand to the Right. D. Signifies the Division partition or Shelf directly down under the Gold Letters on the Top. N. Signifies the Number of the Book’s in Each Shelf According to the figure mark’d on the Back.\(^{31}\)

\(^{31}\) Thus Agrippa’s *Vanity of the sciences* which has the shelfmark B.C.09 was in the second column, third row down, and the ninth book on that shelf. A manicule signals a note at the bottom of the page which stresses ‘that the Large Black Letters [in the catalogue] denotes the Division which are Reckon’d downward from the Top A, B, C, D, E &c. Which are plac’d against the Middle of that shelf to which they Direct.’
Plenty of empty pages suggest that future additions were expected. The creation of such a luxurious item signifies Carlisle’s move to London from the provinces and entrance into fashionable society.

Though containing more pages, the second catalogue, created eighteen years later at Castle Howard, is plainer than the first and lacks its precision.⁵² Considering the grandness of his new residence, it is curious that he was less concerned with having an elaborately embellished catalogue. It perhaps speaks of his retirement from public life and from his London townhouse where everything, including his first catalogue, would have been on show. As with the first catalogue, plenty of space was left in the second for future purchases to be added, though none were. Whilst the handwriting differs from the other catalogue, the format is almost identical to that used in the earlier one.⁵³ A comparison of the pressmarks used in both catalogues reveals that, though the classification system remained the same, those marks employed at Carlisle House were replaced with a new set upon arrival at Castle Howard.

Of the 1,000 books that Carlisle owned at one stage or another during his life, just under half this number feature in both library catalogues. These core texts provide a clearly defined group from which we can draw conclusions about the Earl’s overall collection and his intellectual interests. Reflecting the traditional education that the son of an Earl would have received at the end of the seventeenth century, more than a quarter of this core group were works of history, whilst the next largest section was theology (see Table 3).

⁵² CH H/2/3/8. The wording of the title-page, which has no calligraphic embellishment like the first, is copied verbatim, as is the following page of instructions.
Countering Smith’s suggestion that the Earl’s commonplace books from his Grand Tour offer a ‘cumulative impression of . . . a young man who was taking his education seriously, reading widely in classical authors, and interested in what information he could glean about art and antiquities’, works by classical authors make up just 5.3% of the core group. Despite being known primarily for the building of Castle Howard, art and architectural books make up just a small percentage (2.5%). Works about heraldry – a topic which, in Smith’s mind, played a key role in influencing the building of Castle Howard – are represented by just 2.5% of the core group.

Smith, BCH, p. 3. Carlisle’s commonplace books should be assessed cautiously. By the end of the seventeenth century commonplacing was not the learned and introspective act which it had been. Advice books and tutors were on hand to teach the most effective methods of gathering comments from classical authors with little if any recourse to original texts. The act of writing out the moral platitudes of Seneca, Horace, and Juvenal does not necessarily indicate an in-depth knowledge of these works. For information on the reading of classical literature in the eighteenth century, see George Brauer, *The Education of a Gentleman: Theories of Gentlemanly Education, 1660-1775* (New York: Bookman Associates, 1959), pp. 82-90, and Penelope Wilson, ‘Classical Poetry and the Eighteenth-Century Reader’ in *Books and their Readers in Eighteenth-Century England*, ed., Isobel Rivers (Leicester & New York: Leicester University Press & St. Martin’s Press, 1982), pp. 69-96. For Carlisle’s notebooks, see CH J8/35/1: Notes on Italy [1690]; CH J8/35/2: Notes on the principal Families in Rome [1690]; CH J8/35/3: Observations upon Medallions in French & English [c. 1688-90]; and CH J8/35/4: Remarks out of several Books in Latin, French, & English [c. 1688-90].

One need only turn to the library of his own architect, Nicholas Hawksmoor, to see the extent of architectural works that were available. See Kerry Downes, ‘Hawksmoor’s Sale Catalogue’, *The Burlington Magazine*, 95 (1953), pp. 332-35.
Howard – was an equally small section at just 1.3%. None of the other seventeen subject areas that feature in the library account individually for more than 10% of the whole collection, revealing a library which was either intentionally diverse or inadvertently unfocused.

As a whole, the composition of the core group reflects Carlisle’s wider book collection, with works of history consistently dominating the library’s holdings throughout his lifetime. In a political pamphlet that he published in 1733, the Earl expressed his belief that the reading of history could inform one’s judgement of the present:

But Oh, my Fellow-Country-Men, be not deluded by false Representations; examine and consider the happy Situation you are in; look back into History, and I believe it will not be found (put all Circumstances together) that the People of England, in any other former Reign, ever possessed so many Blessings as they do under the present.

Carlisle’s role in the nation’s government is evident in the multiple collections of state tracts, parliamentary proceedings, acts, declarations, and other publications detailing the political debates in which he would have been personally involved. To make his mark in the House of Lords, the Earl would have needed to know the course of English history as well as the root causes of the political and religious turmoil that the country had endured over the past century. Works on English history feature most predominantly, therefore,

---

56 Smith, BCH, pp. 11-12.
57 [Charles Howard, 3rd Earl of Carlisle], Some observations upon a paper intituled The List. That is, of those who voted for and against the excise-bill (London: J. Peele, 1733), p. 27.
58 For example, a publication detailing statutes passed in the last year of Queen Anne’s reign. CH 1715/16 MD 06: Anno regni Annae reginae magnae Britannisae, Franciae, & Hiberniae, duodecimo (London: Printed by John Basket, 1714).
with grand historical narratives of the nation’s monarchy the most frequent topic. The appearance of John Toland’s *Anglia libera: or, the limitation and succession of the crown of England* (London, 1701), Gilbert Burnet’s *History of the reformation of the Church of England* (London, 1679-1715) and the Earl of Clarendon’s *History of the rebellion and civil wars in England* (Oxford, 1702-04), for example, suggests that the Earl knew much about the volatile history which had shaped England’s political climate at the turn of the eighteenth century.

Alongside books on Britain, accounts of European history were also present as well as a variety of histories detailing the classical periods and the New World. Another aspect of Carlisle’s career – as a commissioner in the talks which led to the Act of Union in 1707 – explains the inclusion of a number of works detailing Anglo-Scottish relations, particularly James Drake’s *Historia Anglo-Scotica: or an impartial history of all that happen’d between the kings and kingdoms of England and Scotland* (London, 1703).

The 3rd Earl’s political and administrative role in the north of England is similarly reflected in the books that he owned. As Carlisle was responsible for numerous estates in Cumbria, Northumberland, Westmoreland, and Yorkshire, it is not surprising to find texts like Henry Finch’s *Summary of the common law of England* (London, 1673). William Dugdale’s *Origines juridiciales; or historical memorials of the English laws* (London, 1680, 3rd ed.) would have informed the Earl of his legal rights as a landowner, as well as those of the communities over which he presided. Matthew Tindal’s *Essay concerning the power of the

---

60 Though he worked alongside the King in 1701, as a Whig, Carlisle was likely to have been cautious of the role that monarchy played in governing a nation, particularly after the constitutional reform that had taken place after the Glorious Revolution.

61 Toland: CH 1698 JA 13 and CH 1715/16 IG 04; Burnet: CH 1698 BE 06-07 and CH 1715/16 LC 02; and Clarendon: CH 1715/16 LD 13.

62 See, for example, CH 1698 GA 03 & CH 1715/16 NC 01: Alexandre Olivier Exquemelin’s *History of the bucaniers of America* (London, 1695) and CH 1698 KD 09 & CH 1715/16 HE 10: Richard Ligon’s *True and exact history of the island of Barbadoes* (London, 1673).

63 CH 1715/16 NF 04.

64 CH 1698 DD 06 and CH 1715/16 CI 06.

65 CH 1698 EE 00 and CH 1715/16 BF 09.
magistrate (London, 1706) and Michael Dalton’s Countrey justice, containing the practise of the justices of the peace (London, 1626) highlight the judicial roles that he (or his representatives,) were often required to assume in the north of England.66

Theology was the second largest group of texts amongst Carlisle’s book collection. As with his history books and his political career, we see a similar correlation between the theological topics present and what we know of his religious outlook. Smith and Wilson have explored the 3rd Earl’s theological views, primarily drawing evidence from his three essays concerning the interrelationship between God, nature, and man.67 These essays, Smith concludes, indicate that ‘Carlisle had come into contact with – and may have been influenced by – the writings of the Deists, and that he certainly held strong and independent views about the role of the Church and of the priesthood.’68 The manuscripts undeniably display a man highly influenced by Deist convictions. Emphasizing the unchangeable laws of nature over supernatural events like prophecies and miracles, Deists called for reason to be the underlying driving force of religious practice. Carlisle expressed such a view in one his essays thus:

I can argue only from the reason of things & the common course of nature which never varies. No arguments can be offer’d against facts alleg’d, & supported by supernatural causes. In such cases every body is at liberty to beleive, or not beleive what is related, as the same appears reasonable to him. for in the points of credit the most insisted upon, it is reason that must determine every Man to give or not give his assent.69

66 Tindal: CH 1698 DJ 07 and CH 1715/16 IH 05; Dalton: CH 1698 EE 13 and CH 1715/16 HF 04. For Carlisle’s role in local judiciary matters, see, for example, CH J8/28/33-47. These letters, sent to Carlisle between 8 October 1724 and 14 October 1737 from his Morpeth agent, Mr Aynsley, concern business which Aynsley conducted on behalf of the 3rd Earl, such as holding court sessions at the yearly assizes held in Morpeth. For a brief look at the importance of law in a gentleman’s education, see Brauer, Education of a Gentleman, pp. 80-82.
67 CH J8/35/15-17.
68 Smith, BCH, p. 167; Wilson, RRR, pp. 46-47; and Wilson, LR, pp. 434-37.
69 CH J8/35/17, Essays on God, Man, and Reason (c.1730s). Quote taken from Wilson’s transcription in LR, p. 95.
The emergence of the English Deist movement stemmed, in part, from the practice of reading classical works in tandem with Christian texts. Such textual collisions occurred on the bookshelves at Castle Howard. Alongside works of practical divinity and Anglican theology, Carlisle had a whole shelf of books about Greek history including John Potter’s *Archaeologia Graeca: or, the antiquities of Greece* (London, 1706), Temple Stanyon’s *Grecian history* (London, 1707), the first volume of Thomas Hind’s *History of Greece* (London, 1707), and a 1598 edition of Polybius.

Religious scepticism of the sort propounded by the Deists was further influenced by the increased availability of travel-writing which introduced early modern readers to non-Christian societies. Accounts of voyages, adventures, and distant lands remain a consistent presence in Carlisle’s library. Whilst it would be wrong to say that Carlisle acquired texts concerning the non-Christian world because he had Deist tendencies, we can certainly acknowledge that his literary encounters with, for example, the histories of China, America, Africa, Persia, and the Far East, would have broadened his religious philosophy. An entry in the 1698 catalogue which reads “Alcoran in English” indicates the 3rd Earl was willing to explore at first hand the theological texts of religions outside the western world. Carlisle’s library catalogues also include entries for *The Hebrew republic* (Leiden, 1617) by Petrus Cunaeus (Peter van der Kun), along with one, if not

---

70 E. Rupp, *Religion in England, 1688-1791* (Oxford & New York: Clarendon Press, 1986), pp. 257-75. Deistic belief, according to Rupp, fed off the Hellenic revival of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries: ‘Here in a pre-Christian world was a belief in rationality and freedom, a splendid culture in prose and verse, the bearers of which were cultivated and liberal-minded men, who saw beneath the façade of ritual and superstition of their age’, p. 260.

71 Potter: CH 1715/16 NE 01; Stanyon: CH 1715/16 NE 03; Hind: CH 1715/16 NE 04; and Polybius: CH 1698 DJ 04-05 & CH 1715/16 NE 05.


73 For example, CH 1715/16 KE 06: *Atlas Chinensis: being a second part of a relation of remarkable passages in two embassies from the East India Company of the United Provinces to . . . Konchi, Emperor of China and East-Tartary* (London, 1671) and CH 1698 EF 01-02: John Ogilby’s *Africa: being an accurate description of the regions* (London, 1670).

two, translations of Flavius Josephus’s *Antiquities of the Jews*, including Joseph Gorion’s *The
doctrine, and most deplorable history of the latter times of the Jews* (London, 1653).\(^75\)

Despite the fact that Carlisle’s library decreased in size between 1698 and 1715/16, the
make-up of the book collection was not drastically altered by his move north (see Table
4). Indeed, the only subject areas which included more books at Castle Howard than when
the collection was at Soho Square were philosophy and reference works. This difference is
negligible, however, at just two and one additions respectively. Quantitatively, the five
subject areas which were most common in 1698 were history, theology, classical
literature, law and trade, and politics. Eighteen years later in Yorkshire, this order
remains very similar: politics has moved up one place, whilst the category of law and trade
was replaced by poetry (4.4%). Though this shift is marginal it might reflect Carlisle’s
retirement from national politics and adoption of a more leisurely life at Castle Howard.

That the Earl wrote a number of poems all seemingly influenced by his experience of
living at Castle Howard, further suggests that he was more engaged with poetry once he
had moved to Yorkshire.\(^76\) Contemporary poetry made up a healthy proportion of the
Earl’s library. Publications of early seventeenth-century poets by the likes of Suckling,
Cowley, Carew, and Waller sat alongside the next generation of writers like those who

---

\(^{75}\) Cunaeus: CH 1698 DC 06; *Antiquities of the Jews*: CH 1698 BF 01 and CH 1698 GH 03. For one man’s
engagement with Jewish texts in the early modern period see Anthony Grafton, *“I have always loved the Holy
Tongue”: Isaac Casaubon, the Jews, and a Forgotten Chapter in Renaissance Scholarship* (Cambridge, MA &

\(^{76}\) Transcriptions and analysis of all of Carlisle’s literary works can be found in Wilson, *LR*: CH J8/35/8,
*Introduction to an Epistle from Antiochus to Stratonice* (1717), pp. 166-79; CH J8/35/6, *A Milk White Heifer*
to his Son* (1735), pp. 461-71.
appeared in Tonson’s popular miscellanies. There was also a small coterie of female poets that included Aphra Behn and Lady Mary Lee Chudleigh.

Table 4. A graph showing the number of books per subject area at both Carlisle House and at Castle Howard.

For the most part, the books recorded in his library catalogues provide the impression that Carlisle was interested in having a collection that was useful to him in professional terms. Amongst the 144 items which were added to the collection between 1698 and 1715/16, works of history and theology were most common. Considering that these subject areas also made up the largest group of books which were removed during this period, Carlisle, it appears, steadily updated his library works with volumes of more contemporary relevance. Thus seven works detailing the reigns of William III and Queen

---

77 Suckling (CH 1715/16 IH 14), Cowley (CH 1698 KC 08 and CH 1715/16 HD 02), Carew (CH 1698 BA 24 and CH 1715/16 HB 18), Waller (CH 1698 GA 17 and 1715/16 IG 10) and Tonson’s miscellanies (CH 1698 HA 09 and CH 1715/16 CE 07).
78 Carlisle had Behn’s Miscellany, being a collection of poems by several hands (London, 1685) and Chudleigh’s Poems on several occasions (London, 1703). See CH 1715/16 IF 08 and CH 1715/16 IH 02 respectively.
79 At least forty-two and sixteen additions respectively were made to these subject areas. For the majority of subject areas, however, less than ten items per group were added.
Anne replaced nine books about the reigns of James I, Charles I, Charles II and James II. Francis Hare’s *The conduct of the Duke of Marlborough during the present war* (London, 1712) replaced *The Life of the thrice noble, high and puissant prince William Cavendishe* (London, 1667). T. A. Birrell has proposed that the motivation behind the creation of most gentlemen’s libraries in the early modern period was ‘predominantly utilitarian’; books were bought as and when they were needed.

As a landowner and magistrate he needed books on law. As a patron of church livings he needed books on theology. His interest in local history was largely a landowner’s interest. General history was ethics: you learnt from the past how to behave in the world to your own best advantage. And even the acquisition of literature . . . was partly utilitarian. It was justified as a mixture of the *utile* and the *dulce*.

Indeed, the range of topics included in the Earl’s library reflects what we know of his education and position in society.

Having provided an overview of the contents of Carlisle’s library, the following section explores the different channels through which the Earl acquired his books. These networks of acquisition were diverse in nature, some were private whilst others were public, some were local and some national, and, as we shall see in the last part of the chapter, some bridged generations.

### 1.4 “Delivering up the books”: The Arrival of Books at Castle Howard

The creation and management of a book collection in the early modern period required commitment and dedication. Contrary to romantic notions of the solitary scholar in his private, book-lined study, the act of acquiring books in the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries involved a large number of people connected to widespread

---

80 CH 1698 JB 13 and CH1715/16 NH 11 respectively.
81 T. A. Birrell, ‘Reading as Pastime: The Place of Light Literature in some Gentlemen’s Libraries of the Seventeenth Century’ in *Property of a Gentleman*, eds, Myers & Harris, p. 114.
82 Ibid, p. 114.
networks of bibliographic exchange. At the turn of the eighteenth century, London was still the commercial hub for the country’s book trade. Whilst the growing role of the early eighteenth-century provincial bookseller should not be overlooked, acquiring books was a more problematic and time-consuming process in rural parts of the country. Even though Carlisle’s book-buying habits were slight compared to some collectors of the period, the logistics involved in getting books to Castle Howard involved no less effort.

The extent of the consumer networks in which men like Carlisle participated reveal the connectedness of country houses and their residents. Due to their social and financial resources, country house residents could choose when and where they purchased their goods. When at Naworth or Castle Howard, the Earl acquired his household and personal goods – including books – from the northern commercial centres of Carlisle, Newcastle, and York alongside London trading establishments. As John Stobart has shown in his work on country houses and consumerism, eighteenth-century aristocrats exercised their consumer power by frequenting regional establishments just as much as urban ones. The misconception that country house residents, living at a distance from London, made little if any use of regional bookshops has been reinforced by the general presumption that regional establishments only supplied everyday rather than luxury goods. By placing emphasis on the relationship between élites, urban centres, and the consumption of luxury goods, we have failed to recognize two important aspects of

83 Calling it the Montaigne-model, Sherman has shown the idea of the isolated scholar in his private library to be a myth. Sherman, ‘The Place of Reading in the English Renaissance’ in The Practice and Representation of Reading in England, eds, Raven, Small, & Tadmor, pp. 70-72.
84 Stobart, ‘Gentlemen and Shopkeepers’, passim.
aristocratic and, more specifically, country house living: namely, that there were opportunities to buy a diversity of goods in the provinces, and that aristocrats purchased everyday, popular goods as much as luxury items.\textsuperscript{86} Indeed, Carlisle’s book-buying habits indicate that he made use of both national and provincial book trade networks \textit{and} purchased cheap, popular works alongside more expensive, élite items.

Once the Earl had settled in Yorkshire, books would have been dispatched to Castle Howard directly from the shops from which they had been ordered. Alternatively, his agents, friends, or family members could have organized their delivery north. Whilst larger items (including statues, a marquee, and mature trees for the garden) were sent from London by boat to Hull, smaller goods, such as books, were placed on the London-York Coach, a journey that typically took four days in the early eighteenth century. If the packages were considered too precious or fragile, or contained items of a sensitive nature, either a porter was hired to accompany the goods or they were sent by private carrier. In 1729, the Earl’s eldest daughter, Lady Lechmere, wrote in the post-script of a letter to her father: “I desire My sister Irwin to send the Papers she mentions to me, either by the stage Coach or Carrier, which she thinks safest \& lett me know where to send for them, and when.”\textsuperscript{87} Whenever Carlisle’s London agent, Michael Jackson, sent the Earl documents of a legal or official matter he placed them in a secure box.\textsuperscript{88}

Having arrived in York, Carlisle’s goods would have been picked up by one of his servants and subsequently delivered to Castle Howard. At one point in the 1730s, Jackson


\textsuperscript{87} CH J8/1/383, Lechmere to Irwin, 28 November 1728, Poland Street, [London], p. 1v.

\textsuperscript{88} See, for example, CH H1/1/3, 13 January 1701: “payd Carriage for A box by the York Coach” (3s. 6d.) and CH H1/1/5, 10 October 1709: “sending a box of writing by Yorke Coach to Mr Adams” (4s.). One George Crabtree, a carrier based at the White Horse Inn on Cripplegate in London, was named by Jackson in a letter to Carlisle. CH J8/34/186-273, Jackson to Carlisle, June 1734.
reminded the Earl that someone from Castle Howard would need to pick up a package of “mould candles” which a carrier would deposit at the Red Lyon Inn on Monk Bar in York.\(^8\) Jackson might well have been referring to a Mr Crowe who appears to have been working for Carlisle, picking up such purchases and taking them to Castle Howard.\(^9\) Esther Potter has calculated that the postage for sending packets of printed books in the mid-seventeenth century was around 2d. a pound, a charge that often doubled the price of the goods being sent.\(^10\) Carlisle’s household accounts offer small clues regarding the cost of shipment half a century later. Although postage would have varied according to weight, distance, and mode of delivery, the cost does not appear to have dramatically altered from earlier in the century. In 1694, for example, 1s. was paid for the carriage of a book from Newcastle.\(^11\) Three years later 4s. 6d. was given to a group of porters and “Carmen” for carrying books to Carlisle House.\(^12\)

As we shall see, the Earl became increasingly dependent on suggestions made by friends, family members, and acquaintances regarding the books that he should purchase. Though he would have encountered publishers’ advertisements in the pamphlets and periodicals which he read, he made little use of trade material – that is, contemporary auction catalogues, subject indexes, catalogues of exemplar libraries, or library science texts – in a quest to expand or enhance his book collection. His participation in book exchange networks was unstructured and, at times, opportunistic. Occupying the space between personal interest and happenstance, his non-systematic way of acquiring books provides insight into how the majority of books ended up in country houses in the early modern period.

\(^8\) CH J8/34/186-273, Jackson to Carlisle, n.d.
\(^9\) CH J8/34/186-273, Jackson to Carlisle, n.d.
\(^10\) Potter, ‘To Paul’s Churchyard to treat with a bookbinder’ in Property of a Gentleman, eds, Myers & Harris, p. 35.
\(^11\) CH H1/1/2, 9 November 1694.
\(^12\) CH H1/1/2, 19 May 1697.
The next part of the chapter examines the different channels through which books arrived at Castle Howard. Before looking at the role that family and friends played in sourcing and recommending books, we shall first turn to the Earl’s participation in local and national book trade networks.

1.4.1 The Acquisition of Books through the Book Trade

In 1732, Carlisle’s son-in-law, Sir Thomas Robinson, wrote to the Earl regarding his hopes for an appointment as one of the Lords of the Admiralty. In an attempt to raise funds, Robinson and his wife sold pictures, sculptures, and books that had once belonged to Lady Lechmere’s first husband. Robinson told Carlisle: “I have sent you Lordship a Catalogue & if there be any you may want, if your Lordship commissions your Bookseller in Town, you may in all probability buy them very reasonably, for the Town will have in this instance what they are very little acquainted with which is a fair sale”.\(^9^4\) As well as being the only piece of evidence that shows the 3rd Earl encountered book catalogues, Robinson’s comment also reveals that Carlisle had an appointed bookseller in London in the 1730s.

Forty years earlier, in the 1690s, a young Carlisle had patronized at least two London booksellers. Whether resident in London or the north of England, his utilization of the Capital’s book trade remained constant. Indeed, in some cases, London was the only place to find a specific service or item. Specialist book dealers grew in number as the eighteenth century progressed and eventually different areas of London hosted subject-specific bookshops.\(^9^5\) Carlisle’s patronage of several booksellers likely reflects the fact that he received different types of books and services from different traders.\(^9^6\)

\(^{94}\) CH J8/1/434, Robinson to Carlisle, 3 February 1732, London, p. 1v.

\(^{95}\) Macky’s guide-book, began in 1714, identified “divinity and classicks” on the north side of St Paul’s Churchyard, “law, history and plays” near to Temple Bar, “French-booksellers” in the Strand, and
His first known payment to one Mr Chapman occurred in 1693, “as per bill”; two years later, at the end of 1695, £5 was “payd mr Chapman by his Lordshipps order”. As well as providing books, the accounts show that Mr Chapman also offered postal and financial services. In November 1696, 11s. 10d. was “payd mr Chapman as per bill for Letters &c” and a year later he was given money “to pay Counsell”.

From 1698, Carlisle also began receiving goods from one Mr Harding. According to the British Book Trade Index (BBTI), one John Harding worked as a bookseller and stationer in London between 1675 and 1718, initially trading from the Bible and Anchor in St Paul's Churchyard and then at properties in Newport Street, near Leicester Fields, and St Martin's Lane. The Earl’s first purchase from Harding, in April of 1698, totalled an impressive £27 though there is no way to know whether he had bought books or other items that a bookseller-stationer might sell. Harding, like Chapman, also handled post alongside book trade services. Though the former stopped trading in 1718, one Samuel Harding (possibly his son) took over the business. He is likely, therefore, to be the bookseller which Robinson referred to in 1732. If this was the case, then Carlisle had maintained a working relationship with the Hardings for over two decades. Such long-
term relationships between customers and booksellers ensured both a regular source of orders for the tradesmen and attentive service for the clients.  

London would not have been Carlisle’s only option for book-buying. It is a misconception that the early modern provincial book trade was, at its worst, non-existent and, at its best, erratic. By the mid-seventeenth century, books and other reading material could be purchased in all the major urban centres and in many minor ones too. The small town of Penrith, for example, twenty-five miles south-west of Naworth, had an established bookseller from the seventeenth century. On 9 November 1694, 1s. was paid for the “Carriage of A Book from Newcastle” suggesting that Carlisle patronized at least one bookseller in this north-eastern town.

For those like the 3rd Earl living in northern England, channels for book-buying were available if one had the money and inclination. Goods could be sourced from a wide area if one were wealthy. On 14 June 1694, £9 14s. 8d. was paid for unspecified goods to one Mr Gale, “As by Bill from Ireland”. Slightly closer to home, in December 1693, Carlisle paid £1 7s. 10d. to “mr Read for carriage of goods from London [to Naworth]”. Getting books to either Naworth or Castle Howard, however, involved a protracted sequence of exchanges. Writing to a young Carlisle in 1695, one Charles Wynne referred to the local distribution networks in the north-west of England which the Howards used to get books delivered to them:

102 Stobart, ‘Gentlemen and Shopkeepers,’ p. 893.
105 CH H1/1/2. See also, for example, CH H1/1/2, 12 February 1694: “payd the carriage of goods from Newcastle” (4s.). The BBTI records thirteen booksellers in Newcastle at the end of the seventeenth century.
106 CH H1/1/2.
107 CH H1/1/2, 4 December 1693.
Dr Hornett presents his most humble service to your Lordship and sent the Books, which I have per this returne of the Kendall carrier sent in my Ladys Box directed to her Honourable to be left with Mr Symson at Penreth, he toold me when in town that it was the best and cheapest way[,] very often the goods, directed for Carlisle through the neglect of the carrier were left att Penreth a weeke sometimes tenn days. I have per this poste wrote to him to take care of the Box, and to send it to Naward.  

Money and social connections clearly made the process of acquiring books easier and quicker.

Although no receipts or trade cards survive that might have revealed which particular booksellers the Earl patronized whilst living at Castle Howard, when a middle-aged Carlisle returned to the north of England he resumed his participation in the region’s book exchange networks. By the eighteenth century, Yorkshire had an active book trade. The region maintained good links with London, and the towns of York and Newcastle were important commercial hubs, buoyed up by the arrival of Carlisle’s aristocratic contemporaries who were increasingly drawn to the county as a place to spend part of their summer. The seaside town of Scarborough is notable in this regard. Writing to his father in 1732, Carlisle’s younger son, Colonel Howard, recorded the imminent arrival north of a number of the Earl’s aristocratic friends:

You will have a great deal of Company this year att Scarborough[.] Lord Malpas comes the beginning . . July & designs coming to Castle Howard, & proposes staying the races, the Duchess of Marlborough I hear has sent to take a house there & Lord Chesterfield who is much out of order I am told is to come besides several others of not so great rank[,] the waters to be sure are in great reputation, & a good deal at present in fashion, which governs more than anything else.

Tapping into this market, in the 1730s the London booksellers Caesar Ward and Richard Chandler set up a lending library in Scarborough. Operating during the Season, the library

109 CH J8/1/41, Howard to Carlisle, 27 April [1732], n.p., p. 2r.
was patronized by fashionable visitors to the seaside town, perhaps even the 3rd Earl himself. Inland, Malton was the closest commercial centre to Castle Howard though opportunities to buy books in the town were limited. A bookseller was active there in the 1680s but another is not recorded until 1719. This later bookseller, named Mennel, was active until 1731 and could easily have supplied the 3rd Earl with books and other types of reading material.

As a regular visitor to the city of York, Carlisle would have certainly been aware of its thriving, competitive book trade. Located fifteen miles south-west of Castle Howard, the Earl spent enough time in the city – attending assemblies, the races, and other social engagements – to warrant the acquisition of a lease in 1719 to a suite of rooms at St. William’s College, just yards from the Minster. Parish registers record that the 3rd Earl maintained a permanent staff at the College which, during the eighteenth century, came to be known locally as Carlisle Buildings. In September 1720, a year after he had purchased the lease, Carlisle paid £2 2s. to “the Bookseller at York for Sir William Temple’s works, & some other books”. Alongside bookbinders, printers, and publishers, there were eight booksellers active in York in the year 1720. Francis Hildyard dominated the city’s book trade between 1682 and 1731 from his establishment

---

110 Sessions & Sessions, Printing in York, Chapters V – VIII.
111 See, for example, CH J8/4/5, 8 August 1721: “Lost at play at York during the time at the Races” and then “Spent at York at the same time”. P. R. Newman, The History of St William’s College ([York]: Published by the Dean & Chapter of York, 1994), p. 16. Newman incorrectly refers to Carlisle as the 6th Earl. The entry for St William’s College in An Inventory of the Historical Monuments in the City of York, vol. V, The Central Area (London: Royal Commission on Historical Monuments, 1981) wrongly assumes that, between 1701-21, the 4th Earl was the builder of Castle Howard. The Castle Howard building accounts record a payment made to a carpenter and joiner for work done in 1705 at the “Yorke House” (CH G2/1/1, f. 60r). This suggests that Carlisle had a property in York prior to 1719, however it has not been possible to trace any more information about this property.
112 Newman, The History of St William’s College, p. 4, p. 16.
114 There were also two bookbinders in York in 1715. See Peter Borsay, ‘Politeness and Elegance: The Cultural Re-Fashioning of Eighteenth-Century York’ in Eighteenth-Century York: Culture, Space and Society, eds, Mark Hallett & Jane Rendell, Borthwick Text and Calendar 30 (York: Borthwick Institute of Historical Research & The University of York, 2003), p. 3.
at the Sign of the Bible on Stonegate. Other successful traders included Richard Mancklin, who had a shop on Coney Street, and Thomas Hammond II, a Quaker, who had premises all over the city. When Carlisle was in residence at St William’s College he could frequent these shops (gout permitting) with ease: Stonegate, where Hildyard had his property, commences on the other side of the Minster Yard. Also located east of the river, Coney Street would have been similarly accessible. Though there is no indication in the Earl’s accounts of the identity (or identities) of the York booksellers that he patronised, Carlisle’s interests and open-mindedness suggest it was just as likely that he made use of the Dissenter’s shop as the fashionable Hildyard’s. Indeed, his acquaintance with another York printer, the Irishman Thomas Gent (1693-1778), highlights the diverse ways he was connected to the city’s book trade.

It is worth bearing in mind the type of relationships that developed around the early eighteenth-century bookshop and how these might have contributed to the bookish

115 Sessions & Sessions, Printing in York, p. 27.
116 Thanks to his self-promotion, much of Gent’s life is well-documented. After marrying into one of northern England’s leading printing families, he settled in York in the 1720s and took over the publication of the city’s newspaper. Over the following two decades, his business struggled and he began to deal in ballads, chapbooks, and almanacs (some of which he also wrote) and took up itinerant selling around York. He died, aged eighty-five, penniless at his printing house in Coffee Yard, Petergate. For more of his biography see Sessions & Sessions, Printing in York, Chapter VIII, and Chapter 4 in Charles Knight, Shadows of the Old Booksellers (London: Bell and Dalby, 1865). See also Thomas Gent, The Commonplace Book of Thomas Gent (c.1743-1778), York Minster Library, MS Add 66 and Thomas Gent, The Life of Thomas Gent of York, York Minster Library, MS. Add 31. During the 1720s and 1730s, the paths of Carlisle and Gent crossed on a number of occasions. At some point in 1726, Gent quarrelled, not for the first time, with one of his apprentices. In an act of revenge, the apprentice “complain’d to the Right Honourable Charles Howard Earl of Carlisle (beneath whose celebrated Castle his parents lived as Tenants) that I did not allow him that common sustenance [i.e., food] as Nature required.” Subsequently, Carlisle ordered “Mr Etty, one of his principal Architects” to investigate. On visiting Gent’s house, where the apprentice lodged, Etty found a tableful of food and the apprentice in bed with a hangover. According to Gent, “Mr Etty’s Astonishment was rather greater than my Resentment: which his Lordship hearing, and being convinc’d that I kept a special Table for one in my condition, it was in vain for the scandalous lying varlet to complain any more against me his innocent master.” Gent, Life, p. 57. After the 3rd Earl’s death in May 1738, Gent printed an elegy entitled Pater patriae: being, an elegiac pastoral dialogue occasioned by the most lamented death of the late right honourable and illustrious Charles Howard… (York, 1738). In 1735, he had printed, as an appendix to his topography of Hull, Carlisle’s advice poem addressed to his son, Lord Morpeth (see below p. 126). Gent had also written about the Howard family in The antient and modern history of the famous city of York (York, 1730) and about the grounds at Castle Howard in The antient and modern history of the loyal town of Rippon (York, 1733).
culture that the Earl experienced whilst living at Castle Howard and in London. In April 1710, Carlisle’s agent paid 2s. 11d. to “Harding the Bookseller for the Reading of Books by the Ladys” and two months later, in June, Harding was again paid “for Books and Reading Books”. Though official lending libraries did not appear until the 1720s, from the mid-seventeenth century booksellers lent out books to trusted customers. Some also let customers read stock on their premises. The Hardings appear to have offered such a service. Carlisle’s social and financial resources meant that he and his family were able to acquire books, as and when required, on either a temporary or permanent basis. Via such booksellers, aristocrats like Carlisle could connect into highly commercialized book exchange networks in London and in the provinces which offered customers a variety of ways to engage with books.

With such a competitive book trade, it is not surprising that York was a leading location in the first half of the eighteenth century for book auctions. The Earl’s presence at St. William’s College makes it highly likely that he knew of, if not attended, these sales. This is particularly so considering that a number of these auctions were held in the Minster Yard at a property which belonged to his son-in-law, Richard Ingram, 5th Viscount Irwin. Carlisle and his daughter, Viscountess Irwin, were particularly close and therefore it is not difficult to imagine the two attending these book sales together. That a variety of different people might have attended such auctions – from booksellers looking

---


118 CH H1/1/7-13, 11 April 1710 (2s. 11d.) and then CH H1/1/5, 23 June 1710 (£3 4s.).


120 In 1717, Carlisle’s middle daughter, Anne, married Irwin. The Ingram’s country residence was Temple Newsam near Leeds, however they also had a York townhouse located in the Minster Yard. In a study of book auctions in eighteenth-century Yorkshire Elizabeth Swaim records that at least three book-sales took place at this residence: in November 1714, December 1717, and March 1732. E. Swaim, ‘The Auction as a Means of Book Distribution in Eighteenth-Century Yorkshire’, *Publishing History*, 1(1977), p. 53 & p. 64.
to bulk up their stock to members of the middling sort looking to acquire second-hand goods at cut-down prices – signals the diversity of the book exchange networks which Carlisle could tap into.\textsuperscript{121} 

The used book market was picking up pace in the early eighteenth century, not only in York but in other urban centres including London.\textsuperscript{122} Rare or specialized items were traded alongside more popular, everyday books in shops as well as auctions.\textsuperscript{123} Second-hand goods had been, for a long-time, the staple stock of many provincial commercial establishments.\textsuperscript{124} There is every likelihood that Carlisle acquired books from the second-hand market for marginalia in a number of his books is traceable to figures from the mid-seventeenth century or earlier who were not part of the Howard family.\textsuperscript{125} The Earl, it would seem, participated in these early modern consumer networks of second-hand goods which have generally been seen as the preserve of the lower and middle classes.\textsuperscript{126} 

Acknowledging that country house residents acquired their books from such diverse sources – sources that so overtly mixed ‘high’ and ‘low’ cultures – brings to light the variety of networks to which they were connected. Indeed, records show that Carlisle bought a wide spectrum of items which ended up at Castle Howard. Alongside folio


\textsuperscript{123} The trading of second-hand books (whether in shops or by auction) became increasingly defined as the eighteenth-century progressed with booksellers specializing in either popular (and thus cheaper) used items or antiquarian and rare publications. Mitchell, “‘Old books–New Bound’?”, pp. 147-52.

\textsuperscript{124} ibid, p. 147.

\textsuperscript{125} An inscription on the front fly-leaf of Diurnall occurrences, or dayly proceedings of both houses reads, for example, “E libris Thos Davies/ 1657” (CH 1698 GC 15). On the engraved title-page of Gerard Malynes’s Consuetudo, vel lex mercatoria, or, the antient law-merchant (London, 1636) we find “Thomas Dethick anno 1664: Livorno” (CH 1698 EE 10 and CH 1715/16 HF 01).

editions, as Chapter Three will show, Carlisle also purchased penny pamphlets and other types of cheap print news. Whilst he paid 5s. for “Colliers essays”, the third volume of Vitruvius Britannicus, a much larger, grander work by all accounts, cost him £3 3s.\(^{127}\) The habitual emphasis on the acquisition of expensive books by aristocrats, who were both unable to purchase the goods that they desired in the country and unwilling to participate in popular book exchange networks, has served to reinforce the view of country houses as disconnected bastions of high culture.\(^{128}\) Furthermore, recognizing the fact that aristocrats like Carlisle brought into their great homes popular, low-priced works as well as rare and expensive publications problematizes the notion that country house living revolved around the material and symbolic display of wealth and ambition.

1.4.2 The Acquisition of Books through Family, Friends, and Acquaintances

Living in Yorkshire and suffering from gout, the Earl increasingly relied upon intermediary figures to get books for him in the 1720s and 1730s. In a study of the retired recusant Sir Thomas Cornwallis (1590-1604), a figure whose life circumstances were not too dissimilar from Carlisle’s, Jason Scott-Warren notes that the early sixteenth-century print marketplace was ‘an institution that buyers approached through complex networks of sociability and expertise.’\(^{129}\) He further proposes that for those people with limited access to London, reading material ‘needed to be filtered through and supplemented by a circle of friends whose lives centred on the Capital.’\(^{130}\) As the following sub-section

\(^{127}\) CH H1/1/3, 23 October 1699 and CH J8/4/6, 13 April 1725. The former work was Jeremy Collier’s Short view of the immorality and profaneness of the English stage (London, 1698) in which the author criticized the theatrical works of contemporary playwrights including William Congreve and John Vanbrugh. The pamphlet appears in both of the Earl’s library catalogues though it is not extant today.

\(^{128}\) Stobart provides such a reading. ‘Taste and knowledge – and thus distinction – were also acquired from and expressed through reading, making an extensive and well-chosen library both a source and statement of social and cultural distinction.’ Stobart, ‘Gentlemen and Shopkeepers’, p. 899.


\(^{130}\) ibid, p. 401.
shows, Carlisle became increasingly dependent upon a variety of friends, family members, and acquaintances to act as intermediaries.\textsuperscript{131}

The 3\textsuperscript{rd} Earl’s involvement in book exchange networks mirrored his participation in social networks.\textsuperscript{132} These networks were based upon the ties that linked Carlisle to his friendship groups as well as familial connections. The aristocratic world in the early eighteenth century was a small one and access to a great library was never too far away for the Earl: Henry Percy, 9\textsuperscript{th} Earl of Northumberland was Lady Carlisle’s grandfather, and Carlisle’s first son Henry, Viscount Morpeth, married Lady Frances Spencer, daughter of the 3\textsuperscript{rd} Earl of Sunderland. By these two marriages Carlisle was in close proximity to two of the grandest libraries in England.\textsuperscript{133} On a number of occasions we also know that the Earl visited friends’ residences where great book collections were housed, encounters that may have affected his own book-buying habits. In October 1720, for instance, Carlisle stayed for a week at Thoresby, the Nottinghamshire residence of his friend, the Duke of Kingston.\textsuperscript{134} Kingston maintained a celebrated library, the catalogue of which was privately printed under the title \textit{Catalogus bibliothecae Kingstonianae} by William Bowyer in 1725-26.\textsuperscript{135} At an earlier date, in December 1697, £5 7s. 6d. was “given att Sir William Temples” indicating that Carlisle had visited the philosopher-statesman at his home, Moor

\begin{footnotes}
\item[132] Naomi Tadmor similarly recognizes this connection. ‘Reading involved social transactions and was also part of sociability . . . purchasing, lending and borrowing of books were closely connected with other social networks.’ See N. Tadmor, “In the even my wife read to me”: Women, Reading and Household Life in the Eighteenth Century’ in \textit{The Practice and Representation of Reading in England}, eds, Raven, Small, & Tadmor, pp. 165-66.
\end{footnotes}
Park, in Surrey. The neo-Platonist and great defender of the Ancients appears to have had some influence over the young Earl for in 1691 Carlisle acquired Temple’s memoirs, a work that remains in the Castle Howard library to this day.

Carlisle’s friendship with the itinerant, Quaker minister, Thomas Story (1670?–1742), deserves attention for it illustrates the diverse ways in which books filtered into Castle Howard. There are three recorded encounters between Carlisle and Story, two of which occurred at Castle Howard. The first encounter, which took place in 1718 at Carlisle’s temporary London lodgings in Greek Street, appears to have set the tone for their subsequent friendship. Story recalled that at an early point during this first meeting Carlisle admitted that, despite attending a number of Friends’ meetings and reading some of their books, he was still unable to fully comprehend Quakerism, particularly its method of preaching. The Earl conceded, however, that Quakers were ‘a very useful People in the Nation, and . . . deserve Encouragement as well as any in it.’ On asking his guest about the Friends’ refusal to pay tithes and hold arms, Story records that the Earl listened to his reply with ‘great Patience and Candour’. Across much of the north of England — and thus some of the land that Carlisle held jurisdiction over — early eighteenth-century Dissenters were free to conduct their business and lives with little hindrance from the authorities. We have already encountered in York, for instance, the successful Quaker bookseller Thomas Hammond II. Such leniency towards dissenting religious groups was a key feature of Whig policy and Carlisle appears to have been a supporter of toleration.

136 CH H/1/1/3, 8 December, 1697.
137 CH H/1/1/2.
138 For the full account of their encounters, see Thomas Story, *A journal of the life of Thomas Story containing, an account of his remarkable convincement of, and embracing the principles of truth, as held by the people called Quakers*. . . (Newcastle upon Tyne: Printed by Isaac Thompson & Company, 1747), pp. 617-23 (for the 1718 meeting), pp. 659-61 (for the 1725 meeting), and pp. 679-81 (for the 1732 meeting).
139 ibid, p. 618.
140 ibid.
142 For details of the integration of Quakers in York, for example, see Adrian Davies, *The Quakers in English Society* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000), p. 218-19.
We know that he procured household goods from such men, for example. In 1702 nearly £9 was paid to "Thomas Cox the quaker for 10 Dozen pints of Canary".  

After securing the possibility of future meetings, Story, upon leaving, spoke the following words to the Earl:

I took Notice of what thou said . . . concerning our Preaching and Writings, that they seemed both awkward and unintelligible: I suppose thou mayst remember something of one James Wilson, who has waited on thee some Times to solicit they Assistance for Relief of several of our Friends.

'This is,' Carlisle enquired, 'Wilson of Westmoreland, an honest good Man?' To which Story replied:

'Tis the same . . . Thou was pleased to admit him to some Discourse with thee on some Points of Religion, on some of those Occasions; and he then promised to send thee a Book, which would clear up some of those Matters more than could be done by him; and he hath accordingly requested me to present thee with it[.]

The book which Story presented to the Earl following Wilson’s suggestion was Robert Barclay’s An apology for the true Christian divinity (Amsterdam, 1676, 1st ed.). Story continued: ‘If thou pleasest to read this Book over with Attention, I hope it will give thee some more Satisfaction, both concerning the Principles we believe and suffer for, ourselves, and our Writings.’ According to Story, Carlisle ‘readily received’ the book.

This account of the Earl’s first meeting with Story is confirmation of Carlisle’s open-minded religious outlook. That liberal-minded aristocrats like Carlisle engaged with works by the likes of Barclay contributed, in part, to the increasing toleration of

---

143 CH H1/1/4, 13 March 1702 (£8 13s. 6d.). The term "canary" refers to sweet white wine that derived from the Canary Islands.
144 Story, A journal of the life of Thomas Story, p. 622.
145 ibid.
146 ibid, p. 623.
147 ibid.
148 Smith, BCH, pp. 165-66.
Dissenters in this period.\textsuperscript{149} The appearance of other works in Carlisle’s book collection, including the history of the Presbyterian and Lutheran churches, further supports this suggestion.\textsuperscript{150} It must be noted, however, that the Earl also had five works by Samuel Parker, whose theological writings viciously attacked Dissenters.\textsuperscript{151} Carlisle, then, was aware of all sides of the argument. Whilst it could be argued that Story and Wilson were only exchanging texts with Carlisle in the hope of influencing governmental policy, it also highlights the different channels through which he acquired his books.

As he became more elderly, the books that Carlisle chose to buy and read were increasingly conditioned by the suggestions of others. One of Carlisle’s agents, Thomas Sergeant, not only acquired books for the Earl but also had the responsibility of choosing titles that he thought might appeal.\textsuperscript{152} From 1720, Sergeant was employed by the Earl to assist with his duties as Lord Lieutenant of Tower Hamlets and Constable of the Tower.\textsuperscript{153}

The pair must have established a good working relationship because Sergeant continued to work for the Earl even after Carlisle was dismissed from these posts in December 1722.


\textsuperscript{150} These works were Peter Heylyn’s \textit{Aerius redivivus: or, the history of the Presbyterians} (Oxford, 1670) and Louis Maimbourg’s \textit{Histoire du Lutheranisme} ([Paris], 1681). (Heylyn: CH 1698 BE 11 and CH 1715/16 HE 04; Maimbourg: CH 1698 GB 13.)

\textsuperscript{151} The works by Samuel Parker in Carlisle’s library were CH 1698 JA 08/09 & CH 1716 IC 04: \textit{Religion and loyalty: or, a demonstration of the power of the Christian Church within it self} (London, 1684); CH 1698 JA 10 & CH 1716 IC 11: \textit{A defence and continuation of the ecclesiastical polite} (London, 1671); CH 1698 JA 11 & CH 1716 ID 07: \textit{A discourse of ecclesiastical polite} (London, 1671); CH 1698 KC 16 & CH 1715/16 HC 02: \textit{Disputationes de deo et providentia divina} (London, 1678); and CH 1698 MC 02 & CH 1715/16 CD 01: \textit{A demonstration of the divine authority of the law of nature and of the Christian religion in two parts} (London, 1681).

\textsuperscript{152} Michael Treadwell has written an account of a figure similar to Sergeant, one Richard Lapthorne, who acted as an agent for the Devonian gentry-man Richard Coffin of Portledge, Bideford, at the end of the seventeenth century. Alongside the traditional duties that an agent undertook, Lapthorne attended auctions and bookshops on behalf of Coffin. Though the letters between Carlisle and Sergeant are not as abundant as the Coffin-Lapthorne archive, they suggest that Sergeant was undertaking similar tasks to Lapthorne. Michael Treadwell, ‘Richard Lapthorne and the London Retail Book Trade, 1683-1697’ in \textit{The Book Trade and its Customers, 1450-1900: Historical Essays for Robin Myers}, eds, Arnold Hunt, Giles Mandelbrote, & Alison Shell (Winchester: St Paul’s Bibliographies, 1997), pp. 205-22. Jason Scott-Warren has written a similar piece on the relationship between the Suffolk recusant Sir Thomas Cornwalls (1590-1604) and his London agent John Hobart. See his ‘News, Sociability, and Bookbuying’, pp. 381-402.

\textsuperscript{153} CH J8/34/1-45, Sergeant to Carlisle, 23 February 1720 to 17 December 1726.
At an undocumented point Carlisle must have asked Sergeant to select and purchase books on his behalf, for, in the spring of 1726, the agent wrote: “Since You have been pleas’d to give me a power, I shall presume now & then, to make use of it & send you such books as come out here & are the most favourably thought of.”

The discovery that Carlisle relied upon the judgement of his employee when acquiring reading material is important because it raises the question of how much control the Earl had regarding the material that ended up at Castle Howard. Several weeks earlier Sergeant had written to Carlisle that “Having been lately concern’d in publishing the Works of Mr Walter Moyle . . . I have presum’d, the last week, to send the Lordship the two Volumes, by the York Coach, of which I humbly beg your Acceptance.” Though a Whig, Walter Moyle (1672–1721) was opposed to Junto policy, believing that the 1689 constitutional settlement had not gone far enough in restricting the monarchy’s power. Carlisle does not appear to have shared such a sentiment, and, though the volumes deal primarily with antiquarian and natural history matters, we can only guess at what his reaction was upon receiving Sergeant’s The works of Walter Moyle, none of which were ever before published (London, 1726) in the post. Sergeant’s desire for patronage meant that books which Carlisle may or may not have wanted arrived at Castle Howard. In this instance also, Sergeant’s provision of books to Carlisle blurred the boundaries between the Earl’s involvement in the commercial book market and the act of gift-giving.

This was not the only recorded incident in which Sergeant took it upon himself to select reading material for the Earl. At the end of April 1726, he wrote:

---

154 CH J8/34/38, Sergeant to Carlisle, 23 April 1726, Tower, p. 1v.
155 CH J8/34/37, Sergeant to Carlisle, 2 April 1726, Tower, p. 1v.
I have subscrib’d for your Lordship to . . . Pemberton’s View of Sir Isaac Newton’s Philosophy, which from the opinion that Sir Isaac himself has of that Gentleman’s abilities for such a work, will undoubtedly be admirably well perform’d & none of the books will be dispos’d of but to Subscribers.  

Henry Pemberton’s A view of Sir Isaac Newton’s philosophy was published in London in 1728 by S. Palmer, and Carlisle was, thanks to Sergeant, one of several hundred subscribers. The Earl was in good company for the work was dedicated to his political ally Sir Robert Walpole. Writing about the ‘communities of the book’ which arose from the distribution of published material in the late seventeenth century, Harold Love concludes that ‘the advent of the subscription list late in the century made these communities publicly visible while strengthening the political dimension of book purchase.’ Acquiring books by subscription encouraged a form of sociability that was not lost on publishers, authors, and readers. The act of subscribing benefitted all that were involved: authors and publishers were grateful for patronage, whilst subscribers were keen to let social peers know the range of their intellectual and cultural interests.

Unable to participate in person, Carlisle subscribed to books during the 1720s and 1730s in order to maintain his involvement in the intellectual life of the Capital. The Earl subscribed to works from a variety of subject areas. Costing six guineas a set, he joined over 650 subscribers for the six volumes of Pope’s translation of Homer’s Iliad (London,
1715-20). Years earlier he had subscribed to Thomas Brodrick’s *A compleat history of the late war in the Netherlands* which was first printed in London in 1713. In the subscription list for this work, which had a colossal 2,141 subscribers, Carlisle’s name has a dagger next to it. According to the key, ‘Those Mark’d with † are for the Coats of Arms.’ The symbol highlights those individuals who had paid for their coat of arms to be included within the border of one of the illustrations. Above all, Carlisle had a penchant for subscribing to architectural works. He features in the subscription lists for William Kent’s *The designs of Inigo Jones, consisting of plans and elevations for publick and private buildings* (London, 1727) and Isaac Ware’s edition of Andrea Palladio’s four books on architecture (London, 1738). Perhaps the most influential publication of the early eighteenth century, Colen Campbell’s three-part *Vitruvius Britannicus* (London, 1715-25), also received the Earl’s subscription. The plans and elevations of Castle Howard were included in the first and third volumes of *Vitruvius Britannicus*. Carlisle is listed as a subscriber for two copies in the first volume. In 1725, when the third volume came out, £3 3s. was given directly to Campbell “for the 3rd Volume of his Vitruvius Britannicus” and Carlisle’s name subsequently appeared in the final volume, again for two copies.

Bibliographic news, like that provided by Sergeant, acted as cultural currency which filtered along social and familial networks. Receiving such news inducted an absent Carlisle into the Capital’s fashionable circles. In 1727, for example, Carlisle’s eldest daughter, Lady Lechmere, wrote to her father from Twickenham where she had been in the company of Sir Robert Walpole, who had recommended a selection of books that he

---

163 CH J8/4/6, 13 April 1725.
thought Carlisle might find useful. One of the publications – which Lechmere referred to as “the Universal Dictionary” – was Ephraim Chamber’s forthcoming *Cyclopaedia: or, an universal dictionary of arts and sciences* (London, 1728, 1st ed.). A second work that Walpole suggested was the newly published *Hysterai phrontides. Or, the last thoughts of Dr. Whitby. Containing his correction of several passages in his commentary on the New Testament* (London, 1727). A third item, described by Lechmere as “the Inquiry into the Evidence of the Christian Religion”, was, according to Walpole, written by a woman, “which if True, he thinks, as great A Miracle, as any of those She pretends to prove, for tho’ the sex excell Men, in Witt, Spirit, & Humour, they rarely do it in what shines in the Author of that Treatise.” The unidentified work, which appears to try and demonstrate the truthfulness of miracles, would have been the type of work that Carlisle, sensitive to Deist arguments, railed against. From Walpole’s description, he also seems to have shared such a reaction. Lechmere noted in her letter that Walpole’s recommendations to the 3rd Earl were approved by the dramatist Samuel Johnson (1691-1773). The exchange of texts and bibliographic news via pre-existing channels of friendship and sociability maintained the Earl’s link to bibliographical developments occurring in London. Via Lechmere’s social connections, Carlisle was part of a broader network of cultural exchange which involved the leading political and literary figures of the period.

It is of interest that Carlisle’s daughters, more than his sons, played a key role in suggesting or acquiring books for their father. The circle of friends that Lechmere kept in London, which included the likes of Walpole and the Duchess of Marlborough, meant that she was in a key position to pass on details of new and fashionable publications to Carlisle. As well as providing news regarding which books were popular in the Capital, the Earl’s daughters also acquired reading material for their father. Such active involvement by élite
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164 CH J8/1/384, Lechmere to Carlisle, 30 December 1727, Twickenham, pp. 2r-2v.
165 ibid.
166 ibid.
women in sourcing and obtaining books suggests that we must reconsider the gender divide that is normally ascribed to early modern participation in the book trade.\textsuperscript{167} When Carlisle’s youngest daughter, Lady Mary Howard, visited London, she would order books for Carlisle on his behalf. In the early 1730s, for example, she subscribed to “the Bishops history” for Carlisle.\textsuperscript{168} Ten days later she advised her father that, “I spoke to Mr Mitchell about your Lordships subscribing for the Bishops History[,] the subscription has been full a great while and the greatest they say ever was known[,] they are now printing it off and it will very soon come out”.\textsuperscript{169} As Carlisle’s catalogues record that he also had four works by the Scottish theologian Gilbert Burnet, the book that Lady Howard subscribed to was probably \textit{The conclusion to Bishop Burnet’s history of his own time} (London, 1734).

In 1733, Viscountess Irwin sent her father “the Second part of the essay upon man”.\textsuperscript{170} She had sent to Castle Howard the second epistle of Alexander Pope’s \textit{Essay on man} (published anonymously between 1732-34), a work which consisted of four letters to the leading Tory and Jacobite politician under the reign of George I, Lord Bolingbroke. In her evaluation of the piece that she had sent to her father, Irwin wrote:

\begin{quote}
  it does not please me so well as the first, it makes man Compos’d of two Contradictory principles reason & pleasure, & that our Vertues arise out of our Vices . . . methinks the Author of Nature does not appear in so good a light as in the first since what ever fault is in the System of the Universe reflects upon the Creator and we as the principal parts of the Drama should not make the worst figure amongst the actors.\textsuperscript{171}
\end{quote}

Irwin continued: “the first Epistle warm’d my heart, the second mortifies my pride, and makes me think with the Fable of the Bees that my Vertues if I have any are only the result

\textsuperscript{168} CH J8/1/141, M. Howard to Carlisle, 9 February [1734?], n.p., p. 1v. Mr Mitchell
\textsuperscript{169} CH J8/1/142, M. Howard to Carlisle, 19 February [1734?], London, p. 1r.
\textsuperscript{170} CH J8/1/252, Irwin to Carlisle, 31 March [1733], London, p. 1v.
\textsuperscript{171} ibid.
Irwin was referencing Bernard Mandeville’s *Fable of the bees*, a work initially published in 1705 and then again in 1714. Whilst this publication is not recorded in Carlisle’s library catalogue, Irwin wrote to her father with the understanding that he knew of its thesis. Mandeville argued that luxury, whilst associated with vice, also had a public benefit, for it fuelled consumer culture, encouraging both sociability and economic growth. Irwin’s evocation of Mandeville’s theory is an apt reference, for he discusses the networks of commerce that linked merchants to English consumers. Intermediary figures like Irwin and her younger sister were part of these networks, linking Carlisle at Castle Howard with the London book trade.

Whilst Carlisle’s familial and social connections facilitated the exchange of books and bibliographical information, the sharing and discussion of books between the Earl and his friends also fostered a certain sociability. Carlisle shared with some of his friends from the Kit-Kat Club a common idea about the role that books should play. In the play *The Relapse* (1696), its author, Vanbrugh, satirized the wealthy man who mindlessly collected books with little concern for intellectual content. Conversing with Amanda, the female protagonist of the play, Sir Novelty Fashion (the newly created Lord Foppington) discusses his collection:

> [the] private Gallery (where I walk sometime) is furnish’d with nothing but Books and Looking-glasses. Madam, I have guilded ‘em, and rang’d ‘em, so prettily, before gad, it is the most entertaining thing in the World to walk and look upon ‘em. (II.i, 193-96).
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Amanda counters this materialistic appreciation of books, responding: ‘Nay, I love a neat Library too; but ’tis, I think, the Inside of a Book shou’d recommend it most to us.’ (II.i, 197-98) Foppington replies: ‘That, I must confess, I am nat altogether so fand of. Far to mind the inside of a Book, is to entertain ones self with the forc’d Product of another Man’s Brain’ (II.i, 199-201). Carlisle’s appreciation of books, like other Kit-Kat members, was far from what Foppington practised.

Carlisle joined the Kit-Cat Club sometime in the late 1690s. Jacob Tonson, the renowned publisher and the Club’s figurehead, supplied members with all types of bibliographic material sourced during trips to the Netherlands. Such exchanges contributed to the solidification of this friendship group. Household accounts show that in September 1705 Carlisle purchased goods costing 17s. 6d from Tonson. A 1703 letter to Tonson from Vanbrugh records the architect’s request for “The book you mention which I wanted . . . ’Tis Palladio in French, with the Plans of most of the Houses he built.” Recalling Lord Foppington’s remarks, however, Vanbrugh continued that “My Lord Hallifax desires you will bespeak him a Set of all kinds of Mathematicall Instruments, of the largest sort in Ivory, but adorn’d as curiously as you please, they being more for furniture than any use he’s like to put ‘em to; He designs to hang ‘em up in his Library.”

Carlisle’s friendships engendered what Andrew Cambers terms ‘relational reading’ – a phrase used to describe the act of selecting and reading a certain book because of a personal connection to the publication, for example to the author, publisher, or
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176 Historians of Castle Howard believe that the house’s origins partly resulted from the cultural and creative forces at play during the club’s regular meetings at the turn of the century. Smith, *BCH*, pp. 38-39.
177 Adrian Johns highlights the amphibious character of Tonson and how his bookshop on Fleet Street was a site of sociable meeting and discussion in *The Nature of the Book: Print and Knowledge in the Making* (Chicago & London: Chicago University Press, 1998), pp. 120-21.
178 CH H1/1/4, 15 September 1705: “payd Mr Tonson Stationer in full”.
180 ibid.
topic. In 1697, members of the Kit-Kat Club led the subscription to Tonson’s publication of Dryden’s edition of *Virgil*. That the Earl was not a subscriber to this significant publication could be a sign that he was not a member at this date. It was not long, however, before Carlisle was participating in Tonson’s publishing ventures. In July 1703, Vanbrugh wrote to Tonson: “I have sent you my Own Coat of Arms, and have written to Lord Carlisle for his: but if you spend much more time about ‘em in Holland, we all resolve never to subscribe to another Book that must carry you beyond the Sea.” Vanbrugh’s letter indicates that both he and Carlisle were to subscribe to one of Tonson’s publication. A search through the books printed by the publisher in and around 1703 finds no such work suggesting perhaps that the project was never completed. Later in his life, once he had moved to Castle Howard, Carlisle subscribed to Tonson’s publication of the first volume of John Gay’s *Poems on several occasions* (London, 1720), an indication that his friendship with Tonson – and thus his connection to the publishing world – was not affected by his retirement from London and his move north. Indeed, five years later Vanbrugh relayed to Tonson that, whilst spending some time with Carlisle and Lord Cobham, the publisher and their former Kit-Kat days “were remembered with pleasure.” He continued that,

both Lord Carlisle & Cobham exprest a great desire of having one meeting next Winter, if you come to Towne, Not as a Club, but old Friends that have been of a Club, and the best Club, that ever met.

The friendships which Carlisle maintained with his Kit-Kat friends, particularly Vanbrugh and Tonson, enabled his participation in key book exchange networks of the early
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184 Vanbrugh to Tonson, 12 August, 1725, London. ibid, pp. 166-67.
eighteenth century. This shared participation in the bibliographic culture which emanated from the Kit-Kat Club also meant their friendship ties were strengthened.

Whilst Vanbrugh was, in the words of Smith, ‘certainly . . . not the type of architect who went round the estate with a copy of learned classical tomes’, Hawksmoor and Carlisle shared a mutual and active interest in books.\(^{185}\) Smith touches upon the influence that Hawksmoor may have had on Carlisle by proposing that the architect 'liked to be able to cite appropriate recondite sources, to discuss the design of a building in his library and to show Lord Carlisle relevant books.'\(^{186}\) More can be said, however, of their shared relationship with books.

Although they always remained on a socially unequal footing, both architect and patron contributed to their working relationship by drawing upon individual experiences and knowledge, as well as their ability to acquire new publications: all factors which helped inform their decisions regarding the building of Castle Howard. The role that architectural books played during the house’s construction is evident in their correspondence.\(^{187}\) Writing to the Earl in 1733, Hawksmoor advised that “The capital I wou’d Recommend is that upon the Arch of Titus at Rome, it is in the parallel of Architecture which Booke Mr Etty has.”\(^{188}\) The book which William Etty, the site manager, was consulting was John Evelyn’s translation of Roland Fréart de Chambray's *Parallel of the antient architecture with the modern* (London, 1664). That this book appears in
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\(^{185}\) Hawksmoor’s ample architectural library has been examined by Kerry Downes and Vaughan Hart. See Downes, ‘Hawksmoor’s Sale Catalogue’, pp. 332-35 and Vaughan Hart, *Nicholas Hawksmoor: Rebuilding Ancient Wonders* (New Haven & London: Yale University Press for The Paul Mellon Centre for Studies in British Art, 2007), pp. 16-18. See also David Watkin’s entry for Hawksmoor in vol. 4 of A. N. L. Munby, ed., *Sale Catalogue of Libraries of Eminent Persons*, 12 vols (London: Mansell, 1972). Hart concludes that ‘Hawksmoor’s library shows him to be a keen student of contemporary works that questioned antique authority, in the sciences as well as in architecture’ (p. 5). Hart further suggests that we might consider the architect’s eclectic style ‘in the wake of a world picture that had expanded to embrace far-flung exotic cultures unknown to the early Renaissance masters but widely represented in books that Hawksmoor collected’ (p. 7).

\(^{186}\) Smith, *BCH*, p. 169.

\(^{187}\) Ibid, p. 149.

both Carlisle’s and Hawksmoor’s libraries indicates the existence of a shared textual culture between the Earl, Hawksmoor, and Etty, three men from very different backgrounds.  

In an oft-cited conversation about the architectural precedents for the building of the mausoleum, Hawksmoor guided Carlisle towards examining particular sources that the architect believed might have interested the Earl: “There are many forms of this nature of fabrick, built to the Memory of illustrious persons, the designs of which are published in the Books of Antiquity, that your Lordship may see at pleasure.” Hawksmoor’s words indicate the ease with which he could provide Carlisle with particular books when required. It also suggests the leisurely manner in which Carlisle engaged with books. Four years later, in 1730, an example of Hawksmoor more robustly encouraging the Earl to acquire particular books is recorded in a set of correspondence between the pair in which they discussed the interior decoration of the Belvedere Temple (later known as the Temple of the Four Winds). Hawksmoor noted that “The Gallery of Farnese has examples enough to follow but if your Lordship has not all them designs we should endeavour to gett the Book and in it we cannot fail of sufficient exam[lple].” As Carlisle did not add the books that he purchased to his library catalogue we do not know whether he acted on Hawksmoor’s advice, acquiring this unknown work which detailed the Farnese gallery and Annibale Carracci’s sixteenth-century fresco cycle. Hawksmoor’s comments reveal, nevertheless, a mutual and considered effort by the two men to acquire architectural sources that would benefit the design process of Castle Howard. They also highlight the architect’s unassuming role in recommending literature to the Earl, unlike Carlisle’s

189 CH 1698 EF 07 and CH 1715/16 LD 15; Downes, ‘Hawksmoor’s Sale Catalogue’, pp. 335.
191 CH J8/1/591, Hawksmoor to Carlisle, 10 April 1730, Westminster, p. 1v.
agent, Sergeant, for example, or – as we shall see in the next chapter – his son-in-law, Sir Thomas Robinson.

1.4.3 The Acquisition of Books through Inheritance

Though non-institutional early modern libraries are frequently described as ‘private’ or ‘personal’, Mandelbrote contends that this terminology fails to ‘adequately reflect the silent choices exercised by wives, sons and daughters, nor the steady incremental effect of inheritance’ upon their formation. Mirroring the generational ebb and flow of a family, a country house library is rarely the handiwork of a single person. The consolidation and division of aristocratic estates following births, marriages, and deaths meant books were frequently moved from one house to another. Each time they arrived at a new home, they would be assessed and, if found appealing, re-marked and combined with existing collections which, in turn, were added to. If found uninspiring, outmoded, or duplicated these books could be readily discarded. Considering that every new owner would have his or her own interests, a library can reflect not just one person’s intellectual pursuits but also those of long-dead ancestors and distant kinsmen. Like many aristocratic libraries, then, a significant proportion of Carlisle’s books were acquired from his relatives and ancestors. The following section explores three separate sets of inherited books and the ways in which they influenced the Earl’s own book use at Castle Howard.

In the 1690s, Naworth Castle housed several individual book collections including the personal libraries of Carlisle’s mother, the 2nd Countess of Carlisle, and his distant ancestor, Lord William Howard. On his accession to the earldom, Carlisle inherited his childhood home and all its contents, including Howard’s library. Howard was a leading antiquarian in the late sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century who counted Robert

Cotton and William Camden amongst his circle of scholarly friends. Via his extensive social and antiquarian connections, Howard gathered together an impressive collection of manuscripts, books, and incunabula, storing them in his private library in the south-east tower at Naworth. His books have received little attention in comparison to the manuscripts that he owned. A nineteenth-century booklist reveals that the collection was primarily made up of works from the sixteenth century, many of which were in Latin.

Considering the historic and intellectual value of Howard’s collection it is interesting that neither of the Earl’s library catalogues record any of his books or manuscripts. Smith suggests that the Earl’s reluctance to include Howard’s books in his library resulted from shame and embarrassment. Not only was Howard a Catholic but, even more disconcertingly, the son of the 4th Duke of Norfolk, one of the most famous traitors in English history. According to Smith, Carlisle built Castle Howard with the hope that it would create the illusion of dynastic stability and permanence. Bringing his
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193 For more information on Howard and his antiquarian circle, see Richard Ovendon, ‘The Libraries of the Antiquaries (c.1580-1640) and the Idea of a National Collection’ in CHL, I, eds, Leedham-Green & Webber, pp. 527-61.
194 Much of Howard’s library remained in situ until the twentieth century. Over 200 volumes (plus five commonplace books) were bought by Durham University in 1992. According to the sale catalogue almost half of the books that were sold were of a religious or theological nature. Other subjects included history (approximately seventy-five volumes), classics, reference works, poetry, science, and law. It also reveals that the majority of those books that were still extant were published on the Continent, with only thirty-two printed in England. See entry for Lot 171 in Sotheby’s auction catalogue, sale date 14 - 15 December, 1992.
196 In 1878, the Surtees Society compiled a list of thirteen printed books and eleven manuscripts at Castle Howard which formerly belonged to Howard. George Ornsby, ed., Selections from the Household Books of the Lord William Howard of Naworth Castle: With an Appendix Containing some of his Papers and Letters, and other Documents Illustrative of his Life and Times, Publications of the Surtees Society, vol. 68 (Durham: Andrews & Co., 1878), pp. 485-87. None of these items appear in Carlisle’s catalogues, suggesting they were moved to Castle Howard after his death. At present only one item from the list of books is known to remain at Castle Howard. This is Alexandri Nerylly angh, de favoribus norfolciensium ketto dace, liber unus (London, 1575). YCHP, p. 11.
197 Smith, BCH, p. 10.
ancestor’s belongings into Castle Howard would only have served to remind the Earl of his unsound heritage. Moving away from Naworth and the rejection of Howard’s library confirms one scholar’s observation that whilst Castle Howard was ‘crammed with antiquities’, members of the Howard family actively chose to distance themselves from their own history.199 Indeed, this shame could perhaps explain why, in 1720, Carlisle chose to sell a number of Howard’s manuscripts to the Somerset herald, John Warburton (1682-1759).200 But if Carlisle was fearful of integrating Howard’s books into his library because of what they represented, why then did he include the books that belonged to a more recent traitor?

Carlisle’s inclusion of a set of books that once belonged to William Fenwick, 2nd Baronet (c.1617-76), suggests that the Earl made specific choices about which inherited books he did and did not include in his library. Although no contemporary record exists of what the Earl inherited from Fenwick, because the latter signed the title-page of his books, it has been possible to identify eighty-eight items in the library today which once belonged to him.201 The Fenwicks were landowners in Wallington, Northumberland, entering into the Howard family when, in 1663, John Fenwick, 3rd Baronet (c.1644-97) married Mary, the eldest daughter of the 1st Earl of Carlisle.202 Six years later their nephew, the future 3rd Earl of Carlisle, was born. During the 1690s the 3rd Baronet was associated with a number of Jacobite conspiracies including one in 1696 which eventually led to his downfall. Having implicated a number of leading Whig politicians – including the Norfolk branch of the Howard family – in a plot to restore James II to the throne,

200 At various stages Warburton’s purchases were added, via Wanley, to the Harley library. There are at least thirteen items in this library today that once belonged to Howard. See Wright & Wright, eds, *The Diary of Humfrey Wanley*, pp. 58-60.
201 *YCHP*, p. 11.
Fenwick incurred a bill of attainder. Executed in 1697, his forfeited personal estate, including his father’s book collection, was granted to Carlisle in 1700.

I would argue that the reason Carlisle rejected Howard’s library but included books that once belonged to Fenwick was for practical rather than symbolic reasons. Many of Fenwick’s books were published in the mid-sixteenth century, making them far more up-to-date than Howard’s Latin-heavy, antiquarian items. Furthermore, the 1st Baronet was a moderate parliamentarian and the subject matter of his books, unlike those in the Naworth collection, would have been useful to Carlisle’s political career. A number of works dealt with local and national laws, statutes, and privileges, whilst others – such as Fisher Payne’s panegyric *Veni, vidi, vici: the triumphs of Oliver Cromwell* (London, 1652) – covered mid-seventeenth-century English national affairs. Works of practical divinity – like John Dod’s *Plaine and familiar exposition of the Ten Commandments. With a methodicall short catechisme* (London, 1628) and Jeremy Taylor’s *A course of sermons for all the Sundaies of the year* (London, 1653) – remained suitable, for both male and female readers, well into the eighteenth century.

Details of the library that belonged to Carlisle’s mother, the 2nd Countess of Carlisle, are found in a booklist entitled *My Laydes Bookes att Noward August 31: 1693*. The Countess’s 143 books are divided in the list into two categories: the first section contains Christian works and texts of practical divinity, the second is headed “History Books” (though it also
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203 Wilson notes that Carlisle was instrumental in revealing letters to the Duchess of Norfolk which exonerated the Norfolks as well as Marlborough and Shrewsbury, whom Fenwick had attempted to implicate. Wilson, *RRR*, p. 5.
204 Wilson also considers Smith’s reading as improbable and, instead, proposes that Carlisle revered Howard, citing the fact that the 3rd Earl consistently described himself as “of the family of the Howards”, named his London home “Carlisle House” but his Yorkshire seat “Castle Howard” and described himself as Lord William’s “present heir” on the Great Pyramid in the grounds of his Yorkshire seat (built c.1728). Wilson, *LR*, p. 222.
205 CH H/2/3/6. See Appendix A. Though the list does not state that the books belonged specifically to the 2nd Countess of Carlisle, a number of entries on the list are found in the Castle Howard library today, displaying her ownership markings.
includes poetry, dramatic works, novels, travel literature, and books of epigrams and songs). The distinct listing of these books as a separate collection from other books in the household is of interest because it provides insight into book organization in rural, aristocratic houses at the end of the seventeenth century. All in all, it is not surprising that individuals, whether male or female, kept their books separate from other collections at Naworth. On a practical level, the cramped, medieval structure would have certainly restricted the storage of books on a large scale.

Whether the creation of this booklist was motivated by financial or bibliographical concerns it is hard to tell. The death of the 2nd Earl the previous year is likely to be significant. Perhaps it was motivated by a need to work out what, exactly, belonged to whom at Naworth following Carlisle’s accession to the earldom. The omission of numbers or pressmarks suggests that it was an inventory rather than a catalogue or index. In addition, the piece of paper used to document the collection has fold marks, indicating that it was sent to someone for inspection or record purposes. It contrasts greatly with the folio catalogue that Carlisle had created for himself just five years later at Carlisle House. The list perhaps indicates the relocation of Carlisle’s mother and her personal belongings to another property, freeing up Naworth for her son, the new Earl.

At least thirty books that once belonged to the 2nd Countess ended up in Carlisle’s book collection. These volumes, some of which remain in the Castle Howard library today, presumably came into Carlisle’s possession following his mother’s death in 1696. The harmonious union of Carlisle’s books with those of his mother’s is evident in the way in which they were shelved at Castle Howard. Instead of being kept together as a smaller collection, the Countess’s books were dispersed throughout his library. The subject
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206 My thanks go to Professor Neil Harris for pointing out the relevance of the fold marks on this document.
207 Not all those that were included in the Earl’s library were entered into his catalogues. Paul Morgan discusses a similar occurrence in ‘Frances Wolfreston and “Her Bouks”: A Seventeenth-Century Woman Book-Collector’, The Library, 6th series, xi.3 (1989), pp. 197-219.
matter of those books that Carlisle kept was diverse, suitable perhaps for a variety of people. They included French romances, the life and reign of Henry VIII, Ovid’s epistles, Francis Bacon’s essays, and even “A mannuell of Phisick”. The merging of books that might interest both male and female readers in the library at Castle Howard supports the proposal that the book collection was used by all members of Carlisle’s family.

The resultant sociability that this book organization engendered recollects the communal book use that he experienced as a child at Naworth. Marginalia found in the four volumes of Madame de Scudéry’s heroic novel *Artamenes: or the grand cyrus* (printed in London throughout the 1650s) provides insight into the reading culture that took place at Naworth Castle during Carlisle’s childhood. Whilst no annotations can be found alongside the text itself, the end papers and flyleaves of the four volumes are sites of much scribbling. Though the markings in question reveal little about the Countess’s engagement with Scudéry’s work, they do convey the social and textual interactions that occurred at Naworth between Carlisle’s mother, her children, and her books. At the front of the fourth volume we find an early attempt by Carlisle at writing his name alongside the drawing of the hind legs of what was perhaps intended to be a dog (see Figure 4). In the third volume we see that Carlisle’s sister, Mary, has written her name just below that of her mother’s, with the adolescent flourish of a young girl taking pleasure in the act of inscribing her name (see Figure 5). These markings indicate the presence of children in the same spaces where books were read at Naworth. The inclusion of “Thee Countess of Carliules Butchers Byle” in the third volume of *Artamenes* (see Figure 6) further highlights the active, domestic setting in which the book was used.
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Figure 4. Markings by a young Carlisle in vol. 4 of Madame de Scudéry’s *Artamenes: or the grand cyrus* (1650s). From the Castle Howard Collection. Reproduced by kind permission of the Hon. Simon Howard.

Figure 5. Markings by Carlisle’s sister, Mary, and his mother, Elizabeth Morpeth, 2nd Countess of Carlisle, in vol. 3 of Madame de Scudéry’s *Artamenes: Or the grand cyrus* (1650s). From the Castle Howard Collection. Reproduced by kind permission of the Hon. Simon Howard.
Reading was a social event at the heart of the household at Naworth. This communal and practical interaction with books was, I contend, later echoed at Castle Howard. Not only did the Earl’s book collection include works suitable for male and female readers, it also contained texts that a child might engage with. He had John Ogilby’s beautifully illustrated edition of Aesop’s Fables, for example, a traditional work commonly used to teach children to read. Furthermore, the main library at Castle Howard was, if we recall, eventually located in the east wing, the family-orientated part
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Figure 6. “Thee Countess of Carlliules Butchers Byle” in vol. 3 of Madame de Scudéry’s Artamenes: or the grand cyrus (1650s). From the Castle Howard Collection. Reproduced by kind permission of the Hon. Simon Howard.
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209 CH 1698 BF 13 and CH 1715/16 ME 07. For the use of Aesop’s Fables whilst teaching children in the early modern period, see Brauer, Education of a Gentleman, p.74, and Katherine Acheson, “The Picture of Nature: Seventeenth-Century English Aesop’s Fables,” Journal for Early Modern Cultural Studies, 9.2 (2009), particularly fn. 2 where Acheson notes John Locke’s recommendation that if a child’s ‘Aesop has Pictures in it, it will entertain him much the better, and encourage him to read, when it carries the increase of Knowledge with it.’ Carlisle was certainly anxious for his children and grandchildren to be educated correctly. In an undated letter which begins “Dear Grandpapa”, Carlisle’s young grandson, Charles Howard, thanked his grandfather for sending a gift “to encourage me to Pursue my Studies with Diligence, and Care”. CH J8/1/839, Howard to Carlisle, 2 February n.d., Long Orton, p. 1r.
of the house. His childhood encounters with different types of collections at Naworth also informed the way that he interacted with books as an adult at Castle Howard. In both residences, certain books were kept in more secluded parts of the house: in Lord William Howard’s tower at Naworth and in Carlisle’s cabinet at Castle Howard. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, country houses like these provided residents with a variety of spaces – public, private, and domestic – in which they could engage with books. That we also know books were read in the gardens of Castle Howard only serves to highlight this fact.

1.5 Conclusion

Focussing on how books arrived at Castle Howard, this chapter has challenged the notion that country house residents lived detached lives, disconnected from social and cultural engagement. As we have seen, Carlisle was a regular participant in both local and national book trade networks whilst living at Castle Howard. Exchanging bibliographic knowledge with friends and family was another way through which Carlisle remained connected to social and cultural circles in London. It acted as a form of ‘cultural currency’, which simultaneously provided the Earl with bibliographical news, strengthened friendship ties, and fostered sociability. Choosing to include or exclude specific books that he had inherited also connected the Earl to social and cultural spheres from different temporal periods. Via his books he could connect not only to past but also to future generations of his family. Just as he had inherited a sizeable proportion of his book collection from relatives and ancestors, its contents continue to be passed down to subsequent residents at Castle Howard.
CHAPTER 2

THE 3rd EARL OF CARLISLE AND HIS EPISTOLARY CONNECTIONS

I have ever thought Men were better known, by what could be observed of them from a Perusal of their private Letters, than any other way.

*The Spectator, No. 27, Saturday, 31 March 1711.*

2.1 Introduction

Carlisle was not part of a recognized correspondence network such as those revolving around London’s literary and intellectual circles and institutional societies of the period. Yet letter-writing was an important feature of his day-to-day life, contributing to the formation and maintenance of his social life and cultural interests. Letters arrived at Castle Howard almost daily from many social spheres: from local tenants and petitioners, family members and close friends, employees, political allies, and other great landowners. Following the previous chapter, which examined the 3rd Earl of Carlisle’s participation in book exchange networks, the present chapter considers how this second type of textual exchange anchored Castle Howard and its residents within a textual web of communication and association.

My approach has been influenced by recent advances in the epistolary history of the early modern period and eighteenth century. This field has been led most recently by James Daybell and his survey of Tudor women and their letter-writing habits, Clare Brant’s and Susan Whyman’s individual studies of epistolary culture in eighteenth-century Britain, and Rebecca Earle’s edited collection of essays in which the importance of
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2 For more on scholarly networks of textual exchange, see Myers & Harris, eds, *Antiquaries, Book Collectors and the Circles of Learning*.
epistolary culture as a worthy strand of investigation is established. Few studies, however, have specifically located letter-writing in the country house, nor considered how these buildings were important centres of information exchange within Britain’s epistolary networks. The approach adopted in this chapter, therefore, sheds important light on the cultural interrelationship between epistolary networks and country houses. By viewing letters as objects which played a significant role in transmitting information to and from the country house, we can learn much about how Castle Howard became a centre of knowledge reception and dissemination.

The chapter begins with an overview of Carlisle’s life in letters. This is followed by an examination of the delivery networks that transmitted his correspondence. Having established the role that his agents played as intermediaries during periods of familial crisis, I then turn to an examination of the epistolary relationships between Carlisle and his children. As I will show, familial letter-writing in this period, guided by early modern epistolary conventions, was shaped by a tension between familial affection and child-parent obligation. The second part of the chapter considers Carlisle’s epistolar

---


4 Although letters are regularly used as sources in country house history and country houses are often mentioned in passing as the setting for letter-writing, there has been no sustained study that specifically investigates country houses and epistolary culture. On the few occasions that the two topics do converge, women’s letter-writing is most often the focus. See Larsen, Dynastic Domesticity and Larsen, ed., Maids & Mistresses; Vickery, The Gentleman’s Daughter; and Leonie Hannan, Women, Letter-Writing and the Life of the Mind in England, c.1650-1750, unpublished PhD thesis, Department of History, Royal Holloway, 2009.

5 My approach has been influenced by Vivienne Larminie and Susan Whyman who have reconstructed the social worlds of the Newdigates of Arbury and the Buckinghamshire Verneys respectively. See Vivienne Larminie, Wealth, Kinship, and Culture: The Seventeenth-Century Newdigates of Arbury and their World (Woodbridge, Suffolk & Rochester, NY: Royal Historical Society & Boydell Press, 1995), and Susan Whyman, Sociality and Power in Late Stuart England: The Cultural Worlds of the Verneys, 1660-1720 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999). Whyman’s study, in particular, has been useful as it emphasizes how the elderly Sir Ralph Verney (d. 1696) remained connected to London society via letter-writing whilst living in rural England.
relationships with his son-in-law, Sir Thomas Robinson, and his middle daughter, Anne, Viscountess Irwin. As a well-connected, "idle man about town", Robinson had access to a variety of cultural spheres in London. The link that he facilitated between these spheres and Carlisle was manifest in the letters and items that he sent to his father-in-law. Irwin’s command of the language combined with a curious and thoughtful manner makes it easy for us to see why she became Carlisle’s most regular correspondent. Based at Court, she had witnessed some of the period’s most notable events which she then related to her father. Supplementary reading material including hand-written and printed poems, plays, epigrams, jokes, and riddles also accompanied a substantial number of her letters. By examining, in particular, the poetic material which Irwin sent to the Earl, we continue to build up our understanding of how Carlisle remained connected to different social and cultural spheres.

2.2 Carlisle’s Life in Letters

Nothing is known about the letters which Carlisle wrote or received in his youth. From the importance that he placed on letter-writing in his later life, however, it is likely that he had received tuition in epistolary customs at some stage in his childhood. Part letter-writing guide, part conduct manual, Erasmus’s *De conscribendis epistolis* (1522) had been particularly influential throughout much of the early modern period. By the late seventeenth century, numerous epistolary guides and copy books offering advice about scripting techniques and writing equipment had joined Erasmus in the book market. Well known works included John Davies’s *The writing schoolmaster: or, the anatomie of fair writing*.

---


(London, 1648), Edward Cocker’s *Guide to penmanship* (London, 1664) and his *The pen’s transcendency or, fair writings store-house* (London, 1657), Thomas Watson’s *A copy book enriched with . . . the most usefull and modish hands* (London, 1683), and John Matlock’s *Fax nova artis scribendi* (London, 1685). Though none of these works was in Carlisle’s library, an entry from the 1698 catalogue which reads ‘The Clark’s Guide’ could indicate his ownership of *The young clerks guide: in four parts. Or, an exact collection of choice English presidents, according to the best forms now used for all sorts of indentures, letters of attorney, releases, conditions, &c* (London, printed from 1649).  

This epistolary guide was initially written by Sir Richard Hutton at the turn of the seventeenth century. By the 1690s it had reached its sixteenth edition.

In addition to such practical manuals, examples of letter-writing styles would have been present in some of the classical literature that Carlisle owned. Editions of Cicero’s letters were particularly important in this regard. Cicero defined epistolary correspondence as a written conversation, something which complemented eighteenth-century notions of politeness. One of the first tasks that young boys undertook when learning letter-writing in the early modern period was the imitation of the great Roman orator’s letters. Carlisle’s 1698 library catalogue records that, in the 1690s at least, he had an edition of these famous epistles.

Bought initially to provide historical information, printed volumes of correspondence written to and from celebrated figures could have also acted as guides to letter-writing styles. Carlisle had many examples of this type of publication in his book collection. With imprints from the mid-seventeenth century, it is possible that some of
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8 CH 1698 DE 05.
9 For discussion of the influence that Cicero had on letter-writing in the early modern period, see Gideon Burton, ‘From Ars dictaminis to Ars conscribendi epistolis’ in *Letter-Writing Manuals*, eds, Poster & Mitchell, pp. 88-89, pp. 91-93, and p. 98.
these publications were already present at Naworth Castle during Carlisle’s early years of education. Lord Burghley’s *Scrinia Ceciliana, mysteries of state & government in letters of the late famous Lord Burghley* . . . (London, 1663), for example, might have provided an impressionable Carlisle with examples of how leading courtiers corresponded with one another in the past. Indicative of his enjoyment of the genre, we know that the Earl also invested in this type of publication himself. In the 1690s, for instance, he acquired the printed letters of two of France’s leading politicians: *Cardinal Mazarin’s letters to Lewis XIV, the present King of France* . . . (London, 1691) and *Letters of the Cardinal-Duke de Richelieu great minister of state to Lewis XIII of France* (London, 1697).

In line with his entry into London society in the 1690s, the Earl began his participation in a variety of epistolary networks that would remain important for the rest of his life. In the late summer and autumn of 1691, soon after returning from his tour of the Continent, he bought two quires of gilt paper, six quires of writing paper, fifty quills, and a pint of ink. Aged twenty-one and newly appointed as MP for Morpeth, Carlisle was preparing diligently for political office. Following his accession to the earldom two years later, in 1693, the new Earl would have had a whole new set of correspondents with whom he needed to establish epistolary relationships, not least those agents who ran the estates that he had inherited. One of the first letters that he received from his agent at

---

11 Much has been written regarding the connections between epistolary novels and letter-writing in the eighteenth century. It should be noted however that Carlisle was born well before the emergence of this genre. For more information about eighteenth-century epistolary novels, see, for example: Whyman, *The Pen and the People*, Chapters Five and Six; J. How, *Epistolary Spaces: English Letter Writing from the Foundation of the Post Office to Richardson’s Clarissa* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2003), Chapter Six; Leah Price, *The Anthology and the Rise of the Novel from Richardson to George Eliot* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), Chapter One; and Amanda Gilroy & W. M. Verhoeven, eds, *Epistolary Histories: Letters, Fiction, Culture* (Charlottesville & London: University Press of Virginia, 2000).

12 *CH 1698 EC 07 and CH 1715/16 HB 03*. This work was a supplement to *Cabala, sive scrinia sacra, mysteries of state and government: in letters of illustrious persons and great ministers of state* (London, 1654) which was also in Carlisle’s library (*CH 1698 KD 04 and CH 1715/16 EE 03*). For eighteenth-century readings of historical letters, see, for example, Clare Brant, ‘Love Stories? Epistolary Histories of Mary Queen of Scots’ in *Epistolary Histories*, eds, Gilroy & Verhoeven, pp. 74-98.

13 *CH 1698 FG 06* and *CH 1698 CD 01* respectively.

14 *CH H1/1/2, 25 July 1691: “payd for 2 quire of guilt paper” (1s. 4d.); 1 September 1691: “payd for six Quire of writing paper” (3s.); 3 October 1691: “payd for ½ A hundred of Quills” (6d.); 10 November 1691: “payd for A pint of Ink” (8d.). A quire is twenty-four sheets.
Naworth Castle reveals that the young Earl was encouraged to spend that winter at the Dean of Carlisle’s house as “provisions will be both Better & Cheaper . . . then here, & it will quit your honours of a great Rabble of people”.  

In these years, Carlisle was also taking delivery of letters from the Continent though it is not known what contacts he had in Europe. As he held no ministerial position which may have warranted governmental letters abroad, perhaps they were from an acquaintance that he had made whilst abroad or from a friend or family member who had themselves left for the Continent.

For reasons of work and pleasure, Carlisle divided his time between a group of properties, including Naworth, Cassiobury Park (his wife’s family home in Watford), a residence in Morpeth, and his London townhouse in Soho Square, before settling permanently at Castle Howard. His highly mobile life is evident in two of the earliest surviving letters from the archives. The first was sent in the summer of 1693 to the new Earl “att Mr Charles Wynns house in German [Jermyn] Street, London”; a second, written seventeen days later, was sent to the Earl “att Cashaberry”. It is presumably because of this peripatetic lifestyle that few of the Earl’s letters survive from this period. Despite his itinerant living, or perhaps because of it, Carlisle remained committed to letter-writing.

The decade between 1695 (when the Earl was twenty-five) and 1705 prompted much letter-writing by Carlisle. An indication of his successful integration into epistolary networks is found in a letter sent from one of his agents following an election in Cumbria in 1695: “I was att the election on Monday Last . . . which I know your honour will have a

---

15 CH J8/28/8, Maxwell to Carlisle, 12 August 1693, Noward, p. 1r.
16 This type of entry first occurred in October 1694 when Carlisle took delivery of a letter from Flanders. CH H1/1/2, 20 October 1694: “payd for A Letter from Flanders” (1s. 10d.). Other letters arrived from the Continent in December and the following January. CH H1/1/2, 31 December 1694: “payd for A flanders Letter” (3d.); CH H1/1/2, 19 January 1695: “payd for A foreigne Letter” (1s. 10d.).
17 At the end of the seventeenth century, postal services between England and mainland Europe occurred four times a week, a service that was regulated by the Foreign Office. Kenneth Ellis, *The Post Office in the Eighteenth Century: A Study in Administrative History* (London: Oxford University Press, 1958), p. 5.
18 CH J8/28/6, Maxwell to Carlisle, 26 July 1693, Noward; CH J8/28/8, Maxwell to Carlisle, 12 August 1693, Noward. If we recall, Charles Wynne appeared in Chapter One, for he was involved in delivering books to Naworth Castle. See below pp. 70-71.
fuller account from several hands this post”. That his agent expected many people to relay details of the election to Carlisle suggests that he had already established important contacts across the north of England. It was also during this decade that the Earl’s young family expanded, the idea of Castle Howard was conceived and its construction begun, and he rose and then fell from ministerial office. All these activities would have brought about intense periods of correspondence. Unsurprisingly therefore, records show that he continually replenished his stock of paper and writing implements. In April 1705, for example, he acquired “12 quire of guilt paper” and “1/2 Rheam of Cuthpaper”. A year earlier he had also purchased a “travelling writing case”, a buy that suggests he wrote letters whilst on the move.

Once the Earl had permanently settled at Castle Howard, letter-writing became his lifeline. To continue functioning as a social being – that is, for him to retain credibility as a father, as an estate owner, and as an aristocrat of national importance – contact with society was fundamental. Carlisle’s continued participation in epistolary networks facilitated the preservation of his social identity, helping to maintain his position and influence in society.

To understand the role of epistolary culture at Castle Howard we must consider how Carlisle’s lifestyle in Yorkshire affected his letter-writing practices. By the mid-eighteenth century, no less than seventeen writing-bureaus or desks were recorded at the house, both in the smaller, more intimate spaces such as bedchambers and closets and in the larger, more accessible areas including, for example, the principal rooms on the

---

19 CH J8/28/14, Maxwell to Carlisle, 6 November 1695, Noward, p. 1r.
20 CH H1/1/5, 18 April 1705 (5s. 6d.). A ream is 500 sheets of paper.
21 CH H1/1/4, 8 April 1704 (£1 5s.).
22 Discussing the social anxieties that amounted from poor letter-writing in the eighteenth century, Brant has suggested that an ‘inability to write letters threatened identity’. Brant, Eighteenth-Century Letters, p. 35.
23 According to Earle, ‘letters display the signs of the distinct environments in which they were conceived.’ Earle, ‘Introduction’ in Epistolatory Selves, ed., Earle, p. 2.
garden front.\footnote{F4/1, “An inventory of the household furniture, antiquities etc. belonging to the late Right Honourable Earl of Carlisle…”}. The room that was once the 3rd Earl’s cabinet, known by mid-century as the “East End Room or Gallery” housed “2 walnuttree Beauroes”\footnote{ibid, f. 23. Indicative of its new status as a gallery, the room also contained eighty-eight paintings.}. Even his steward had four writing-desks in his private suite of rooms. In the first half of the eighteenth century, then, letter-writing could have occurred in numerous locations at Castle Howard.

Clearly the variety of different places in which he (and his family members and guests) could engage with textual material was extensive and so we should not assume that Carlisle undertook all these activities in one dedicated space: his cabinet, for example, or the New Library. Writing letters could be a time-consuming process that involved the careful selection and explanation of thoughts, ideas, and material. Reading letters required a similar type of considered engagement. Household accounts and surviving letters give little suggestion of Carlisle’s daily routine at Castle Howard and it is not known how his letter-reading and letter-writing fitted in with other activities such as reading the news or consulting his book collection. It is of no coincidence that at the same time that the Earl began to suffer from the debilitating symptoms of gout in the early 1720s, his letter-writing activities increased dramatically.\footnote{This rise is evident in the many hundreds of letters that survive in the archives from the 1720s and 1730s.} Being house-bound clearly did nothing to deter his interest in what London had to offer, nor did it disrupt his supervision of his estates in northern England. Rather, such a restriction on his movement appears to have spurred Carlisle’s desire on for more regular and detailed communication.

In these final decades of his life, the epistolary networks that the 3rd Earl participated in were, for the most part, familial.\footnote{For work on familial letter-writing styles in the early modern period, see Susan Fitzmaurice, The Familial Letter in Early Modern English: A Pragmatic Approach (Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2002). In The Converse of the Pen: Acts of Intimacy in the Eighteenth-Century Familial Letter (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987), Bruce Redford shows how writing letters to friends and family could be a creative and artful process. ‘The finest familiar letters are always correspondent-specific: they play to a particular audience’, p. 10. For a broader look at the construction and literary presentation of familial...} Efficient more than they were intimate,
only on occasion do we catch a glimpse of a more personal family dynamic: requests for news of a sibling’s health, references to the exchange of much anticipated goods between family members, Colonel Howard promising time and again that he will get around to writing to his sisters. Retired from national government, Carlisle only occasionally received letters from old political colleagues. That is not to say that his interest in politics ceased. It was to his children, however, that he turned for detailed information from Parliament.

The seemingly quotidian nature of his familial letters veils the fact that his children acted as important intermediaries, who relayed news from London to Carlisle. Indeed, the strands of conversations in his children’s correspondence reveal that he was a regular recipient of all manner of detailed commentary from the nation’s Capital. As we shall see in the second half of the chapter, Viscountess Irwin provided gossip from Court and London’s literary circles and her brother-in-law, Sir Thomas Robinson, offered thorough accounts of parliamentary activity alongside architectural news which he thought might interest his father-in-law. Colonel Howard, the Earl’s youngest son, also regularly wrote to his father, particularly with details of local political affairs. As MP for the city of Carlisle (1727-61), Howard supplied his father (who held the titles of Lord Lieutenant for Cumbria and Westmorland and Governor of Carlisle Castle) with news of local elections, current issues surrounding law and order, and the volatile state of land control. As he increasingly became confined to Castle Howard in the 1720s and 1730s, it would have been reassuring for Carlisle to have his son act as his eyes and ears across the countryside over which he held jurisdiction. When writing from London – sometimes on consecutive days – Howard provided his father with up-to-date, personalized information about


Recent epistolary historians have seen the distinction made between ‘private’ and ‘public’ letters as problematic because much correspondence – including that sent between Carlisle and his children – incorporated both personal and public news. See Earle, ‘Introduction’ in Epistolary Selves, ed., Earle, p. 4.
parliamentary activities. Though the 3rd Earl received printed newspapers several times a week, Carlisle relied upon his youngest son to fill him in on the nuances of the political debate overlooked by printed sources. Indeed, in a letter to the Earl, Howard’s sister, Viscountess Irwin, expressed recognition of her brother’s efficient news-reporting to Carlisle: “My brother Howard informs your Lordship of everything in the political way, which is much more authentic than the reports I hear.”

Revealing his connectedness to London society, the Earl often received multiple letters containing descriptions of the same topic or event. In the late winter of 1735, for example, both Howard and Robinson provided Carlisle with detailed accounts of a parliamentary debate about the enlisting of seamen. Howard wrote to his father: “I sent your Lordship last post an account of the debate of the number of Seamen, which they say has not happened these thirty years before.” A letter dated from the previous day records that Robinson had also sent a very long report of the proceedings. In this respect, Carlisle tended to receive well-rounded accounts of what was occurring in London.

As so many people were in contact with the Earl, confusion sometimes arose regarding who should send what news north. In February 1734, for example, Howard wrote of a debate that was introduced by Morpeth concerning the dismissal of Officers from their Commission. He apologized to Carlisle for the delay, saying: “I heard Sir Thomas Robinson had given your Lordship an account of the debate last Wednesday in the House of Commons, but upon enquiry found yesterday I was mistaken, otherwise you should have had it sooner.”

Carlisle’s most well-known epistolary relationships – with his two architects, Nicholas Hawksmoor and John Vanbrugh – also reached their zenith in the 1720s and

---

29 Irwin to Carlisle, 1 February 1733, n.p., HMC, Carlisle, p. 90.
30 Howard to Carlisle, 11 February 1735, n.p., HMC, Carlisle, p. 151.
31 Robinson to Carlisle, 10 February 1735, n.p., HMC, Carlisle, pp. 148-51.
1730s. These letters have been used most often to establish the timeline of Castle Howard’s construction as well as the origins of particular aspects of the house’s design. Considered more broadly, however, these documents reveal that it was through the regular and consistent exchange of letters that Carlisle was able to maintain a working relationship with his architects that spanned almost four decades. The sustained momentum behind such a time-consuming project was the result of the efficiency with which Carlisle, Vanbrugh, and Hawksmoor corresponded with one another. The slow construction process meant that for much of the time, neither Hawksmoor nor Vanbrugh were present at Castle Howard. Indeed, after Vanbrugh’s death in 1726, Hawksmoor was left to steer the project but, by this stage, was himself suffering from gout and rarely left London. At key moments, even regular and detailed epistolary communication between Carlisle and his architects did not suffice. Discussing problems arising from the construction of the mausoleum in the summer of 1734, Hawksmoor acknowledged that “had I bin nearer to you, I would have continually have assisted in these affairs but the distance was too great.”

Poor health hindered – but never stopped – Carlisle’s letter-writing. In a 1736 letter to Robert Walpole, the Earl apologized for using an amanuensis: “Age and the Gout have occasioned such a trembling in my hand, that what I now write is scarce legible . . . excuse the Liberty I take, in making use of another.” In one instance, Carlisle was able to authenticate another letter which had been written by his unknown helper by adding his own shaky signature (Figure 7). The last known letter that the Earl received was from his son-in-law, Robinson. Dated six weeks before he died, the letter provided the rather
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34 CUL CH (H) Correspondence, 1, 2636, Carlisle to R. Walpole, 28 November 1736, [Castle Howard], p. 1r.
35 See also CH J8/29, Carlisle to Nowell, 24 December 1736, Castle Howard.
scandalous news of Walpole’s marriage to his mistress. This letter also contains Robinson’s thanks to Carlisle for his previous correspondence, an indication that the Earl was still writing letters in the months leading up to his death. Considering his declining physical state, this achievement highlights the unrelenting importance Carlisle placed on corresponding with others.

Figure 7. An elderly Carlisle’s shaky signature. Letter to Nowell, 24 December 1736, Castle Howard (CH J8/29). From the Castle Howard Collection. Reproduced by kind permission of the Hon. Simon Howard.

---

36 Robinson to Carlisle, 16 March 1738, Whitehall, HMC, Carlisle, p. 194.
2.3 Networks of Delivery

At every stage in Carlisle’s life his epistolary relationships were structured and defined by accessibility to and the timing of the nation’s postal routes. As postage was customarily paid by the addressee in the early modern period, we can assume that account entries record incoming rather than outgoing mail. Epistolary networks were dependent on what Dena Goodman terms ‘the rhythm of the post’; ‘[j]ust as verbal exchanges were structured by the rules of polite conversation,’ she continues, ‘epistolary ones were structured by the post. The private time of reading and writing was inscribed within the public time of arrivals and departures.’\(^{37}\) In the winter of 1695 payments for letters began to be recorded in Carlisle’s accounts on a weekly basis.\(^{38}\) On many occasions, Carlisle paid for the postage of multiple letters suggesting that, no matter when it was sent, his correspondence tended to arrive in one instalment. This routine was by no means rigid. In some instances, the period between the delivery of letters was longer than a week, whilst at other times it was more frequent.

It is noticeable that fewer letters were paid for in the summer months, a finding which correlates to the time of year that Carlisle’s family would have escaped London for Castle Howard. Unmarried, the Earl’s younger son Colonel Howard often returned north when the parliamentary season ended at the beginning of the summer. A similar pattern is found with the letters from Viscountess Irwin, a widow from 1721 until she remarried in 1737. As an official member of the royal household, Irwin was only required at Court when the monarch was present. In contrast, letters from Carlisle’s eldest daughter and son, Lady Lechmere and Lord Morpeth, are more evenly placed throughout the year, perhaps because they had their own marital residences to which they returned in the summer.


\(^{38}\) See account entries in CH H/1/1/2 for 30 November 1695 and then, seven days later, for 7 December 1695.
Identifying patterns regarding the finance of receiving letters is problematic as payments differ with every entry, sometimes quite dramatically: in the first week of June 1700, for example, payment for news and letters totalled 2s. 1d., whereas the following week 11s. was paid for the same number of items. Letters were nearly always delivered with other types of reading material. There is no indication whether this was because they were all dispatched from one source (for example, a bookseller who dealt in a variety of reading material as well as offering postal and news services) or because they were gathered together by one of his agents and then sent to the Earl as a single package. Whilst taking into consideration that some payments covered a variety of goods, the consistent flux in cost was also probably due to the fact that postage varied depending upon the number of sheets used in the letter, its overall weight, and the distance it had travelled.\(^39\)

As Carlisle regularly received his letters in one weekly instalment, he likely encountered outdated information from his correspondents. He would have replied to these letters with the knowledge that they too would take time to arrive at their destination. From London, the Inland Office provided three posts a week to the provinces.\(^40\) Once a letter had arrived at a provincial sorting office (such as York or Carlisle), it would then be sent on to its destination via a minor postal distribution route. If the letter’s destination was particularly rural, it would need to be picked up at a designated drop-off point or a private carrier would complete the delivery. Considering that Carlisle generally paid for his letters on a weekly basis, it appears that during the times he resided in the north there was a need for this secondary stage in the delivery system – from the city of Carlisle to Naworth Castle, or later, from York to Castle Howard – which occurred weekly. That Hawksmoor tended to write “Malton bag” (or sometimes just “bagg”) at the end of the address when sending letters to Castle Howard

\(^{39}\) Ellis, *The Post Office*, p. 38.
\(^{40}\) ibid, p. 5. It also maintained a service of express deliveries for the dispatch of urgent correspondence.
further signifies the possibility of an intermediate stage of delivery. If this was the case, a letter sent from London to Castle Howard would have probably travelled thus: London-York-Malton-Castle Howard. A letter from London to Naworth Castle might have passed through this route: London-Newcastle-Carlisle-Naworth.

Of course, there were many other ways of sending mail at the turn of the eighteenth century. The Howard family’s use of public coaches to send parcels to one another was highlighted in Chapter One, and, in Chapter Three, we will see how Carlisle made extensive use of a private carrier to deliver newspapers to Naworth. Another way was to place letters in the hands of a friend who was travelling in the direction they needed to be sent. In fact Carlisle himself acted as a carrier for Robert Harley in 1701, when the latter was Speaker of the House of Commons and still a member of the Whig party. Writing to Harley, Lord Godolphin reported: “Your letters to our northern friend will hardly come to bear at present, since I am told Lord Carlisle is come to town again, and his journey to the north ended in going but just four miles beyond Northampton.”

When resident in London, the 3rd Earl would have presumably made use of his servants and agents to deliver his correspondence. If necessary, he could have also used the daily postal delivery service which stretched across the whole city (a distribution system managed by the General Post Office) or paid a Penny Post boy for an express delivery.

On two occasions we have evidence that Carlisle’s correspondence was subjected to the scrutiny of the postal authorities. Such occurrences could make letter-writing a covert operation at times. Sending details about monarchical relations at Court in 1738, Viscountess Irwin cautiously informed her father that “the enclos’d is an authentick copy of the message sent by the K__ to the P__. I was desirous your Lordship should see it [and] therefore venture to convey it to you as Letters att this time are frequently open’d I

---

omitting putting my name to this”. It is likely that the message concerned the schism between George II and his son which had reached new heights at the beginning of 1738.

Six years earlier, in 1732, Carlisle was notified by his London agent that his last letter had been “broke open, and sealed again with a drop of wax on the side of your Lordships impression, which I believe had been done at the post house.” Following the Post Office Act of 1711, letters thought to criticize the government could be intercepted at the post house and, from 1714, the policy was tightened. Whilst there is little reason to think that Carlisle was on a list of subversive people to watch, these incidents highlight the existence of an external presence which presided over early eighteenth-century epistolary networks and, at times, affected what people chose to send through the post.

As he became elderly and infirm Carlisle had to rely more and more on others to assist him with the transmission of his correspondence. In touch with agents, secretaries, and other aristocrats on behalf of his father, Colonel Howard took on this intermediary role. He was, at times, required to convey politically significant material deemed too sensitive to be handled by an agent or a carrier. At certain times he acted as an envoy for Carlisle, delivering letters to the likes of Sir Robert Walpole, Lord Townshend and, on one occasion, George II. He would then relay the receiver’s response to his father via letter. Such activity allowed Carlisle to maintain extensive engagement with socio-political circles in London, albeit by proxy. In 1730, when the Earl was sixty-one, Howard wrote to his father regarding the delivery of parliamentary material in London.
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42 CH J8/1/293, Irwin to Carlisle, 30 January [1738], [London], p. 1r.
43 Frederick, Prince of Wales was forbidden from attending his mother’s deathbed in 1737. It is not clear whether it was George II or the Queen herself who denied the Prince access. After her death both the Prince and Princess of Wales were banished from Court. See Frances Vivian, A Life of Frederick, Prince of Wales, 1707-1751: A Connoisseur of the Arts (Lewiston, NY & Lampeter: The Edwin Mellen Press, 2006), p. 262. Also Peter Quennell, Caroline of England, An Augustan Portrait (London: Collins, 1939), p. 326.
44 CH J8/34/134, Idle to Carlisle, 24 June 1732, n.p., p. 1r.
45 Ellis, The Post Office, p. 63.
46 It was not uncommon for sons to undertake duties similar to agents in this period. See, for example, Whyman, Sociability and Power, p. 17, where Whyman discusses the role of Sir Ralph Verney’s eldest and only surviving son who acted as his London agent during the 1690s.
The passage reveals the multifarious channels of communication that occurred between early eighteenth-century aristocrats:

The Duke of St Albans' Secretary was with me, & told me he had been with Mr Iddle [Carlisle's agent in London] to know whether he had had your Lordships answer to deliver up the books, which Mr Iddle not having received he came to me to know whether I had heard anything from you, and this day the Duke begged I would write to your Lordship that you would send Mr Iddle those orders, he seem's to be pressing for them, whether it is to look into the term’s & Custom’s when the King is there or what I cant say.47

With Carlisle residing at Castle Howard and the Duke of St Albans at Court, the extract is a clear example of the complex nature of communication in the early modern period which the Earl had to navigate remotely. The passage also reveals how his correspondence regularly intersected with other people’s epistolary networks, as well as the many people who were involved in transmitting information for Carlisle at this late stage in his life.

2.4 Letters from “your assured Friend”: The Correspondence between Carlisle and his Agents

Due to the geographical distances that normally existed between a lord and his agents, letter-writing was an essential tool for both parties. Agents could be permanently based in London or at one of their lord’s country estates. They could travel with their master or to him if required. The men that Carlisle hired were indispensible figures, helping him conduct the lifestyle expected of an eighteenth-century aristocrat.48 Throughout his

47 CH J8/1/26, Howard to Carlisle, 4 June [1730], [London], p. 1r.
lifetime, the Earl employed a number of agents who were based in London, at Naworth Castle, and in Morpeth. We also know that in the 1720s one John Lowthian was Carlisle’s ‘steward’ of Castle Howard. That these figures were known interchangeably as agents, stewards, managers, secretaries, surveyors, and even bailiffs, highlights the difficulty of classifying their duties. Though not necessarily explicit, the intermediary nature of the agent’s role was, however, always implicit. We have already seen in the previous chapter, for example, how Thomas Sergeant was given the responsibility of sourcing books and other types of reading material for Carlisle in the 1720s. As well as duties of a professional nature, agents were regularly required to conduct personal business on behalf of their master. The following section will focus on a neglected aspect of agent-lord correspondence: the intermediary role that such figures played between a lord and his family.

In the early modern period, agents came from diverse backgrounds. Social standing and education varied from agent to agent. Whilst some were hired for their specialist abilities in law, finance, or agriculture, family members in need of an income were also employed. Some were full-time employees, whilst others undertook work alongside existing occupations. They held a privileged but ambiguous position in an aristocratic


Correspondence between Carlisle and the following agents survives in the Castle Howard archives: James Maxwell (CH J8/28/1-32, April 1693-22 June 1700); Mr Aynsley (CH J8/28/33-478, October 1724-14 October 1737); Nowell (CH J8/29); Nicholas Ridley, (CH J8/33/1-52, c.1704-10); Thomas Sergeant (J8/34/1-45, 23 February 1720-17 December 1726); J. Idle (CH J8/34/46-185, 19 October 1723-15 March 1737); Michael Jackson (CH J8/34/186-273, 17 July 1729-11 January 1735).

CH J8/14/1, pp. 1r-1v. Presumably Lowthian compiled the Earl’s account books and assisted him with the day-to-day running of his estate. In his will, Carlisle also names Mr Lewis as his chaplain, Mrs Robinson his housekeeper, William Joy as the man who waits upon him in his chamber, and John Malcott as his groom of the chamber.

Hainsworth, Stewards, Lords and People, p. 3.

This type of duty has received little attention from scholars. Hainsworth, for example, only mentions such personal duties at the very end of his book, focussing on role that stewards played in organizing marriages. Ibid, pp. 257-58.

Many of the letters sent from Carlisle’s agent, Mr. Idle, were written at Middle Temple and Lincoln’s Inn in London suggesting that he also worked as a lawyer in the 1720s and 1730s. It is possible that Idle was
household, a position which set them apart from other staff members. They were often allocated private rooms in their master’s residences. Some were given access to their master’s library. A letter written by Michael Jackson, Carlisle’s agent in London during the 1730s, highlights the goodwill that existed between the Earl and his agent: “My Lord . . . I received the Hogshead of Ale the two flitches of Bacon & two hams In good order for which Valluable present I humbly presume to return your Lordship my humble Duty and thanks for them”. Whilst those agents who had other means of income were not beholden to their position like other household staff, ultimately, however, they fell under the control of their master. Indeed, Carlisle expressed his thoughts regarding the relationship between a lord and his servants in his political pamphlet published in 1733: ‘Every Master of a Family is at Liberty to chuse his Servants, to place and displace them as he thinks proper.’

Agents were, nevertheless, ‘trusted repositories of many confidences’. In the words of David Hainsworth, they ‘were accustomed to protecting the concerns of their lord and his family from prying eyes.’ Considering the trusting relationship that often developed between an agent and his master, it is not surprising to find that Carlisle signed-off his letters with one agent, Nicholas Ridley, with the phrase “your assured Friend”, an

from Bulmer, a village that is part of the Castle Howard estate. Hainsworth has noted that at the turn of the eighteenth century, Lord Gower had an agent called Mr. Idle (d. 1707) who was from Bulmer. Hainsworth further notes that Idle had a son who, one guesses, could have followed in his father’s footsteps, becoming the agent for Carlisle. ibid, pp. 35-36. The 1758 inventory compiled after the 4th Earl’s death recorded private rooms for the estate steward on the ground floor. The rooms included a steward’s office, a steward’s room, a steward’s kitchen, a bed chamber next the steward’s scullery, and a steward’s dining room. CH F4/1. We saw in Chapter One that Carlisle had a selection of books in his library that would have been useful in his role as landowner. Other books would have been helpful in estate management: William Dugdale’s The history of imbanking and drayning of divers fens and marshes, both in forein parts, and in this kingdom (London, 1662), for example, and Jean de la Quintinie’s Compleat gard’ner; or, directions for cultivating and right ordering of fruit-gardens and kitchen-gardens; with divers reflections on several parts of husbandry (London, 1693). Dugdale: CH 1698 EE 06 and CH 1715/16 EE 01; de la Quintinie: CH 1715/16 LD 08 and CH 1715/16 NC 03. CH J8/34/197, Jackson to Carlisle, 4 June 1730, London: 2r. [Howard], Some observations, p. 20. Hainsworth, Stewards, Lords and People, p. 257.
indication of the successful working friendship that had been forged between the pair. He also employed this sign-off when writing to his other agent, Nowell (see Figure 7). Indeed, as Hainsworth has observed, the dynamic between lord and agent did ‘not simply manifest itself in the degree of trust in the steward’s discretion’, rather it was also present ‘in the very tone of the correspondence of the lord and of the members of the lord’s immediate family’.60

The Earl was highly dependent on regular, efficient, and discreet communication with his agents.61 Such qualities were particularly necessary when personal affairs were the topic of discussion, even more so when these affairs reached crisis point. As his London agent during the first two decades of the eighteenth century, Ridley was required to communicate news to and from Carlisle’s estranged wife.62 It is, in fact, from this set of correspondence that we know much about the couple’s deteriorating relationship. By 1705 the couple had officially separated, though rumours of their marriage’s breakdown had begun several years earlier.63 In an undated letter from the first decade of the century, Carlisle wrote in a postscript to Ridley: “I have nothing to doe to advice my wife in her affairs now, but I should think Goremberry to big a hous, & to high a rent for her.”64 Via Ridley, the pair argued over who should take possession of certain expensive items. Diamonds, medals, paintings, and tapestries were all debated. Even Lady Carlisle’s mother, Lady Essex, became involved in the dispute. At one point, the Earl told his agent:

My wife may have the Duchess of Somersets picture, it is her own.
Send me word, whither she has carry’d her toilet plate with her. You

---

59 CH J8/33/1-52, passim.
60 Hainsworth, Stewards, Lords and People, p. 258.
61 The letter-writing style of agents is a rich topic that deserves attention in its own right. For example, they had to assume, alternately, their employer’s voice when corresponding to tenants and a third party’s voice when relaying information back to their master.
62 See CH J8/33/8, 15-17, 19, and 22 for letters from Carlisle to Ridley discussing separation arrangements.
63 Wilson, LR, pp. 200-201.
64 CH J8/33/8, Carlisle to Ridley, 20 December n.d., Henderskelfe, pp. 2r-2v. Ridley’s words suggest that Lady Carlisle was considering renting out Gorhambury House, a residence near St. Albans.
may let my Lady Essex know, that as for the makeing any allowance for the Tapestry, I do not think fit to doe it, I looked upon them, as given, but if she demands them againe you have orders to take them down, & send them to her. I would have you demand the jewels without any further delay.\textsuperscript{65}

In the midst of these arguments, Carlisle was keen to ascertain from his agent the state of his wife’s mind: “You say you are going to my wife, send me word how you find her, both as to her health of body & temper of mind, I would be glad to know what she says, & what she proposes to doe, nothing sure, was ever so unaccountable as this behaviour of hers.”\textsuperscript{66}

That there exist no letters to or from Lady Carlisle suggests the extent to which Carlisle had to rely on intermediaries like Ridley to communicate with his estranged wife.\textsuperscript{67} As we shall see in the following section, once the Earl’s children reached adulthood they took over this intermediary role, relaying to Castle Howard news of their mother.

Ridley was also involved in organizing the upbringing of the couple’s five children, even though they remained with Lady Carlisle at her mother’s home. In a letter from the turn of the century, Carlisle asked his agent to "give Lord Morpeth a couple of guineas from me for his new years gift, Lady Betty one, & Master [Colonel Howard] half a guinea, tell him, if he learns his book well, he shall be my best boy."\textsuperscript{68} The children’s education emerged as a battleground which Ridley had to traverse following the breakdown of the couple’s marriage. At one stage, Carlisle had observed that his eldest daughter, Lady Betty, had “lost her writing”. The Earl asked Ridley to inform Lady Carlisle that he was "unwilling to take Lady Betty from her, provided th..."
loose her time, & have such an education, as is fit for her”. The question of Lord Morpeth’s education was another topic that Ridley had to resolve. Following the arrival of an unpaid tutor’s bill, Carlisle ordered Ridley,

to acquaint my Lady Essex from me, that out of compliance & kindness to her I allow Lord Morpeth to be with her, but I do expect that she shall be at the charge of his education in all particulars & that he shall be taught every thing his age is capable of learning, if this be any way uneasy to her, I shall dispose of him elsewhere, & you are not to pay any of his Masters any more.\textsuperscript{70}

Whilst Ridley’s main task was to look after his master’s interests, he also needed to remain impartial in such tense situations so that he could effectively convey news to and from the disputing parties.

2.5 “From an obliged Child to the best of Fathers”: Familial Letter-Writing at Castle Howard

By the later stages of Carlisle’s life, his children were – by the quantity of surviving letters at least – his chief correspondents. At 550 items, the letters written by them during the 1720s and 1730s make up almost half of all the extant letters from the 3rd Earl’s lifetime. Carlisle maintained different epistolary relationships with his five children and their spouses, a disparity which highlights a difference in their personal relations as well as their diverse personalities. The following section argues that the act of letter-writing strengthened familial bonds between Carlisle and his children. As we shall see, however, inherent in their exchange of letters was a tension between familial affection and parent-child obligation.

\textsuperscript{69} CH J8/33/22, Carlisle to Ridley, 8 May n.d., Henderskelfe, p. 1r.

\textsuperscript{70} CH J8/33/15, Carlisle to Ridley, 20 February n.d. [but post-1694], Beverly, pp. 1r-1v. Carlisle also proposed in this letter that Ridley should begin “looking out for a proper school to send Master [Col. Howard] to this spring”, p. 1v.
Whilst providing channels for the transmission of information, regular letter-writing also fostered good relationships. The exchange of letters served to establish a bond, whether desired or not, between participating correspondents. As head of the family, we can see that Carlisle used letter-writing, in the words of Susan Whyman, ‘to maintain cohesion, for its members were often separated.’ As Illana Krausman Ben-Amos has highlighted, despite ‘the “readymade” quality which endowed kin ties with a certain privileged position and which implied that they could be relied upon without being initiated, kinship, like all other ties, had to be nurtured if they were to remain durable forms of support.’ By maintaining the epistolary networks that linked his family together, Carlisle was ensuring that family members remained tightly allied to each other, thus enabling a smooth transition of dynastic power from one generation to another.

One way in which kinship ties were maintained and fostered was through the exchange of family news. With the knowledge that Carlisle might not have seen individual family members for months at a time, his children regularly informed their father about how they found their siblings. As the mental health of Lady Lechmere deteriorated in the 1730s, both her sisters and her husband regularly updated Carlisle with news of the situation. In the winter of 1737, for example, Viscountess Irwin wrote to her father that her sister’s “actions & her whole behaviour is shocking[,] they are forc’d to keep her dark & quiet she fancying she sees parrots mice & all sorts of living creatures running about her & is allways feeling to catch them.” Aware that their older brother seldom visited Castle Howard or wrote to their father, other family members often relayed news of Lord Morpeth’s activities. At the beginning of the 1730s, for instance, Lady Howard reported

71 Cedric B. Brown draws similar links between the sending of letters and gift-giving in ‘Losing and Regaining the Material Meanings of Epistolary and Gift Texts’ in Material Readings of Early Modern Culture, eds, Daybell & Hinds, pp. 23-46.
72 Whyman, Sociability and Power, p. 10.
74 CH J8/1/301, Irwin to Carlisle, 1 December [1737], [London], pp. 1r-1v.
that her brother was looking well despite growing fat.\textsuperscript{75} Around the same time, Colonel Howard provided details of his brother’s performance in the House of Commons: “Yesterday my brother made a motion for an address to be presented to the King to desire his majesty would communicate to the house what further engagements he had entered into”.\textsuperscript{76} At his father’s insistence, Howard also provided a detailed account of what occurred in the Commons when, in 1736, Morpeth took part in the Quaker Bill debate.\textsuperscript{77}

One frequent topic of conversation between the Earl and his children concerned their mother’s erratic behaviour. The provision of news concerning his wife linked Carlisle to his children, an act which set them up in opposition to Lady Carlisle. In 1730 Irwin conspiratorially wrote to her father: “I beg when the Lordship or my Sister writes to me, you will not mention any thing I’ve nam’d in regard to her [Lady Carlisle’s] illness, since she thinks her self in so much danger, she would be very angry if every body else did not att least say so.”\textsuperscript{78} The autumn of 1730 was a troubled time for Lady Carlisle who suffered from acute paranoia and hypochondria. Visiting her mother at Cassiobury, Irwin wrote to Carlisle: “she has I think no particular distemper, but her apprehensions and frights are beyond what I could have imagined in a person that was actually a dying.”\textsuperscript{79} Writing later that same year, Irwin declared that “she is the most unfortunate Woman in the World neither to be believed nor helped.” She concluded:

\begin{quote}
I can see no end to this but as time wears out the passion of grief & Love, so I hope it may have the same effect upon fear, reason att present I’me sure can have no weight . . . for as the poet says upon another occasion: The Cause of fear can never be assign’d/ tis in nothing, but in the persons mind.\textsuperscript{80}
\end{quote}

\begin{small}
\textsuperscript{75} CH J8/1/144, M. Howard to Carlisle, n.d. [1734?], n.p., p. 1r.
\textsuperscript{76} CH J8/1/9, Howard to Carlisle, 27 January [1730], [London], p. 1v.
\textsuperscript{77} See Chapter Three, pp. 168-71.
\textsuperscript{78} CH J8/1/227, Irwin to Carlisle, 13 October [1730], London, p. 1v.
\textsuperscript{79} ibid, p. 1r.
\textsuperscript{80} CH J8/1/231, Irwin to Carlisle, 19 November [1730], London, p. 1v. Further evidence of the way Irwin was so deeply immersed in contemporary literature, she presumably adapted these lines from Dryden’s tragedy \textit{Tyrannick Love: or, The Royal Martyr} (1670) in which is found the couplet: ‘The Cause of Love can never be assign’d: ’Tis in no face; But in the Lover’s mind’ (III.i, 122-23). John Dryden, \textit{Tyrannick love, or,}
\end{small}
Irwin was not the only child who had a fraught relationship with Lady Carlisle. Staying with her mother and sister, Lady Lechmere, the Earl’s youngest daughter, Lady Howard, reported to her father that “here we have had lately some very bad days[,] no quarrels but a good deal of teasing”. Few clues remain to indicate Carlisle’s true feelings towards his estranged wife though it is apparent that in her absence he turned to his children for companionship, something which was played out through their letter-writing. In this regard, the network of familial correspondence that connected London and Castle Howard provided support for Carlisle and his children, creating a union between father and children.

There is another feature of familial letter-writing – that of parent-child obligation – which is evident in a number of Carlisle’s letters with his children. Indeed, widowed and aged thirty-three, Viscountess Irwin signed off one of her letters to her father on one occasion with the phrase, “from an obliged Child to the best of Fathers”. A form of gift-giving that in the early modern period brought into play issues of indebtedness, letter-writing, Goodman has acknowledged,

was the written equivalent of polite conversation . . . [it] was an exchange of gifts, especially when the letters contained news. Like conversation as well, letter-writing required the individual to think always in terms of the other.

This process began at a young age. Letter-writing manuals regularly encouraged children to begin letters to their parents with words of gratitude and obligation. Brant has

the royal martyr a tragedy, as it is acted by his majesties servants, at the Theatre Royal (London: Printed for H. Herringman, 1670).

CH J8/1/142, M. Howard to Carlisle, 19 February [1734], London, p. 2r.

The tension that might arise between obligation, affection, and familial union has been highlighted by Ben-Amos. She has noted that ‘gift-offering invariably and increasingly came to play a key role in cementing family attachments and bonds of obligations.’ Ben-Amos, The Cultures of Giving, p. 153.

CH, J8/1/190, Irwin to Carlisle, 18 January [1729], London, p. 2r.

observed, furthermore, that this rhetorical exercise ‘may well have contributed to adult anxieties about epistolary indebtedness.’

Carlisle’s correspondence with his eldest son and youngest daughter provides evidence that, within the convention of familial letter-writing, this sense of obligation became intertwined with familial affection and/or duty. In 1729, three decades after Castle Howard was first conceived, construction finally began on the mausoleum. As Carlisle was housebound and Hawksmoor similarly constrained in London, Lord Morpeth played an important intermediary role regarding its construction. It was around this time that the 3rd Earl of Burlington, introduced to the project by Sir Thomas Robinson, became involved in design considerations. Hawksmoor’s plans were scrutinized by both Burlington and Robinson and were found wanting of any classical precedent. Geoffrey Webb has observed that the project ‘brought Hawksmoor and the Burlington group . . . into sharp opposition.’ ‘Both Hawksmoor and his client Lord Carlisle’, he continues, were old men, and could not travel to meet each other as readily as in former years. They were therefore dependent on intermediaries. Of these Lord Morpeth, Carlisle’s son, appears fairly balanced between his father’s old friend and architect, and the new school, more nearly his contemporaries.

With Carlisle at Castle Howard and both Hawksmoor and Burlington based in London, Morpeth facilitated an exchange of information, ideas, and instructions between the different parties via his letter-writing. After one meeting with Hawksmoor, for example, Morpeth reported back to his father that “the last time I was with him we settled almost every part of the mausoleum for your approbation”.

---

86 Smith, *BCH*, pp. 177-84.
88 CH J8/1/510, Morpeth to Carlisle, 7 July [1729], Althorp, pp. 1r-1v.
I would argue that Morpeth’s role as his father’s intermediary was primarily undertaken because he felt a sense of familial duty. This duty required that the mausoleum be completed, both for posterity’s sake (Morpeth and his offspring were to inherit Castle Howard after all) and, more pressingly, for Carlisle, who was nearing the end of his life. A verse from an advice poem that Carlisle wrote to Morpeth three years before the former’s death highlights this matter:

On yon green Hill a dome does stand,
Erected by thy Father’s hand,
Where thou & I must go.
To thee what comfort then ‘twill be!
The like also ‘twill be to me
When our last breath we yield[.]\(^9\)

(70-75)

Earlier lines indicate that Carlisle believed he had successfully fulfilled his parental duties towards his eldest son and that it was now Morpeth’s turn to assume responsibility as head of the family: ‘What then for thee thy father’s done,/ Do thou the like for thy dear Son’ (64-65). The weight of obligation is apparent in the few letters that survive from Morpeth to Carlisle. Never more than polite to his father, his letter-writing style is in contrast to that employed by his brother, Colonel Howard, which was more affectionate and relaxed in tone.\(^90\) Indeed, if we recall, the Earl had to rely upon his other children to provide news of his eldest son. It seems, therefore, that the exchange of letters between Carlisle and Morpeth regarding the building of the mausoleum did not necessarily occur because of

\(^9\) CH J8/35/9, *The 3rd Earl’s Advice to his Son* (1735). The poem was published in 1735 in the appendix of Thomas Gent’s *Annales regioduni Hullini* (re-print in facsimile, Hull: M. C. Peck & Son, 1869), and then in 1738 in Gent’s *Pater patriae*. A third version was printed in the *Gentleman’s Magazine* (August 1739), p. 435. The present research uses the MS version at Castle Howard. Wilson suggests that the poem was ‘an extension of [Carlisle’s] own creation of a rural paradise in the building and adorning of Castle Howard and its grounds. But this is not an end in itself, for it is within this framework that virtue is to flourish — virtue encouraged in the enumeration of the beneficent activities Carlisle outlines for his heir.’ Wilson, *LR*, p. 449.

familial affection, but rather because it allowed the pair to embark upon a project that they were mutually obliged to complete.

The tension between child-parent obligation and familial affection and duty is also apparent in the letters sent from Carlisle’s youngest daughter, Lady Mary Howard. On the reverse of a letter which she had written to her father in the early 1720s, Carlisle endorsed the document with the phrase, “My Daughter Mary’s letters asking pardon for her omission in not writing sooner to me.” Lady Howard had begun the letter in question with an apology for this oversight: “I am extremely concerned to find my Dear father thinks I have neglected paying my duty to him which I hope upon no account I shall ever do[.]” She continued:

I should certainly have troubled your Lordship with writing if I could have been hap’y enough to have thoughts[,] it w’d not have been troublesome – I am very much grieved that you should think I neglect any proof that looks like regard to you – I am sure my intention is allways to do whatever I hope may oblige you and whatever you think proper for me.

Interminably sick and unmarried, she was reliant upon Carlisle’s generosity to fund her semi-permanent residence in England’s spa resorts. Due to her unmarried status Carlisle was obliged to support his daughter but, in turn, he expected regular correspondence with her.

Discussing parent-child relationships in the early modern period, Ben-Amos suggests that despite heavily investing emotionally and materially in their children, parents rarely received similar treatment from their children, even once they had reached old

92 ibid, p. 1r.
93 An endorsement written by Carlisle on the back of a letter from one of Lady Howard’s suitors offers the only reference to the marriage prospects of the Earl’s youngest daughter: “Letter from Sir John Rushout concerning his marriage with my Daughter Mary Hee broak it off, a good escape.” CH J8/1/711, Rushout to Carlisle, 20 March 1716, London, p. 2v. Considering his daughter’s temperament, it is not clear whether Carlisle thought it was Lady Howard or Rushout who benefitted from the broken engagement.
age.94 She writes: ‘the reciprocation offered by children to their parents remained unequal and asymmetrical, which implied that a great deal of parental generosity was built into the exchange between parents and children.’95 This ‘unequal bonding’, according to Ben-Amos, ‘implied a great deal of . . . negotiated exchange over the life course.’

The correspondence between Carlisle and his youngest daughter demonstrates this type of negotiation, on both an emotional and material level. Lady Howard’s distress at not maintaining efficient correspondence with her father is suggestive of the fact that she knew she had not upheld her part of the bargain. Her inability to financially support herself is implicit in the subservient tone that she employed. It indicates a shared but unspoken recognition of her dependency. Part of a broader literary convention which regularly dictated father-daughter exchanges in the early modern period, Howard’s deferential language reflects the patriarchal framework that still ran deeply through such relationships at the beginning of the eighteenth century. Daybell notes that it is, nevertheless, difficult to assess whether this type of submissive expression was ‘convention, device or as symptomatic of women’s feelings of inferiority to men.’97 He proposes that such language could well have been employed by women to use for their own advantage – not an implausible reading when we consider Howard’s situation as an unmarried woman.

2.6 “An Idle Man about Town”: Sir Thomas Robinson and his Epistolary Relationship with Carlisle

In 1728, Sir Thomas Robinson married Carlisle’s middle daughter, Elizabeth, Lady Lechmere, and entered into the life of the 3rd Earl and Castle Howard. Though certain

94 Ben-Amos, The Cultures of Giving, p. 42. Ben-Amos discusses a variety of aspects of parent-child exchanges in the early modern period under the themes of parental investment, unequal exchange, and gendered obligations, pp. 17-44.
95 Ibid, p. 42.
96 Ibid.
family members never warmed to Robinson, within months of his marriage he had become one the Earl’s most frequent correspondents.\(^98\) Marrying into one of the nation’s leading aristocratic families must have delighted an ambitious Robinson who never achieved the heights of fame that he desired. Best known as the gentleman-architect who assisted with the building of Castle Howard’s mausoleum and west wing, the personal relationship that developed between Robinson and Carlisle has been less examined by scholars.\(^99\) Did Robinson ingratiate himself with Carlisle, for example, in order to progress his architectural career, or did he express an interest in architecture and the building of Castle Howard in order to impress his father-in-law? In this regard, their correspondence is an untapped source, shedding light on Robinson’s character, his personal motivations, as well as his relationship with Carlisle.

Via Robinson, the Earl was tangentially linked to the cultural networks of early eighteenth-century London. Robinson was a well-connected figure in London’s intellectual and cultural circles: amongst other things, he was a member of the Royal Society, the Society for Antiquaries, and the Royal Society of Arts.\(^100\) He was a proud man, always keen to show off how well-informed he was about current cultural trends and events. In 1736, for instance, Robinson announced that he “shall bring down a young Painter for History & landscapes (recommended to me by the Walpole Family) he is of

\(^{98}\) It is interesting to note that at the same time, Lady Lechmere’s letters to her father became more sporadic. Such a shift in her letter-writing habits gives the impression that Robinson took charge of the couple’s correspondence with Carlisle. Such controlling behaviour was in line with Viscountess Irwin’s opinion of Robinson. A year after Lechmere’s marriage to Robinson she reported to her father that her sister’s husband “seems absolute master of everything” and that “every thing else must be given up to what he likes”. CH J8/1/189, Irwin to Carlisle, 9 January [1729], London, p. 1v.

\(^{99}\) Like the letters of Vanbrugh and Hawksmoor, historians of Castle Howard have tended to use Robinson’s correspondence to identify his role in the design and construction of the house’s Palladian-inspired west wing and the mausoleum. See, for example, Smith, BCH, p. 178, pp. 180-84. Giles Worsley had begun to unpick Robinson’s life and career, including his relationship with the 3rd Earl. See his ‘New Light on “Long Sir Thomas”’, The Georgian Group Journal, IX (1999), pp. 1-16 and ‘The Financial Problems of Sir Thomas Robinson’, The Georgian Group Journal, X (2000), pp. 15-20. Worsley’s premature death has meant, however, that there is still valuable work to be done on Robinson.

\(^{100}\) Worsley demonstrated Robinson’s breadth of interests by isolating a period in 1762 in which the gentleman-architect heard papers on or attended committee meetings concerning verdigris, sheep-marking, varnishing, drawing, pig and bar iron, salomonic, fish carriages, copper medals, landscape painting, statues, sea water, and a Swiss engine for use in forestry. Worsley, ‘New Light’, pp. 4-5.
great expectations in his business & in all probability will be very famous in his profession.” Portraying himself “an Idle Man about Town” with all the time, connections, and taste needed to pick up material for the 3rd Earl, Robinson hoped to both entertain and inform his father-in-law with what he sent north. In Chapter Three we will see how he provided Carlisle with political pamphlets, but along with his letters he also sent poetry, architectural prints, and other more ephemeral pieces such as “Lord Vanes merry advertisement for his eloped Wife, a Masterpiece of its kind”. I would argue that this act was an attempt by Robinson to bond with his father-in-law. Marcel Mauss’s anthropological examination of gift-giving in archaic societies has provided historians with a useful framework to examine the exchange of gifts in the early modern period. As gift-giving is rarely a spontaneous act, Mauss observed, the exchange is seldom without an objective. It follows then that gift-giving is nearly always undertaken ‘to maintain a profitable alliance’. I believe that Robinson’s motivation behind sending gifts to Carlisle was influenced by a desire to gain entry into the echelons of aristocratic society.

In a clear attempt to bond with Carlisle over their shared interest in architecture, Robinson sent architectural prints to his father-in-law including, for example, an upright of George Sampson’s new Bank of England and a design for an unknown “plain strong

103 ibid.
106 Presumably thinking it brought him cache, years later Robinson proudly recalled his involvement in the building of Castle Howard. In a letter dated 30 July 1768, Robinson wrote to the Earl of Verney (for whom he built Claydon House in the 1760s and 1770s): “Lord Carlisle constantly Settled with me each year how much was to be done that year, I knowing that he never was disappointed, nor had the least trouble, Such will be the case att Claydon”. M. Verney & P. Abercrombie, ‘Letters of an Eighteenth-Century Architect’, Architectural Review, 59 (1926), p. 263. For further details of Robinson’s involvement with the building of Claydon, see also M. Verney & P. Abercrombie, ‘Letters of an Eighteenth-Century Architect’, Architectural Review, 60 (1926), pp. 1-3, pp. 50-53, and pp. 92-93.
Rustick Gateway . . . as your Lordship intends building one”. Ben-Amos has observed that ‘some types of support were more strategic than others’ and I believe that Robinson’s provision of such material was a veiled effort to become a key figure in the construction of Castle Howard. To be associated with such a building project would have excited a man who considered himself to be architecturally accomplished. In one of his first letters to his father-in-law, Robinson introduced his passion for the art: “When I enter upon the Subject of Sculpture & architecture my two favourite studiei (& of which I have bought most of the good books & plans of whatever was yet writ or built) I quit the conversation with reluctance”. Later in the same letter, however, Robinson offset this confidence, responding in an obsequious and self-effacing manner to the Earl’s request for an opinion on the recent building work at Castle Howard:

I am afraid your Lordships too partial in thinking me capable of giving my opinions . . . a Person must be very vain who imagines he can with advantage alter any of your plans for the outworks there.

Despite his humble pretensions, Robinson readily involved himself with the building project at Castle Howard soon after his marriage to Lady Lechmere. Though he was

---

108 Ben-Amos, The Cultures of Giving, p. 79.  
109 CH J8/1/412, Robinson to Carlisle, 6 December 1730, Paris, p. 2r.  
110 ibid, pp. 1r-1v.  
111 The manner in which Robinson was involved with the building project has been glossed over by architectural historians despite an obvious tension between the parties involved. Horace Walpole recorded that Robinson and Vanbrugh quickly became enemies, ‘spitting and swearing at one another’. (Webb, ‘The Letters and Drawings of Nicholas Hawksmoor’, p. 116.) As Vanbrugh died before Robinson married Lady Lechmere they must have fallen out before he was part of the Howard family. Robinson fared no better with Hawksmoor. In 1734, the former wrote to his father-in-law: 

I have spent this whole morn with Mr Hawksmoor & have shewn him my design for the Basement of the Mausoleum, he flatter me with his approbation of it, I am sorry I can’t return him the compliment by approving the scheme he shew’d me[.] CH J8/1/457, Robinson to Carlisle, 20 July 1734, London, p. 1r.

Considering the agreeable working relationship that existed between Carlisle, Vanbrugh, and Hawksmoor, it must have been difficult for the ageing Earl to face such an imposition from Robinson, particularly his desire to involve the celebrated architect, Lord Burlington. Smith notes that Robinson ‘was a frequent unwanted guest at Lord Burlington’s villa at Chiswick’, yet Robinson had others believe that he and
ultimately successful in making changes to the mausoleum and completing the main body of the house with his west wing, his alterations sit awkwardly with the rest of the design. I would suggest that this incongruity echoes the way in which Robinson sat uncomfortably alongside the Howard family unit, a dynamic evident in the letter-writing style that he employed when writing to Carlisle.¹¹²

The tone that Robinson used in his letters to Carlisle indicates his desire to be accepted into the family. Whilst he might well have had useful ideas regarding the design and building of Castle Howard, his disagreeable nature meant he struggled to gain the confidence of some members of the Howard family. In August 1730, Viscountess Irwin – who had formed a particular dislike of Robinson – wrote to her father that,

"Mr Robinson is just the same as when I saw him last: no real distemper I'm persuaded attends him but if laziness & inactivity may be accounted a disease, he is certainly in a bad state, for I never saw a man less dispos'd for business than himself, but in my opinion he will allways be the same; for tis his mind and not his body that wants a cure."¹¹³

A letter written from Robinson to Carlisle five years later suggests that he perceived himself rather differently. Discussing his new role as a Commissioner of Excise, Robinson pronounced:

"To a person of a lazy disposition, or to one who has an aversion to business, this would not be a very agreeable life; as I believe no one will accuse me of the one, nor do I find myself in the least averse to the other, that I believe I shall be able to do the duty, with as much ease to myself, as any of my brother Commissioners[]."¹¹⁴

¹¹² In the words of Amanda Gilroy and W. M. Verhoeven, ‘correspondence promotes dissonance and difference as well as connection and community.’ Amanda Gilroy & W. M. Verhoeven, ‘Introduction’ in Epistolary Histories, eds, Gilroy & Verhoeven, p. 15.
¹¹³ CH J8/1/223, Irwin to Carlisle, 11 August [1730], Brussels, p. 1v.
¹¹⁴ Robinson to Carlisle, 6 December 1735, n.p., HMC, Carlisle, p. 157.
Whilst Robinson’s letters to Carlisle could be read as one man’s failed attempt to bond with his father-in-law, it could also be argued that his correspondence exemplifies the early modern epistolary convention in which socially inferior correspondents were required to display flattery and deference.

Throughout his letters, Robinson made use of epistolary devices which, in the words of Ben-Amos,

expressed personal bonding and obligations – references to previous commitments and courtesies . . . allusions to a joint personal history or relationships, expressions of affection and promises for future returns in enhancing the reputation of the addressee. These devices were buttressed with exaggerated pronouncements designed to single out the unique personal qualities of patrons . . . as well as magnify the gulf that separated the petitioner from his or her own superior.\(^\text{115}\)

After Robinson’s appointment to the post of Commissioner of Excise in November 1735, for instance, Carlisle received these words of thanks:

I am indebted to your Lordship for your letter of congratulation, and the kind advice therein given. As I have always esteemed your Lordship’s notice in regard to our affairs, to proceed from your humane and generous disposition to all your family, so your last mark of goodness on this head, I take as a fresh one of your concern as to what regards our welfare.\(^\text{116}\)

This passage suggests that Robinson was aware of ‘the efficacy of deference as a form of reward.’\(^\text{117}\) Moreover, ‘[i]n return for favours and help, a petitioner offered a patron or a potential provider of aid signification of status and enhancement of his or her reputation and esteem.’\(^\text{118}\) With the use of the word “our”, Robinson positions himself as an equal to his brothers- and sisters-in-laws, firmly locating himself as part of the Howard family. He also deferentially places Carlisle at the head of the family, a role which he proclaims the

\(^{115}\) ibid, p. 199.  
\(^{118}\) ibid.
Earl conducts with “humane and generous disposition”. Even after a decade of correspondence with Carlisle, Robinson’s letter-writing style changed little, remaining that of a social inferior who had been denied full access into the Howard family. An apt comparison can be made when contrasting Robinson’s letters with those that Carlisle received from Colonel William Douglas, whom Viscountess Irwin married in 1737. In a matter of months, Douglas’s writing-style became more relaxed, hinting at a much warmer relationship between the Earl and his new son-in-law. He soon became involved, for example, in discussions regarding the minutiae of family life. Writing with little affectation or flattery, unlike Robinson, he was quickly welcomed into the Howard family fold.

2.7 “Trifles that I think may amuse you”: The Exchange of Poetry between Carlisle and Viscountess Irwin

Viscountess Irwin was, by far, Carlisle’s most regular correspondent. As a published poet and acquaintance of the likes of Alexander Pope and Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, she linked her father to the leading literary circles in London. As a Lady of the Bedchamber, she was also his connection to the royal circle. Indeed, her letters regularly conveyed greetings from those members of the royal family who had not forgotten Carlisle following his retirement from London society. Frequently concerned that her father was lonely at Castle Howard, she informed him that she was “willing to send any trifles that I think may amuse you.” As we shall see, alongside snippets of gossip and accounts of the plays and operas which she had attended, Irwin also sent supplementary items ranging

---

119 For Colonel Douglas’s letters, see CH J8/1/ 283, 287, 289, 294, 297, 299, 304, and 305.
120 As a result of the Earl’s promotion of his daughter at Court, Irwin was appointed Lady of the Bedchamber to Princess Augusta in 1736. Her first duty was to bring to England the sixteen-year old Princess from Germany in preparation for her marriage to Frederick, Prince of Wales. Irwin continued to serve the family into the 1750s and became a close friend and confidant to both the Prince and Princess of Wales.
121 CH J8/1/210, Irwin to Carlisle, 8 April [1729?], London, p. 1v.
from light-hearted jokes and riddles to more weighty poems and essays. By considering Irwin’s position as an intellectually curious women at Court, it becomes evident that what she included is not a straightforward indication of what reading material Carlisle enjoyed. An assessment of their epistolary relationship reveals that she was acting out of a desire to impress him.122

Chiefly known today as the anonymous author of Castle-Howard (a poem celebrating the life of Carlisle and his Yorkshire residence), it is not surprising to find that one of the most frequent topics of conversation that Irwin shared with her father was poetry. The discussion and exchange of poetry which occurred between Irwin and her father could be seen as a bonding exercise that brought the pair closer together. As we saw in Chapter One, the percentage of poetry in the Earl’s book collection was higher in 1715 at Castle Howard than it was in 1698 at his London townhouse.123 This shift, I suggested, reflected Carlisle’s retirement from national politics and adoption of a more leisurely lifestyle at Castle Howard which also included his own poetry writing. That Carlisle did not discuss poetry to such an extent with anybody else indicates the unique nature of their correspondence.

As well as small amusements which she inserted into the main text of her letters, Irwin sent longer, separate works of poetry in or alongside her letters.124 In one undated letter, for example, we learn that she had sent to Castle Howard a copy of James Bramston’s The Man of Taste (1733), a poetic work running into many hundreds of lines. She told Carlisle, “tis in general much lik’d, a good Satire upon the present reigning taste

122 As Lawrence D. Green acknowledges, ‘any effort to survey the wealth of material in letter-writing entails some unexpected forays into the reasons why people would choose to write’. Green, ‘Dictamen in England’ in Letter-Writing Manuals, eds, Poster & Mitchell, p. 103.
123 See above, pp. 62-63.
124 As few of these supplementary texts survive, our knowledge of what Carlisle received comes primarily from the letters that accompanied the material. Often handwritten or printed on single sheets of paper which could easily slip inside the folded pages of a letter, the ephemeral nature of this material meant that it was easily discarded or passed on to others once it had been read.
(or more properly follies of the World). Marking the text for the Earl, Irwin pointed out that one of the female figures referred to in the poem was immune from further ridicule because she “was too noted in her life to have any reputation to lose att her death.” Of particular interest to Carlisle might have been a brief passage in the poem that satirized Vanbrugh, his architectural style, and, specifically, his infamous love of ruins:

\[
\text{Tis Vanbrug's structures that my fancy strike:} \\
\text{Such noble ruins ev'ry pile wou'd make,} \\
\text{I wish they'd tumble for the prospect’s sake.}  \tag{114-16}
\]

Irwin remarked of “poor Sir John” that Bramston “falls a little heavy upon [him] and unluckily hits upon the same thought in Verse which he so often express’d in prose in regard to ruins.”

It was primarily through Irwin that Carlisle became linked to the élite networks of manuscript circulation that spread throughout polite society in the early eighteenth century. The increased efficiency of the postal networks as well as the “idle hours” that the Earl had at Castle Howard enabled him to be an active participant in such networks. The distribution of hand-written verse was a common practice amongst educated circles of this period, a practice that was reliant upon one’s social connections rather than the

---

125 CH J8/1/205, Irwin to Carlisle, 13 March [1729?], London, pp. 1v-1r. The Man of Taste was written in 1733, which would mean that the proposed date of the letter is incorrect. Bramston wrote The Art of Politics in 1729. Irwin’s description of the poem, however, including the reference to Vanbrugh, indicates that she was discussing the former work with her father.

126 ibid.


128 CH J8/1/205, Irwin to Carlisle, 13 March [1729?], London, pp. 1v-1r. Considering its architectural style, Castle Howard could have easily fallen into the category of "noble ruin". It is surprising, therefore, that Irwin does not comment further on these lines.
unpredictable stock of the pamphlet shop. In the words of Peter Beal, ‘manuscript culture . . . operated rather like gossip.’ Although, initially, the audience for a particular manuscript was controlled and targeted, as with gossip, its very exclusivity ‘invited an expansion of the audience to include more and more supposedly privileged “insiders”’. Such a transmission of hand-written verses is exemplified by two sets of poetic verse that Irwin sent to Carlisle from London.

The earlier example, a poem of six stanzas which was generally believed to be written by either Lady Mary Wortley Montagu or Lord Hervey (one of Montagu’s admirers), was included in a 1729 letter she sent to Carlisle. The verse was hand-written, presumably transcribed from either a printed version of the poem or another manuscript copy. Four of the stanzas refer to individual female socialites of the era, with each represented by a classical literary figure. In stanza three Montagu is represented as Sappho, the ancient Greek poetess: ‘when Our Sapho appears whose witt’s so refine’d/ I am forced to applaud with the rest of Mankind/ Her Charms are Confest her Spirit & fire/ Every word I attend but I only admire’ (9-12). The identities of each of the women are written alongside each stanza. Though Irwin proposed to her father that neither Montagu nor Hervey composed the poem, she considered it to have “pretty turns of wit[,]”

130 Beal, In Praise of Scribes, p. 149, fn. 10.
131 Irwin possibly sent her father another copy of a manuscript verse but as there is no conclusive evidence to support her involvement, the item has been discounted in the present analysis. The work is a political lampoon called The Seven Wise Men of England (CH J8/35/18). Wilson, who dates the piece to the summer of 1719, suggests that Irwin sent it because the handwriting is comparable to her own. Wilson, LR, p. 181.
132 CH J8/1/288. It is not know for certain which letter the poem was sent with thought it was possibly CH J8/1/203, Irwin to Carlisle, 8 March [1729?].
133 Thus Mrs. Harvey is Celia (stanza two), Mrs. Medows is Prudentia (stanza four), and Mrs. Howard, Countess of Suffolk is Chloe (stanza five).
sharp satire & good similes, but I think the reflection . . . to often repeated and the whole
too long."\textsuperscript{134}

Details of Montagu’s literary escapades occur frequently in Irwin’s letters to her
father suggesting the former’s fascination with this figure. A decade older than Irwin,
Montagu was the daughter of Evelyn Pierrepont, 1\textsuperscript{st} Duke of Kingston, a close friend of
Carlisle’s. It was presumably via this familial network that the two women became
acquainted.\textsuperscript{135} Following a prickly encounter in London, in 1729 Irwin wrote to the Earl
that Montagu’s principles were “as Corrupt as her wit is entertaining”. Irwin recounted
how the two women had clashed over the issues of constancy and mourning:

Lady Mary immediately attack’d me for a practise so inconsistant with
reason & nature call’d for a pen & ink said she found her self inspired
for my service & writ as she pretend’d the enclos’d of hand[.] I had the
better of the argument but not having her wit to support it my
answer will appear flatt.\textsuperscript{136}

Referring to the lengthy mourning period that Irwin had taken following her first
husband’s death, the final sentence displays a defensiveness regarding both her behaviour
as a widow and her ability to argue successfully against Montagu. Though not extant in the
archives, Irwin enclosed with this letter “Lady Mary Wortleys advice to me and my
answer”, thus providing Carlisle with a transcription of the whole conversation.

It is likely that a second hand-written copy of verse in the Castle Howard archives
accompanied a letter from Irwin to her father from the spring of 1733. This particular

\textsuperscript{134} CH J8/1/203, Irwin to Carlisle, 8 March [1729?], London, pp. 1v-2r. Irwin was correct in thinking that
neither Montagu nor Hervey wrote the poem. It was written by Charles Mordaunt, Earl of Peterborough
(1658-1735) in 1723. Peterborough was a close friend of Pope’s and therefore part of the same literary
scene as Montagu and Hervey. John B. Hattendorf, ‘Mordaunt, Charles, third earl of Monmouth (1658—1735)’,
For a modern edition of the poem, see Roger Lonsdale, ed., The New Oxford Book of Eighteenth Century Verse
\textsuperscript{135} Montagu stayed at Castle Howard with Carlisle’s three daughters in 1714. Isobel Grundy, Lady Mary
\textsuperscript{136} CH J8/1/210, Irwin to Carlisle, 8 April [1729?], London, p. 1v.
letter refers to some enclosed lines which were “made by Mr Pope in return to those said to be writ by Lady Mary Wortley upon him tis now known Lord Hervey was the author”. The turbulent friendship between Montagu and Pope (who was jealous of the former’s friendship with Hervey) was played out over the course of two decades via the circulation of their poetry in manuscript form. It appears that Irwin and Carlisle were part of the élite networks through which the literary rebuffs that were exchanged between the pair were dispersed. Despite living a seemingly remote existence at Castle Howard, Carlisle was linked to early eighteenth-century fashionable London society via the circulation of such poetic manuscripts. This connection was possible thanks to Irwin’s membership of London’s literary circles. Irwin, therefore, played an essential intermediary role in connecting her father to wider cultural spheres of literary engagement, even if the topic was something which fascinated her more than it fascinated him.

Alongside Montagu, news of Pope’s poetic activities regularly featured in Irwin’s letters. The frequency with which he appears in her letters suggests that she was as intrigued by his reputation as much as by his poetry. On at least four occasions – that is, more than any other poet – she sent examples of his work to Castle Howard. In February 1729, for example, she wrote: “I hope you receiv’d the packet I sent which is now own’d

137 CH J8/1/253, Irwin to Carlisle, 12 April [1733], London, p. 1v. The manuscript verse has been allocated the acquisition number CH J8/1/251. The lines read: “No title page the Lady need express/ Where ev’ry Line displays the Poetress/ And could she dip her pen in blacker Gall/ Let Pope be patient – he deserves it all/ For sure he merits the Severest Lays/ Who ever could write a Sonnet in her praise” (1-6).


139 For the influence of Pope’s work on women’s poetry throughout the eighteenth century, see Thomas, Alexander Pope and his Eighteenth Century Readers, particularly Chapters Two and Three.
to be Popes & extremly lik’d.” As with her relationship with Montagu, Irwin appears to have been both frustrated and fascinated by Pope. Whilst Castle-Howard (1732) was a clear retort to Pope’s Epistle to Lord Burlington (1731), and her Epistle to Mr Pope (1736) was, according to the subtitle, ‘Occasioned by his Characters of Women’ (1735), Pope’s stylistic influence on her writing is notable. With this in mind, it becomes apparent that the intellectual interests of another determined which literary topics and material Carlisle encountered.

At times, the poems that Irwin sent to Castle Howard were shared with guests and other members of the household. In a postscript of an undated letter, Irwin noted to her father that “I hope you lik’d the Poem I sent Mr Lewis.” Lewis was Carlisle’s chaplain and, it seems, also part of the network of textual exchange in which the Earl participated. It is also likely that Castle Howard was not the final destination for such material, nor was it just a one-way system of exchange, from city to country. Whilst much of this section looks at what the 3rd Earl received at Castle Howard, there are two recorded examples of Carlisle sending poetry to London. Such evidence indicates that the house was merely one node within a broader network of textual exchange.

---

140 CH J8/1/199, Irwin to Carlisle, 22 February [1729], London, p. 2v.

141 Although Carlisle must have been aware of Pope, lacking his side of their correspondence, we do not know whether he shared his daughter’s fascination with the poet. If any of Pope’s poems drew his attention then it would have certainly been Epistle to Lord Burlington (1731). In a 1733 letter to her father, Irwin enclosed “Mr Pope’s new poem [Epistle to Bathurst] which is much in the style of Epistle to my Lord Burlington but as the objects of his satyr are low; people will be less offended” (CH J8/1/244, Irwin to Carlisle, 18 January [1733], London, pp. 1v-2r). Her words suggest that the Earl knew all too well the earlier work which had advocated Lord Burlington’s neo-Palladianism as the supreme architectural style. Infamous for criticizing those aristocrats who had built houses in an extravagant and tasteless manner, Carlisle was a prime target of the poem. Indeed, in 1732, when writing to the Earl regarding Castle Howard’s mausoleum, Hawksmoor observed: “I don’t question but we shall gain honour and satisfaction from that fabrick and hope the poet Mr pope will not set his satir upon us for it” (Webb, ‘The Letters and Drawings of Nicholas Hawksmoor’, p. 129). For a short summary of Pope’s Epistle to Lord Burlington, see Kathleen Mahaffey, ‘Timon’s Villa: Walpole’s Houghton’ in Pope: Recent Essays by Several Hands, eds, Maynard Mack & James A. Winn (Brighton: The Harvester Press, 1980), pp. 315-351, and G. R. Hibbard, ‘The Country House Poem in the Seventeenth Century’, Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, 19 (1956), pp. 172-74. For a broader assessment of Pope’s representation of country houses in his poems, see Chapters Seven to Ten in Kelsall, The Great Good Place.

142 CH J8/1/203, Irwin to Carlisle, 8 March [1729?], London, p. 2r.
Along with “a very Sensible pamphlet”, in 1734 Carlisle sent to Horatio Walpole “a very Ingenious copy of verse”. It has been suggested that this item was a seven-verse riddle in Carlisle’s hand that survives in the Castle Howard archives. Thought to have been devised by the Earl, the riddle refers to the once popular card-games of whisk and ombre which are personified as the mother and father of another card game, quadrille. Despite being their ‘son’, quadrille has exceeded both his ‘parents’ in popularity, first in France and then in England, at Court as well as in the provinces. Reporting to Carlisle that he had given the verse to Queen Caroline, Walpole noted that she had been delighted by the composition. By sending such items to London, Wilson has suggested, Carlisle was attempting to ingratiate himself with the Queen with the hope of getting both Colonel Howard and Viscountess Irwin official posts at Court, as well as the Crown to remit arrears concerning his estate at Lanercost in Cumbria. If this was the case, then Carlisle was effectively using networks of textual exchange to further the cause of his family.

Interpreting the riddle with any consideration of the political and familial tensions at Court, however, challenges the suggestion that it was the riddle which Carlisle sent to London. I would argue that the riddle is in fact a thinly veiled reference to the increased popularity that Frederick, Prince of Wales was experiencing in the mid-1730s, a popularity that contrasted to the mounting dissatisfaction that the public felt towards both George II and Queen Caroline. Whilst this public scorn was primarily directed towards the King for leaving the country to spend time with his mistress in Hanover, the Queen

143 CH J8/1/855, H. Walpole to Carlisle, 30 March 1734, Cockpitt, pp. 1r-1v.
144 CH J8/35/7, A Riddle made upon a Game called Quadrille (Summer 1734). See Wilson, LR, pp. 308-22.
145 CH J8/1/855, H. Walpole to Carlisle, 30 March 1734, Cockpitt, pp. 1r-1v.
146 Wilson, LR, p. 310.
147 Relations between members of the royal family deteriorated steadily during the early 1730s, sometimes into farce. For an account of this period, see Vivian, A Life of Frederick, Prince of Wales, pp. 227-34, pp. 238-66.
fared little better. She was criticized for not preventing (and perhaps even encouraging) poor relations between her husband and the Prince of Wales. Considering these events at Court, it seems evident that ‘Quadrille’ represents the Prince of Wales and ‘ombre’ and ‘whisk’ the King and Queen. The ending of the poem clearly indicates the intense and sometimes cruel family rivalry that was increasingly present at Court:

My aged Parents, much depress’d,
Neglected stand, by none caress’d,
Tho’ once great Fav’rits highly priz’d,
Now much contemn’s, as much dispis’d,
Disgrac’d by me, by me outdone,
They must give way, where e’re I come[.]

(178-83)

This riddle, then, would not have been in any way an ideal instrument of flattery for Queen Caroline. Indeed, the very nature of the work raises questions about Carlisle’s proposed authorship. The conflict between George II and his son (centred primarily on the latter’s personal revenue) reached a climax in 1734 when the Prince announced his support of the anti-Walpolean opposition. As a Whig (and a non-confrontational one at that), it would be unlikely that Carlisle would write something which essentially supported the Prince of Wales’s ascendency through his alignment with the Tory party.

Furthermore, in his letter, Horatio Walpole promised Carlisle that “the verses shall be printed as soon as I have received them from the Queen” yet there is no evidence that A Riddle made upon a Game called Quadrille was ever published.

Whatever Carlisle sent to Court, it was not this riddle. Although it is easy to see why Wilson linked Walpole’s phrase, “ingenious copy of verse”, to a surviving riddle in

---

148 See below, p. 144.
149 In a letter to Carlisle, the Earl of Sunderland discussed an earlier conversation that they had shared concerning “your Lordships Coming into the King’s business & particularly into the Post of President of the Council”. Though the pair were referring to George I, Sunderland observed that Carlisle had “been known allways to have acted upon the steady Whig Principle” and “that there is no man so qualified in the Kingdom in whom both the king & the Whig Party can have an entire Confidence, but your Selv”. CH J8/1/693, 13 November 1717, London, pp. 1r-1v.
150 CH J8/1/855, H. Walpole to Carlisle, 30 March 1734, Cockpitt, pp. 1r-1v.
Carlisle’s hand in the archives, more attention should be given to his use of the word “copy”. This term indicates that the 3rd Earl, like his middle daughter, wrote and circulated manuscript copies of verse with his friends and acquaintances at Court. One unanswered question remains, however. Why would Carlisle have copied out and kept A Riddle made upon a Game called Quadrille? One can only assume that it caught his attention and he perhaps intended to send it on to someone else. Whoever that was, however, it would not have been Queen Caroline.

The second recorded instance in which poetry was sent from Castle Howard to London occurred just one year before Carlisle’s death. Around the turn of 1737 the Earl sent to Irwin a poem by one Mr Pindar. Upon receiving the poem, Irwin replied to her father:

> the Poem . . . of Mr Pindar’s I think an exceedingly good one[,] the expression is beautiful and the thought excellent[,] I shall endeavour to serve him by showing it to some people of good taste who may possibly convey it to Mr Pope for his approbation, and if tis lik’d I will take the properest method I can to get it printed.\(^1\)

A month later, Irwin told Carlisle that she had given the poem to, amongst others, the Prince of Wales but that she was still waiting for an opportunity to show it to Pope.\(^2\) It is unknown whether Pope ever saw the verses but, from Irwin’s letters, we know that the poem was eventually published by a printer who promised her that “if it sells . . . he will make a present to the author but would engage for nothing till he saw the success of it.”\(^3\) The exact identity of Mr Pindar is unknown however one John Pindar was presented to the rectory of Moor Monkton, a village to the north-west of York, six years after Irwin’s

---

\(^1\) CH J8/1/273, Irwin to Carlisle, 11 January [1737], [London], p. 2r.
\(^2\) CH J8/1/275, Irwin to Carlisle, 22 February [1737], [London], p. 2v.
\(^3\) CH J8/1/280, Irwin to Carlisle, 16 April [1737], [London], p. 2r. Though Irwin confirms that the poem was published, it has not been possible to trace it.
correspondence.\textsuperscript{154} It is evident, therefore, that via Carlisle and his daughter members of Castle Howard’s surrounding community were connected to the most prominent literary circles in the Capital which included members of the monarchy, one of the greatest poets of early eighteenth-century England, and the printing houses of London. The case of Mr Pindar and his poem highlights how Carlisle, like Irwin, acted as an intermediary for other people and was himself a disseminator of textual material.

Despite frequently sending her father topical jokes, verses, and epigrams that had been circulating around her social circles in London, by the 1730s Irwin began to voice, unapologetically, her opinions about what she perceived to be the increasingly degenerate state of literary culture in England. One piece which received her critique was a pasquinade devised in reaction to George II’s unpopular retreat to Hanover between the summer of 1736 and January 1737. Irwin did not regard this satirical verse very highly but whether this was because of its poor literary quality or its criticism of the King’s behaviour it is not known.\textsuperscript{155} In 1733 she wrote:

tis a Critical age & the more I see of people of Genius the less amiable they appear, since they dedicate those talents which were given ‘em for the pleasure of mankind, wholly to the detriment of those who dare take pen in hand, as for the numerous herd of Readers they pass uncensur’d, tis the poor writers only upon whose reputation they sit[.]\textsuperscript{156}

The passage suggests that Irwin believed that her fellow writers were improperly using their talents to create mindless and unskilful jibes at each other.


\textsuperscript{155} CH J8/1/271, Irwin to Carlisle, 1 January [1737], [London], p. 1v.

\textsuperscript{156} CH J8/1/240, Irwin to Carlisle, 2 January [1733], London, p. 2v.
Considering her confident character, she may also have been reticent that, at the same time as her male cohorts were receiving recognition for what she perceived to be poorly written and flippant scrawls, as a female poet she had to publish anonymously if she wanted to maintain her social standing.\(^\text{157}\) Her frustration at this situation is apparent in the letters that she wrote to her father after the publication of *Castle-Howard* in 1732.\(^\text{158}\)

Although there is no indication that Carlisle was involved in the writing of the poem, unlike other family members he was implicit in her authorship. Writing soon after it was published, she reported, “I have heard some observations . . . upon *Castle Howard* to its advantage”, further noting that “I am pleased to remain an unsuspected person; tis thought a Masculine performance no body believing I have any other Concern in it than my fondness to the place.”\(^\text{159}\) In a previous letter Irwin had written to Carlisle: “I have heard no body mention the Poem . . . my Mother, who was the last person I thought would have read or liked it . . . Commended it to me, but has no suspicion that I was the Author.”\(^\text{160}\) The manner in which the pair colluded over her anonymous authorship of the poem reveals the close relationship that they had, particularly in comparison to that which Irwin had with her mother. That Irwin had the confidence to share on more than once occasion details of her poetry with her father, as well as her thoughts about contemporary

---

157 In her other anonymously published poem, *Epistle to Mr Pope. By a Lady. Occasioned by his Characters of Women* (Gentleman’s Magazine, December 1736), Irwin displays her incredulity at the current state of women’s education. After establishing that all men and women, whether young or old, are driven by the same desire for fame and power, she argues that the main reason for any difference between the sexes is down to their education. Irwin criticizes the current tendency to educate women only in the art of lisping French, dancing, and ambushing men. For the only published analysis of Irwin’s poetry, see Thomas, *Alexander Pope and his Eighteenth-Century Readers*, pp. 146-150, pp. 157-58. A variant manuscript version of Irwin’s poem is at the British Library (BL, Add. MS 28101, f. 100v).


159 CH J8/1/241, Irwin to Carlisle, 6 January [1733], London, p. 2r.

literary culture, suggests that the Earl was receptive to her strong criticism of the ambiguous role of women in society.

The privacy afforded by letter-writing allowed Irwin to express thoughts and ideas, particularly about poetry and literature, which she was unable to do at Court. In late 1737, Irwin reported to Carlisle that John Théophilus Desaguliers, the French natural philosopher and member of the Royal Society, had arrived at Kew Palace. She noted that “I have gain’d some credit by the little knowledge I have in Astronomy . . . I know more of that Science than all the Ladies here.” In the same letter, however, Irwin continued:

this is no Commendation, for ignorance in all parts of Learning both in Men and Women who belong to Court is as Universal as affectation, neither of which I would willingly be infected with[.]

As Lady of the Bedchamber, Irwin felt a need to curtail her expressive nature in London, aware that it was considered imprudent for a woman to voice her opinions too strongly in public. She shared her father’s love of Castle Howard and often felt the wearing

---

161 Irwin’s discussion of these thoughts with her father should not necessarily be understood as evidence of her complete self-expression. In the words of Gilroy and Verhoeven, the ‘most historically powerful fiction of the letter has been that which figures it as the trope of authenticity and intimacy, which elides questions of linguistic, historical, and political mediation’. Gilroy & Verhoeven, ‘Introduction’ in Epistolary Histories, eds, Gilroy & Verhoeven, p. 1. Irwin could be compared to other intellectually-minded women of the period such as Aphra Behn and Lady Mary Wortley Montagu. For details of Wortley Montagu’s letter-writing style, see, for example, Donna Landry, ‘Love Me, Love My Turkey Book: Letters and Turkish Travelogues in Early Modern England’ in Epistolary Histories, eds, Gilroy & Verhoeven, pp. 51-73. For the role that letter-writing played in the lives of educated early modern and eighteenth-century women, see Dena Goodman, Becoming a Woman in the Age of Letters (Ithaca & London: Cornell University Press, 2009).

162 J. T. Desaguliers was the ‘indefatigable popularizer of Newton’. He presented lectures from 1712 to 1717 in a private academy in Little Tower Street, publishing Physico-Mechanical Lectures in 1717. Desaguliers noted in this work that “the following papers being only minutes of my lectures for the use of such gentlemen as have been my auditors, were printed at their desire; to save the trouble of writing them over for every person.” See G. S. Rousseau, ‘Science Books and their Readers in the Eighteenth Century’ in Books and their Readers, ed., Rivers, p. 208. It is also worth noting that Hawksmoor was acquainted with Desaguliers. See Vaughan Hart, Nicholas Hawksmoor, p. 99. Vanbrugh also bought Desaguliers’s printed works for his library (Downes, Vanbrugh, p. 215).

163 CH J8/1/274, Irwin to Carlisle, 19 December [1737], Kew, p. 1r. Carlisle’s library contained a selection of geographical texts which Irwin likely encountered when she stayed with her father. Two specifically concerned astronomy. ‘Leyburn’s Introduction to Astronomy’ was at one point shelved close to Joseph Moxon’s Tutor to astronomy and geography: An easy and speedy way to know the use of both the globes (London, 1698). (Leyburn: CH 1698 BC 15; and Moxon: CH 1698 BC 04 and CH 1715/16 HC 04.)

164 CH J8/1/274, Irwin to Carlisle, 19 December [1737], Kew, p. 1r.
constraints of London life. Her frustration at not being able to fully participate in the intellectual discussions at Court due to the prevailing social codes emerged soon after her appointment:

I find myself so great a Coward in London that I never venture to show the few qualifications I have: I talk upon subjects att Castle Howard I never presume to mention from thence[,] for indeed I meet with few people here who would not rather dispise than approve me if I talk’d upon books or any subject relative to them.  

This revealing statement locates Castle Howard as the antithesis of London and points towards the role that the house and Carlisle played in her intellectual development. She is grateful for the freedom of expression that she is granted at Castle Howard and, by extension, thankful to her father for his support. Indeed, this support is implicit in the very fact that she can express such feelings of frustration in letters to the Earl.

That letter-writing played such a role in Irwin’s life – linking her back to her family home – is of interest as it provides an image that contrasts with existing interpretations of women and epistolary culture. Scholars have emphasized how letter-writing was one of the few acceptable ways early modern and eighteenth-century women were able to break out from their cloistered lives in the private and domestic realm of the home. Whilst letter-writing was a form of escapism for Irwin, its liberating effects actually took her back into the private world of Castle Howard.

Unlike other family members, the exchange of letters between Irwin and Carlisle most clearly exceeded familial duty and obligation. In this case, letter-writing was not
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165 CH J8/1/257, Irwin to Carlisle, 1 April [1736], London, p. 1r.
166 This interpretation has been interlinked with the rise of the novel and, in particular, the epistolary novel in the first half of the eighteenth century. Reading this type of work, alongside letter-writing, was seen as a suitable pastime for women in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. See Patricia Meyer Spacks, *Boredom: The Literary History of a State of Mind* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1995), particularly Chapters Three and Four; Nancy Armstrong, *Desire and Domestic Fiction: A Political History of the Novel* (Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press, 1987).
167 Discussing the ‘liberating effects’ of letter-writing, Whyman has suggested that the act is ‘a psychological process which brings self-exploration and the means to relate oneself to society.’ Whyman, *Sociability and Power*, p. 10.
only a way to reach out to other social spheres and maintain connections that satisfactorily stimulated private interests. For both Carlisle and Irwin, letter-writing was a means to live beyond their restricted states, at Court and at Castle Howard.\textsuperscript{168}

Irwin’s gifting of poetry and other reading material to Carlisle fulfilled a sentiment that she herself expressed in a letter to Carlisle in 1729: “I wish I could in more material things show you how much I am Your Dutyfull & Obedient Daughter . . .”\textsuperscript{169} Irwin leaves us to guess what she meant by this comment: did she regret not being able to provide Carlisle with enough good quality reading material, or was she apologizing for not being at Castle Howard, regretting that the only way the pair could be in touch was through the exchange of letters? Either way, the statement implies Irwin’s unfulfilled obligation and desire to provide for her elderly father.

I would argue that the literary gifts that Irwin sent to Castle Howard were more often than not predicated by her own opinions about the suppression of women’s intellectual opportunities and, as we saw earlier, the declining quality of published literature. In light of her frustration at the social constraints women faced in polite society, it is possible to interpret Irwin’s desire to send Carlisle high-quality reading material as an act of proving and upholding her belief that women were equally as competent as men when it came to intellectual pursuits; they merely required adequate education. Such sentiments are expressed in her \textit{Epistle to Mr. Pope, Occasioned by his Characters of Women}:

\begin{center}
In education all the difference lies;
\end{center}

\textsuperscript{168} Drawing from Henry Lefebvre’s ‘production of space’ theory, the historian, J. How, has also interpreted letter-writing in this way. Examining the letters of Dorothy Osbourne and Sir George Etheridge, How shows that, despite living in the provinces, both Osbourne and Etheridge were well-connected to London through epistolary networks. How argues that both these figures were dissatisfied with the spaces that they inhabited and letter-writing was a means of escape. How, \textit{Epistolary Spaces}, p. 3.

\textsuperscript{169} CH J8/1/199, Irwin to Carlisle, 22 February [1729], London, p. 2v.
Women, if taught, would be as bold and wise
As haughty man, impr’ed by art and rules;
Where God makes one, neglect makes twenty fools.¹⁷⁰

(33-35)

For Irwin, however, the social principles of gift-giving were entwined with the early modern letter-writing conventions which required daughters to act passively towards their fathers. Though the pair communicated as equals on a semi-intellectual plane, there were moments when she slipped into the role of a submissive female correspondent. After telling a story about Lord Essex, the son of Carlisle’s brother-in-law, she admitted that “this account is too trifling for your Lordship to hear from any but a female hand”. Whilst implying that such news could only be transmitted by a female, Irwin had the wit and intelligence to counter such a sentiment with a defence of letter-writers:

as memoirs are sometimes as acceptable as a History, I put the letters of Men & Women upon that foot, & a memoirist may without a fault descend to such particulars as are much below the dignity of an Historian to relate[.]¹⁷¹

Irwin’s semi-conformity to traditional female behavioural codes adds a contradictory layer to her gift-giving: though she spent time choosing the material which would best reflect her intellectual ability, in her letters she nevertheless had to adopt the role of a daughter, pre-empting any possibility that what she sent to her father might be seen as impertinent. Consequently, despite her informed position as a member of London’s literary élite, Irwin regularly apologized to her father for the items that she sent. In 1729 she wrote:

I wish I dont tire your Lordship with the many large packets I send to Castle Howard, but when any thing new comes out in the Belle Lettre, I am willing to Communicate it . . . believing I am your only Correspondent in this style.¹⁷²

¹⁷⁰ Anne, Viscountess Irwin, Epistle to Mr Pope in Gentleman’s Magazine (December 1736), p. 745.
¹⁷¹ CH J8/1/165, Irwin to Carlisle, 1 February [1729], n.p., p. 1v.
Though she clearly wanted to help her elderly father fill his time at Castle Howard, Irwin did not want to appear to distract him from any important political or estate business, nor presume to impose her judgment on him. By dismissing the literary value of the material that she sent, Irwin rhetorically minimized the effort she made in choosing the items as well as the initial reasoning that motivated her to select them. Irwin’s letters were thus a balancing act in which she was torn between conforming to father-daughter epistolary conventions and expressing her intellectual curiosity.

2.8 Conclusion
Carlisle’s letters have been treated in this chapter as both sources of information and as material objects which signify Castle Howard’s position in correspondence networks. As a result of tracing the epistolary networks between Carlisle, his friends, acquaintances, family members, and employees, we have successfully added to our knowledge of his character as well as his living experiences at Castle Howard. We have also come to see how important these communication networks were in his life. Efficient and regular letter-writing enabled links to be maintained with a variety of social and cultural spheres, indicating that he was by no means disconnected from “the World”.

Comparable to the sets of correspondence examined by Whyman and Larminie, the epistolary networks which the Earl participated in – familial, courtly, estate-based – were entirely typical of the early eighteenth-century. Indeed, it was not the aim of the present chapter to show that Carlisle and Castle Howard were unique examples of early eighteenth-century epistolary correspondence. Rather, I intended to show that by exploring the communication networks in which country house residents participated we achieve a fresh perspective regarding the social and cultural position of these great houses and their residents in early modern and eighteenth-century society.
Chapter 3

The 3rd Earl of Carlisle and the News

I would therefore in a very particular Manner recommend these my Speculations to all well regulated Families, that set apart an Hour every Morning for Tea and Bread and Butter; and would earnestly advise them for their Good to order this Paper to be punctually served up, and to be looked upon as a Part of the Tea equipage.

The Spectator, No. 10, Monday, 12 March 1711.

3.1 Introduction

When the 3rd Earl of Carlisle was born in 1669, the only textual source of news, other than that provided by personal correspondence, was the intermittent newsbook or the exclusive newsletter. By the time that Castle Howard was built, Carlisle could receive a daily dose of news for little more than a penny. Like no other generation before him, the Earl was able to connect to London, Europe, and beyond via the news reports that he read. A panoply of news items emerged on the market at the turn of the eighteenth century. In the words of Ian Atherton, these new avenues of information exchange brought about 'a complex chain of choices,' something that is reflected in Carlisle’s news-buying habits. Completing this thesis’s investigation of the textual networks that linked Carlisle at Castle Howard to different cultural and social spheres, this third chapter

3 Ian Atherton, ‘The Itch Grown a Disease: Manuscript Transmission of News in the Seventeenth Century’, Prose Studies, 21 (1998), p. 43. Atherton further comments that ‘choices concerning reading the news were largely a matter of what one proposed to do with the news and how much discussion and reflection was intended.’
considers the arrival of news at Castle Howard at the turn of the eighteenth century. At different stages in his life, the 3rd Earl made use of newsletters, newsbooks, periodicals, pamphlets, and newspapers, as well as official publications of parliamentary proceedings. After testing out different formats he eventually settled on newspapers as his primary source of news.

The chapter will begin with a case study that demonstrates Carlisle’s interaction with one specific news story. We learn that he discussed the news in his correspondence, an occurrence which highlights the intertextuality between news and letter-writing. This section is followed by an overview of the different ways in which Carlisle acquired his news. After considering how newsbooks from earlier periods could play an important role as historical sources, the penultimate part of the chapter discusses Carlisle’s use of newsletters and periodicals, and his involvement in a ‘republic of letters’-style network.

In concluding, the chapter looks at how Carlisle’s social identity was reinforced in the national and provincial press, something that was particularly useful once he had become housebound at Castle Howard.

Residents of country houses had read the news long before the 3rd Earl. The accounts of Lord William Howard show that Carlisle’s ancestor frequently received a

---

4 In his study of the intellectual life of Sir Thomas Cotton (1594-1662), Jason Peacey has provided an example of this type of network of textual exchange in action and thereby offers a precedent for the present chapter. See Jason Peacey, ‘Sir Thomas Cotton’s Consumption of News in 1650s England’, The Library, 7th series, 7.1 (2006), pp. 3-24. Like Carlisle, Cotton chose to retire from political life in London, spending the remainder of his years in rural Bedfordshire. Countering those who portray Cotton as having lived an unremarkable life in the countryside, Peacey argues that though Cotton may have ‘absented himself from the nation’s political crucible, he was not in the least disinterested in its affairs. If he was “neutral”, then he was very far from disengaged’, p. 6. Highlighting the continuous stream of news items that was sent to Bedfordshire from his agent in London, Peacey shows that Cotton was fully engaged with the nation’s political events. Furthermore, Cotton’s well-informed rural existence supports the proposition that by the mid-seventeenth century the printed word was filtering efficiently and regularly into the provinces, p. 8.


6 For research on the transmission of information in England, see Adam Fox, Oral and Literate Culture in England, 1500-1700 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000), particularly Chapter Seven. Fox writes: ‘England in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries . . . was a society in which the three media of speech, script, and print infused and interacted with each other in a myriad of ways.’ He suggests that ‘the written word tended to augment the spoken, reinventing it and making it anew, propagating its contents, heightening its exposure, and ensuring its continued vitality, albeit sometimes in different forms’, p. 5.
newsbook, the *Mercurius Gallobelgicus*, at Naworth Castle throughout the 1620s. That Howard read such a publication in rural Cumbria suggests that country house residents were connected to a transnational network of printed news well before the news boom of the early eighteenth century. What marked the eighteenth century as different, however, was the speed and efficiency with which the news was transmitted. Drawing connections between Carlisle and the news that he read at Castle Howard, the following chapter highlights how the news can be used as an access point through which to better understand the social and cultural role of early-eighteenth century country houses.

3.2 “The very best specific which was ever found out in physic”: Reading the News at Castle Howard

In the winter of 1734, Carlisle read a newspaper article which prompted him to enquire in a letter to his son-in-law, Sir Thomas Robinson, about “the meaning of the Courant upon Mr Ward”. Robinson wrote back, “it has puzzled every mortal here to find it out, Sir Archer Croft is the supposed Author”. He added that, in reflection, the article in question was “too dull to have any pretentions to Wit & too silly to be serious”.

The pair were discussing an article from an issue of the *Daily Courant* dated 28 November bearing the headline ‘Some Conjectures on the true Reasons of Mr. Josh ___ a W ___ rd’s coming into England at this Time; with some Reflections on the Consequences that may attend it’. Discussing Dr Joshua Ward (1684/5–1761) and his

---

7 For Lord William Howard’s accounts, see Ormsby, ed., *Naworth*. Entries for the *Mercurius Gallobelgicus* are on pp. 143, 185, 221, 234, and 240. Several copies of this newsbook which once belonged to Howard can be found in the Special Collections department at Durham University. The *Mercurius Gallobelgicus* was first published in Cologne in 1594. Printed in Latin, it was semi-annual (until 1635) and primarily reported European military news. Its chief aim, according to Jason Scott-Warren, was the reportage of Continental ‘religious geopolitics’. See Scott-Warren, ‘News, Sociability, and Bookbuying’, p. 391. Also Joach Raymond, *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering in Early Modern Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), p. 129.

8 As far as I am aware, seventeenth- and eighteenth-century country houses have yet to be considered alongside the history of news culture.

9 CH J8/1/460, Robinson to Carlisle, 10 December 1734, London, p. 1r.

10 *Daily Courant* (London, England), Thursday, 28 November 1734, issue 5820. The *Daily Courant* was, by
legendary “Pill and Drop” medicine, this particular article was to prove surprisingly divisive, triggering a number of responses in other national newspapers. The following case study examines the way in which Carlisle encountered the unfolding news story of Ward, one of the eighteenth-century’s most infamous physicians.\textsuperscript{11} Tracing the Earl’s involvement in the dissemination and consumption of a story that captivated newspaper readers across England, we acquire an insight into how news flowed in and out of Castle Howard.\textsuperscript{12}

Purporting to cure a whole host of illnesses from colds to cancers, Ward’s pills and drops became a sensation throughout English polite society in the early 1730s. “It is not my Lord to be conceiv’d how much this Gentleman is the subject of conversation,” Robinson told his father-in-law, “go where you will his Pill & drop are talk’d off before you leave the Company”.\textsuperscript{13} Carlisle’s son-in-law would have taken a particular delight, one imagines, in such a response, for it was Robinson who introduced the pills to England.

Writing from Dunkirk in 1731 (at the end of his Continental tour with his wife, Lady Lechmere), Robinson informed Carlisle that,

\begin{quote}
I have brought with me some of Mr. Ward’s drops, which now make great noise in Paris; if any secret health was ever inestimable, this certainly is so; they are chymically prepared, and two years in the early 1730s, the main government mouthpiece of the Whig party. Primarily preoccupied with foreign news, it had a reputation for accuracy because of its connections with the Secretary of State’s office (Harris, \textit{London Newspapers}, p. 156). In 1704, about 800 copies were circulated a day. Henry L. Snyder, ‘The Circulation of Newspapers in the Reign of Queen Anne’, \textit{The Library}, 5\textsuperscript{th} series, 23.3 (1968), p. 210.


\textsuperscript{12} Robert Darnton, ‘An Early Information Society’, pp. 1-35. Darnton discusses the circulation of news in eighteenth-century Paris and the complex system of ‘media’ and ‘milieu’ that a single news story might travel through. Emphasizing how stories became amplified as they were transmitted, Darnton concludes that ‘the communication process . . . always involved discussion and sociability, so it was not simply a matter of messages transmitted down a line of diffusion to passive recipients but rather a process of assimilating and reworking information in groups – that is, the creation of collective consciousness or public opinion’ (p. 26).

\textsuperscript{13} CH J8/1/460, Robinson to Carlisle, 10 December 1734, London, p. 1r.
\end{quote}
making; among other distempers, wonderful cures have been wrought by them for the gout.[14]

Despite the questionable nature of their healing power, Robinson believed that Ward’s remedies would cure Carlisle’s gout. He tried, from the very start, to convince his father-in-law to take the medicine: “could I have told your Lordship some particulars of these drops by word of mouth,” Robinson wrote from Paris,

I am sure you would make no hesitation in trusting yourself to them. Mr. Ward has met with vast opposition here from the whole body of physicians, apothecaries, and surgeons, though he has cured these three last years about 2,000 people of all ranks and conditions, and there is no one instance of their ever having done harm.[15]

Robinson recognized, nevertheless, “how difficult it is to persuade any one to take a new remedy, the ingredients of it not being known”. [16] It is not known exactly how, but at some stage, Ward’s medicine did in the end come into Carlisle’s possession, for in the autumn of 1734 Robinson wrote to the Earl:

I hope your Lordship bore your western expedition well, and has had no occasion to take Mr. Ward’s drop nor any other remedy since your return; if you have, I shall be very glad to hear it has done you good; he has great success here of late, and gets a great deal of money; 10 guineas a day, as he tells me[.][17]

Whilst Ward received royal patronage and had advocates including Henry Fielding, Horace Walpole, and Edward Gibbon, some remained sceptical of his medicine’s healing properties. William Hogarth satirized Ward in his engraving The


[16] ibid. It is thought that some of his pills contained mercury and arsenic.

Company of Undertakers (1736) and he became a figure of contempt in Alexander Pope’s poetry.\(^\text{18}\) Though Robinson was aware of this mounting criticism, he remained a supporter of both Ward and his medicine:

I wish [its popularity] holds, and that the method he has taken of giving it to all ages and sexes and to all distempers incident to human nature, does not in the end bring a bad character upon a remedy which I believe in my conscience, if discreetly managed, for some particular ails and constitutions is the very best specific which was ever found out in physic.\(^\text{19}\)

The Courant article that had prompted Carlisle to write to his son-in-law in the winter of 1734 did little to help Robinson’s case, stirring the nation’s interest in the physician and his medication. Whilst Robinson highlighted that the article “in the main . . . speaks well of the Remedy”, he informed Carlisle that its author had nonetheless “given the alarm to some timourous Dissenters & good Churchmen who really think Ward to be a forerunner of greater attempts to subvert the Protestant Religion & introduce Popery”.\(^\text{20}\) Emphasizing Ward’s recent conversion to Roman Catholicism and the fact that he had developed his medicine under the guidance of a Romish Priest in France, the article engendered fears that Ward not only held Jacobite sympathies but used his medicine to convert his vulnerable Protestant patients.

In an attempt to dispel Carlisle’s doubts about Ward’s agenda, Robinson sent to Castle Howard a selection of views concerning the benefits and drawbacks of the pills and drops.\(^\text{21}\) As well as a letter written by the Lord Chief Baron, Sir James Reynolds, who attested to the positive effect of the pills, Robinson enclosed an article from the Grub Street

\(^{18}\) Pope referred to Ward in *Imitations of Horace* (1733-38) as well as in *Epistle to Dr Arbuthnot* (1735). For further research on Ward and his appearance in literary works, see Marjorie H. Nicolson, “Ward’s "Pill and Drop" and Men of Letters’, *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 29.2 (1968), pp. 177-96.

\(^{19}\) Robinson to Carlisle, 10 October 1734, Albermarle Street, London, HMC, *Carlisle*, p. 139.

\(^{20}\) CH J8/1/460, Robinson to Carlisle, 10 December 1734, London, p. 1r.

\(^{21}\) ibid. Robinson noted in his letter that “I should not have dwelt so long upon this subject had not your Lordship intentions of taking it”, p. 1v.
This article, which Reynolds’s letter occasioned, “was writ by one Clopton a Quaker apothecary in Holborn, who joyntly with others have made it their entire business to find out any pretence of its hurting those who have taken it.” Issued on the same day as the article in the Daily Courant, Clopton (who used the pseudonym Misquackus) recounted a number of cases where Ward’s medicines had brought about undesired results, including paralysis and death. As well as these documents, Robinson noted that he had sent in the previous post “a Pamphlet . . . of some humour, writ by a young Physitian on this subject”. Robinsons’ description appears to fit a publication written by a Dr Joseph Clutton, entitled A true and candid relation of the good and bad effects of Joshua Ward’s pill and drop (London, 1736). Published two years after Robinson’s letter, it was perhaps an earlier edition of this work or, possibly, a manuscript version that Carlisle received at Castle Howard.

Ward remained a topic of conversation in Robinson’s correspondence with Carlisle for a number of weeks. Writing on the 23 December 1734, Robinson confirmed the identity of the author of the Courant article. He informed Carlisle that one “Lord Gage by threatening the Printer has found out the author who is Sir Archer Croft”. Croft had fuelled concern about the spread of popery by reporting that a Catholic lady of quality had helped Ward distribute his medicine to the poor. Gage’s reaction appears to have confirmed suspicions that it was his wife who had been assisting the doctor.

---

22 Neither of the documents that Robinson sent with his letter are extant in the Castle Howard archives.
23 CH J8/1/460, Robinson to Carlisle, 10 December 1734, London, p. 1r.
28 It was probably Thomas Gage, 1st Viscount Gage and his wife, Benedicta Maria Theresa Hall, who were caught up in this incident.
Aware that Carlisle might not have been able to keep track of subsequent articles and editorials regarding Ward, Robinson updated his father-in-law in the same letter with news that “the Craftsman of 14th instant supposed to be writ by Mr Poultnye was a very good Burlesque on it.” In his article, Daniel Poultnye (a Whig politician who financially supported the *Craftsman* and occasionally wrote articles for the paper) called for calm and sound reasoning. After questioning whether a quack could really mastermind a second Popish Plot, Poultnye proposed that the main concern should be whether the pills actually worked or not. Keen to provide Carlisle with as much information as possible, Robinson provided details of “Sir Archers answer to it in the Courant of the 19th.” Croft’s response did not go down well with the public. Indeed, Robinson wrote that it “has made all Parties unite in this particular, that there never was so unintelligible & ridiculous a Political Writer, who has shot very wide from the mark upon this occasion.”

As a result of Clopton’s article, Ward took *The Grub Street Journal* to court but was unsuccessful in winning his case. According to T. A. B. Corley, Ward’s ‘scant medical knowledge was revealed and his case was thrown out, the defendants gleefully commemorating their victory in prose and doggerel.’ Though the physician carried on his controversial career until his death in the 1760s, Ward does not appear in any further correspondence between Carlisle and Robinson.

This brief examination of the how England’s news-reading public and, more specifically, Carlisle, followed the story of Ward’s pills and drops has highlighted the different textual avenues through which news could be encountered in the first half of the eighteenth century. He learnt about Ward via newspaper articles, but also from

---

31 Robinson was referring to an article in the *Daily Courant* (London, England), Thursday, 19 December 1734, issue 5838. CH J8/1/462, Robinson to Carlisle, 23 December 1734, London, p. 2v.
32 ibid.
33 Corley, ‘Ward, Joshua (1684/5–1761)’, *ODNB*.
Robinson’s letters, in which a variety of supplementary texts were included. In order to remain engaged, those who lived at a distance from London were required to gather information from diverse sources in order to piece together the full picture of what was happening. In this particular instance, Robinson’s letters supplemented the newspaper reports that Carlisle read, providing the Earl access to different views of Ward’s remedies.

As this case study illustrates, the circulation of news cannot be considered without considering the interplay between manuscript and print channels of communication. One of Carlisle’s agents highlighted the intertextuality that occurred between print and manuscript versions of the news in a letter to the Earl regarding a disagreement between Poulney and one Mr. Young. Assuming that his master had read about the dispute in the newspapers, Carlisle’s agent wrote from London with the latest details of the story:

Your Lordship sees there is a considerable paper war carried on in the newspapers by the Friends of two great men. It is reported that my Lord Herbert carried a message from Mr. Poulteney to Sir William Young to know if he writ a copy of verses which is handed about, and to acquaint him if he did, that Mr. Poulteney demanded satisfaction of him. But Sir William denied that he was the Author.34

Like never before, the Earl was able to follow how such a news story unraveled by receiving frequent and regular dispatches of news, both printed and handwritten. The subsequent discussion of current affairs with correspondents reinforced this connection with the news. This sequence of textual exchange helped link the Capital to the provinces, Castle Howard to the wider world.

Daniel Woolf has proposed that the ever-increasing arrival of news into the early modern home contributed to the internalization of the news, ‘making it something to be perceived quietly by the reader, in isolation from others, rather than part of ordinary

34 CH J8/34/182, Idle to Carlisle, 20 January [1736/7], n.p., p. 1r.
conversation.”\footnote{Daniel Woolf, ‘News, History and the Construction of the Present in Early Modern England’ in The Politics of Information, eds, Dooley & Baron, p. 91.} The two examples provided above, however, concerning Ward’s “Pill and Drop” and the Poultney/Young dispute, show that news-reading at Castle Howard often stimulated epistolary discussion between the Earl and his correspondents. They also challenge Joad Raymond’s suggestion that once a news story was put in print, having potentially circulated in manuscript form for many months or years prior to publication, it reached an ‘apotheosis of a dynamic set of oral and manuscript exchanges.’\footnote{Raymond, Pamphlets and Pamphleteering, p. 123.} As we have seen, though, reading printed news was by no means the end of the sequence of information exchange. In the words of Ian Atherton, once an article had been read,

> there was the question of what to do with the information: how much to share, how much to preserve, and how to understand and interpret events. Much news was for sharing, but it was a mark of discernment to know how much to divulge to whom and in what form.\footnote{Atherton, ‘The Itch Grown a Disease’, pp. 43-44.}

Indeed, an inherent characteristic of news is its very need to be conveyed. Once it stops being transmitted, it stops being news.

### 3.3 Receiving the News at Castle Howard

In the late seventeenth and early eighteenth century, news was circulated around the country via an ‘interlocking system’ of official and informal distribution networks.\footnote{Discussing the characteristics of the distribution of London newspapers in the provinces, Harris has written of an ‘interlocking system of newsmen and agents’. Michael Harris, London Newspapers in the Age of Walpole: A Study of the Origins of the Modern English Press (London: Associated University Presses, 1987), p. 40.} Francis Howgrave, an eighteenth-century publisher from Stamford, marvelled at how many people were involved in making and distributing a single edition of his newspaper:

> ‘In short, when I trace in my Mind a Bundle of Rags, to a Quire of these Mercuries, I find so many Hands employ’d in every Step they take thro’ their whole Progress, that while I
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am compiling a Mercury, I fancy my self providing Bread for a Multitude.”

The distribution networks which enabled country house residents to receive the news comprised hundreds of named and unnamed tradesmen who, along with friends and family members, linked England’s great houses to different social and cultural spheres. The following section illustrates the different ways in which news was delivered to Carlisle at Castle Howard.

Reading the news on a regular basis was not only a way for the Earl to remain engaged with topical debate, it was also part of a larger effort by him to be seen as informed and well-connected. Having up-to-date information meant he could maintain a standing as a leading figure in society, both as a young man in London and later in life when he moved to Yorkshire. Being conversant in current affairs was a *sine qua non* for any aspiring public figure, whether at Court, in Parliament, or in regional affairs. In the provinces, for example, the Earl’s ability to demonstrate to the local communities over which he presided a connection with the Capital helped him retain a seat of influence in northern England. It is not surprising to find, therefore, that with the commencement of his professional career in government Carlisle began having printed news delivered to him on a regular basis.

The earliest record of Carlisle purchasing the news occurred on Wednesday 23 November 1695, when 1s. was paid for a number of newsbooks. A week later, on the 30 November, 2s. 5d. was paid for three letters and more newsbooks. Unfortunately the titles of these publications were never recorded. Carlisle’s news-reading pattern mirrors the parliamentary year, for he soon began to receive news fairly systematically throughout

---


40 The peripatetic lifestyle which his new career entailed sometimes caused delivery problems. In the spring of 1699, for example, payment was made “for new’s att London when his Lordshipp was att Norward”. CH H1/1/3, 27 March 1699.

41 CH H1/1/2, 23 November 1695.

42 CH H1/1/2, 30 November 1695.
the year, apart from, that is, the late summer and early autumn months. In the years
between 1697 and 1700, for example, no news was purchased in the months of July and
August and regular payments do not resume until October or November. As political
activity came to a standstill during Parliament’s summer recess, with little to report,
newspapers filled their pages with essays, verse, and advertisements. That Carlisle did not
purchase the news in these periods suggests that he chiefly read it for political updates
rather than light entertainment.

Though it is not known from whom the Earl first bought his news items, by the
end of the decade, when he was living in London, Carlisle was paying a Mr. Gostling for
newspapers: on 2 February 1699 the sum of £3 2s. 5d. was paid to Gostling “for Letters
and gazettes”\(^43\). Gostling was a member of the Stationer’s Company, active in London
between 1699 and 1741, however no other evidence exists which might clarify or confirm
his business with Carlisle.\(^44\) Considering that the fee for most news items was little more
than a shilling at the turn of the eighteenth century and that the cost of postage was
similarly inexpensive, the bundle of documents provided by Gostling in this particular
instance must have been substantial. In 1706 an even larger payment of £6 1s. was given to
one Mr Bowyer for “newes”.\(^45\) The Bowyers were one of the most successful and learned
printing dynasties in London during the first half of the eighteenth century. It is not
surprising to find, therefore, that an up-and-coming wealthy figure like Carlisle
patronized their business.\(^46\)

\(^{43}\) CH H1/1/3, 2 February 1699.
\(^{44}\) Carlisle does not appear in Gostling’s business ledgers dating from 1730 to 1740. ‘Gentleman’s Ledger B’, Bod, MS. Eng. Misc. c. 296.
\(^{45}\) CH H1/1/5, 4 July 1706. The account entry is likely to refer to William Bowyer the elder (1663–1737) who was head of the printing business at this time. See Keith Maslen, ‘Bowyer, William (1663–1737)’, ODNB, [http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.york.ac.uk/view/article/3092, accessed 30 May 2012].
Whilst the Earl’s relocation from London to Yorkshire in the first decade of the eighteenth century did not disrupt his consumption of news, it seems to have affected how he received it. During the 1690s and early 1700s, entries for news were recorded in his accounts at a rate of about once a week. In these years, news publications were often entered with other household goods and, in particular, with different types of reading material including letters, books, playbooks, and trials. This occurrence indicates that Carlisle did not make use of the delivery services which newsagents and printing houses were beginning to offer their customers at the end of the seventeenth century. In more rural areas, where these news distribution networks were yet to be established, postal workers were often called upon to deliver newspapers along with the post, sometimes dropping off such items at designated collection points along their distribution routes. In those parts of the country where postal networks did not reach, however, such as rural Cumbria, commercial or private carriers would have to be employed to courier both postal and news items. Indeed, when Carlisle was at Naworth Castle, he relied upon a carrier named Henry Bell to deliver his news.

Bell was charged with transporting news publications, along with other household goods, to the Earl at Naworth from mid-1696 to the winter of 1704. He would have presumably met up with the Newcastle-Carlisle coach which conveyed all manner of items, including Carlisle’s news, across the Pennines. In 1696, for example, 4s. was paid

47 See, for example, CH H1/1/3, 19 February 1700: “payd for bookes, news and letters” and CH H1/1/3, 26 March 1700: “payd for Letters, wth Letters, new’s and play books”.


49 Bell often sent Carlisle bills for his services pointing towards a formal arrangement between the pair. See, for example, CH H1/1/4, 29 September 1703: “To Henry Bell for newes & Lettres as by bill & acquisition” (14s. 11d.); CH H1/1/4, 11 December 1703: “paid Henry Bells bill for newes & Lettres from Michelmas to that time” (L1 1s. 2d.); and CH H1/1/4, 5 February 1704: “Henry Bell Bill for newes and Lettres for 3 weeks per Bill” (15s. 5d.). To make it worth his while, Bell likely transported goods for numerous customers, including Carlisle, along his delivery route.

50 Harris, London Newspapers, p. 42. In Newcastle, this western arm of the coach network connected to the south-north coach line which transported people and goods between London and the north of England.
to “Henry Bell for Newes, Letters, parcells, from the Coach, carriage of hampers, & Cords and Mullet leaves for my Lady.” A similar entry from the following month confirms the local carrier’s duties: “payd Henry Bell for parcells by the Coach 2 portmantues & . . . newes Letters”. One of Carlisle’s agents had likely placed these goods on the coach, either in Newcastle or perhaps in London, where the majority of news publications were produced during this period.

That no other figure replaced Bell when he stopped delivering news in 1704 is, I propose, a sign of Carlisle’s permanent relocation to Castle Howard. At the same time that Bell stopped delivering news to Naworth, in the winter of 1704, disbursements for Carlisle’s news shifted from a weekly to a monthly schedule, suggesting he had set up a subscription with a newsagent or printing house. That he no longer needed to employ a private carrier indicates Carlisle’s move to Yorkshire where he was able to take advantage of the delivery services offered by news traders in and around York. As the publishing capital of the north, York was certain to have newsagents who offered customers the chance to subscribe to newspaper delivery. Booksellers often took on this role and, as we saw in Chapter One, York had plenty of those at the turn of the eighteenth century. The York bookseller, Thomas Hammond, printed and sold the York Mercury from 1719,

51 CH H1/1/2, 25 September 1696.
52 CH H1/1/2, 22 October 1696.
53 By partly making use of this timetabled coach network rather than a long-distance carrier, the 3rd Earl was saving money. Michael Harris has suggested that the charge of ½d. for sending a newspaper by coach to the provinces in the 1790s was probably used in earlier periods. See Harris, London Newspapers, p. 42.
54 Undated letters written by Carlisle to one of his agents during the first decade of the eighteenth century record his move from London to the country. See CH J8/33/1-52. Until now, no exact date has been suggested for his relocation. Bell delivered goods to Carlisle throughout much of 1703 and 1704 (as opposed to just the summer months), indicating that the Earl was resident at Naworth during the greater part of these years. (Bell appears in the accounts in 1703 on 20 May, 2 June, 29 September, 11 December, 29 December, 5 February, and in 1704 on 19 February, 27 March, 12 June, 7 August, and 2 December. His first appearance in the accounts indicates that Carlisle left London in the late spring of 1703. CH 1/1/4.) Considering that this was the period in which both his marriage and career were stalling, and construction work at Castle Howard was still ongoing, it is easy to see why Carlisle chose to spend time at Naworth.
55 On 1 December 1704, 8s. 5d. was paid for “Newes for a month”. CH H1/1/5.
for example; for example; and from the mid-1720s, Mr Mennel, the bookseller in Malton, sold both the *York Mercury* and the *York Courant*. By setting up a subscription, the Earl would receive his news via a cheaper and more regular payment and delivery system. Connection to these networks of news distribution did not fully eradicate delivery problems however. Although both the printing and supply of news became more standardized in the first half of the eighteenth century, availability and timely delivery was not always guaranteed. Even if your newsman was trusted and experienced, poor roads, particularly in the winter time, often meant delayed deliveries. Fluctuations in the amount that Carlisle paid per month suggest that instead of having a standing order for a pre-selected set of material, payment was made after the news was received. News for December 1705 cost 8s. 5d. but the following January only 7s. 1d. was entered into the accounts. The next month the price had gone back up, to 8s. These variations suggest that what arrived at Castle Howard varied every month.

Commercial networks of news distribution were often supplemented by private networks of delivery. ‘Occasionally one finds in provincial newspapers’, Ferdinand has observed, ‘the promise of a halfpenny allowance to the neighbour who arranged to collect the newspaper at an agreed location for those out-of-reach gentlemen.’ Indeed, in 1707, Carlisle’s groom of the chamber, John Malcott, was paid 4s. 10d. for fetching his master’s news. As the previous section revealed, those of Carlisle’s correspondents based in

---

58 ibid, p. 511 & p. 513. Tradesmen like Mennel would receive a regular supply of news publications from London as well as from other provincial cities, which they then distributed across the region to subscribers.
59 ibid, p. 123. In April 1706, for example, 5s. was paid for five weeks of news (CH H1/1/5, 29 April 1706), whilst later that autumn two months’ worth of news was paid in one instalment (CH H1/1/5, 16 September 1706).
60 CH H1/1/5, 29 January 1706.
61 CH H1/1/5, 23 February 1706. For further variations in price, see CH H1/1/5, 23 March 1706: “Newes for a month” (8s. 3d.) and CH H1/1/5, 27 May 1706: “Newes per month” (5s.).
62 Ferdinand, ‘Local Distribution Networks’ in *Spreading the Word*, eds, Myers & Harris, p. 146.
63 CH H1/1/5, 2 May 1707. John Malcott is named in Carlisle’s will. CH J8/14/1, pp. 1r–1v.
London were involved in sending him news items. Indeed, some early newspapers even retained space for those who sent papers to add their own personal words of greeting.\textsuperscript{64} This tendency to share news publications meant that a single news item was, at the turn of the century, likely to be encountered by a large audience. In the second decade of the eighteenth century, for example, just one issue of the \textit{Spectator} was expected to pass under the eyes of about twenty separate readers, and, in the 1730s, according to contemporary claims, the \textit{Craftsman} was read “by no less than four hundred thousand of the good people of Great Britain, allowing no more than 40 Readers to a Paper.”\textsuperscript{65}

Appreciating the importance of news-reading, Carlisle’s friends displayed concern that he might not be able to access certain publications whilst living at Castle Howard. In 1733, for example, Horatio Walpole wrote to the Earl: “I suppose your Lordship has some correspondent in town who sends you of course all that are printed; If not, you will be so kind as to lay your commands”.\textsuperscript{66} The younger brother of Robert Walpole, Horatio Walpole was an English diplomat with connections across Europe. That he offered his services to provide Carlisle with news highlights the widespread news networks that the Earl could tap into if he so desired. Perhaps aware that the elderly Earl was reliant upon others to update him with news of recent publications, Walpole informed Carlisle that “there are some other pamphlets lately published, particularly one, entitled the Rise & Fall of the Excise &c: is much esteemed . . . & one upon the game of Chess, in answer to a Craftsman on that subject’.\textsuperscript{67} Such reliance on others served, in the words of Jason Scott-Warren, ‘to strengthen the ties of friendship . . . since it implied shared tastes and mutual

\textsuperscript{64} Atherton, ‘The Itch Grown a Disease’, p. 40.
\textsuperscript{65} Harris, \textit{London Newspapers}, p. 48.
\textsuperscript{66} CH J8/1/854, H. Walpole to Carlisle, 9 October 1733, Cockpit, p. 1v.
\textsuperscript{67} ibid, pp. 1r-1v. Walpole was referring to Robert Walpole and Matthew Concannen’s \textit{The rise and fall of the late projected excise, impartially consider’d} (London, 1733) and John Hervey’s \textit{A letter to The Craftsman, on the game of chess. Occasioned by his paper of the fifteenth of this month} (London, 1733).
trust.\textsuperscript{68} With concerned friends like Walpole, there were doubtlessly many other unrecorded personal exchanges of news that took place, all with the intention of keeping Carlisle connected to wider cultural spheres.

Along with Robinson, the Earl’s family played an important role in this regard, sending different types of topical publications northwards. In some instances, these pamphlets were bought specifically for Carlisle from stationers or booksellers in London. At other times, his children and their spouses simply sent on to Castle Howard material which had been passed on to them via their own social circles in London. Carlisle’s middle daughter, Viscountess Irwin, always hoped to maintain a certain quality of publication in regards to the material that she sent her father. Believing that the hack-writing of Grub Street was below standard, Irwin wrote to her father:

\begin{quote}
I should be glad could I send your Lordship any thing new or entertaining to make my Letters acceptable, but wit is att a Low ebb or else kept in bank till the parliament meets: I have sent to the pamphlet shop two or three times, where I can find nothing but Grub Street[.]
\end{quote}

Indicating that she was a regular customer of London’s pamphlet shops, the passage reveals the constraints Irwin faced when obtaining printed news for her father. High-quality reporting was reliant upon the sitting of Parliament and when the political season was over Irwin faced the task of picking something she thought might amuse Carlisle from whatever second-rate writing was in stock.\textsuperscript{70} The act of choosing, sending, and discussing the news ultimately reinforced familial bonds between Carlisle in Yorkshire and his

\begin{footnotes}
\textsuperscript{68} Scott Warren, ‘News, Sociability, and Bookbuying’, p. 395.
\textsuperscript{69} CH J8/1/234, Irwin to Carlisle, 22 December [1730], London, p. 2r. For a literary historian’s take on Grub Street, see Pat Rogers, Grub Street: Studies in Subculture (London: Methuen & Co Ltd, 1972).
\textsuperscript{70} When Parliament was in session, pamphlets could be purchased from stalls which appeared along the outside walls of Westminster Hall. Michael Harris, ‘The Book Trade in Public Spaces: London Street Booksellers, 1690-1850’ in Fairs, Markets and the Itinerant Book Trade, eds, Robin Myers, Michael Harris, & Giles Mandelbrote (London & New Castle, DE: British Library & Oak Knoll Press, 2007), p. 189. Pamphlet shops were also located in the early eighteenth century around the Royal Exchange, Temple Bar, and Charing Cross. Harris, London Newspapers, p. 38.
\end{footnotes}
London-based family. Receiving material that had been selected by those who knew him best provided Carlisle with a more personal source of news. As pamphlets were slightly bigger than the average-sized letter, they were often sent to Carlisle as parcels with the correspondence tucked inside the wrapping.\(^{71}\)

In the spring of 1736, Carlisle’s eldest son, Viscount Morpeth, sent his father a pamphlet concerning the Quaker Tithe Bill.\(^ {72}\) Opening his accompanying letter with the line “my Brother told me you desired to know my thoughts in relation to the Quakers Bill”, Morpeth went on to inform his father that he thought the bill a positive step.\(^ {73}\) He continued:

I am told that tho’ the Court had promised and engaged to the Quakers that this bill should pass[,] yet since the Bishops have sounded the trumpet so loudly all over the Kingdom they have changed their resolution and the bill is not to pass, whither this is true or no next week will shew. I send you a paper that is writ by the Bishop of Salisbury, and is reckon’d the best for the Clergy.\(^ {74}\)

Introduced to Parliament by the Whig Ministry in 1736, the Quaker Tithe Bill sought to reprieve those Quakers who had been punished for refusing to pay church tithes.\(^ {75}\) In response, a huge oppositional movement arose, particularly amongst the bishops and parochial clergy. Many anti-Quaker pamphlets were written, including the one sent by Morpeth to his father: *The country parson’s plea against the Quakers bill for tythes ([London, 1736])* by Thomas Sherlock, Bishop of Salisbury.\(^ {76}\) Despite such opposition, the bill was

---

\(^{71}\) This explains why most of the letters that accompanied the pamphlets do not have addresses or wax seals on them.

\(^{72}\) CH J8/1/514, Morpeth to Carlisle, 3 April [1735/6?], Althrop. The pamphlet does not survive in the archives.

\(^{73}\) ibid, p. 1r.

\(^{74}\) ibid, pp. 1r-1v.


\(^{76}\) This essay appears to have been released both individually and as part of a collection of tracts. See *Papers relating to the Quakers tythe bill*: viz. I. Extracts from the yearly epistles of meeting of Quakers . . . II. Remarks upon a bill now depending in Parliament, to enlarge, amend, and render more effectual the laws now in being for the more easy recovery of tythes . . . III. The country parson’s plea against the Quakers tythe bill: humbly addressed to the Commons of Great-Britain assembled in Parliament. IV. The case of the people called Quakers (London, [1736]).
passed by the Commons. Due to the presence of the bishops in the Upper House, however, it was eventually defeated in the Lords.

The new legislation that the bill called for aligned with the Earl’s tolerant and liberal-minded stance, a stance evident, for example, during his meeting in 1718 with the Quaker, Thomas Story.77 At one stage the conversation had turned to the government’s proposal that a new oath be taken by Dissenters regarding the payment of tithes, to which Carlisle acknowledged to Story: ‘I know your People are not generally satisfied with the Affirmation; because I have been often applied to for Relief of such as have suffered that Way, and have always done what I could to relieve them, and have helped many.’78 Indeed, two days after the Lords’ vote, Colonel Howard wrote to his father: “I imagine your Lordship would be surprised at the fate the Quakers Bill met with in the House of Lords.”79 Considering his interest in these affairs, it is surprising to find that Carlisle failed to cast his vote in the Lords.80

In his letter, Morpeth had pointed out why some, including his father, might oppose a change to the legislation: “I do not see that the Clergy are only concerned in this for all those who have the great tythes, (and I believe you have a considerable share in Cumberland) are just in the same situation with the Parsons.”81 As a landholder of a region favoured by the Quakers, Carlisle was likely to lose a considerable amount of income if the bill was passed. Such sentiments were expressed in Salisbury’s pamphlet which

77 ‘The aims of the Quakers Tithe Bill were informed by the principle of relief from persecution, which allowed Whigs to reassert the doctrine of toleration, and was an opportunity for some to indulge in anti-clerical invectives.’ Taylor, ‘Sir Robert Walpole, The Church of England, and the Quakers Tithe Bill’, p. 60.
78 Story, A journal of the life of Thomas Story, p. 619. Indeed, a letter to Carlisle from one of his agents records such a request: “I have written to John Horne the Quaker at Pearith [Penrith] about that monyes your Honour paid for his son[,] for mr Crofts tells me that thee has not paid it yet to your honour.” CH J8/28/31, Maxwell to Carlisle, 29 July 1696, Noward, p. 1r.
79 CH J8/1/97, Howard to Carlisle, 15 May [1736], n.p., p. 1r.
80 The motion to commit the bill was defeated by fifty-four against thirty-five. See volume IX in Gobsett’s Parliamentary History of England, 1066-1803 (London: T. C. Hansard, 1806-20), pp. 1179-219.
81 CH J8/1/514, Morpeth to Carlisle, 3 April [1736], Althrop, p. 1r.
Morpeth had sent his father a month before the vote. Drawing on recent debates regarding the rights of man, the pamphlet certainly spoke to the Earl’s social and financial position. The polemic opened with these declarations:

1. I have a Right to receive in kind, and to my own Use, the due and accustomed Tythes arising in my Parish.

2. I have a Right to lett them to the Occupier of the Land, or to any other Person, at such Price as I can agree for; and no Man has a Right to hinder me taking my Tythes in Kind, or to set a Value on them, if I think fit to lett them.\footnote{Papers relating to the Quakers tythe bill (London, [1736]), p. 16. Eighteenth Century Collections Online. Gale. University of York. 25 May 2012. <http://find.galegroup.com.ezproxy.york.ac.uk/ecco/infomark.do?&source=gale&prodId=ECCO&userGroupName=uniyork&tabID=T001&docId=CW3321091684&type=multipage&contentSet=ECCOArticles&version=1.0&docLevel=FASCIMILE>.

If these words did not strike a chord for Carlisle, then a subsequent statement might well have resonated. If the law was passed, Salisbury wrote, Quakers would retain the tythes for their own use and men like Carlisle would be ‘debarred having them in Kind, how necessary forever they may be to my own and my Family’s Subsistence.’\footnote{Ibid.}

Writing about the relationship between the self and the state, A. Mousley has suggested that news in the early modern period should be considered ‘less as a “system” of information abstracted from the lives of individuals, than as a practice of pressing upon individuals . . . questions of their allegiance and location, within the changing social relations of the period.’\footnote{A. Mousley, ‘Self, State, and Seventeenth Century News’, Seventeenth Century, 6 (1991), p. 150. This proposition falls in line with recent thoughts about early modern pamphlets. According to Raymond, pamphlets became the ‘pre-eminent model of public speech’ and thus ‘the primary means of creating and influencing public opinion.’ ‘Notwithstanding their commercial and contestatory basis’, he continues,

they assisted in creating informed critical debate about news, politics and culture. Put another way, pamphlets became a foundation of the
influential moral and political communities that constitute a “public sphere” of popular political opinion.\textsuperscript{85}

Having read Salisbury’s pamphlet, it is possible that Carlisle became more conscious of the fact that, if the Bill was passed, this particular income strand would be lost. Conscious, perhaps, of the need to safeguard financial provision for future generations of the Howard family, the pamphlet that Morpeth sent to Castle Howard appears to have influenced Carlisle’s decision to vote.

Aware that Morpeth rarely engaged with his father over politics, his brother-in-law, Sir Thomas Robinson, included many political pamphlets in his letters to the Earl. It is my contention that Robinson set himself up as Carlisle’s personal supplier of parliamentary news in order to ingratiate himself with his father-in-law. After writing that he had “enclosed to your Lordship a little piece handed about here relative to the Yorkshire petition”, Robinson continued, “I shou’d be glad of an opportunity to send any thing else, I thought might be in any shape amusing to you”.\textsuperscript{86} Though on at least one occasion the Earl “writ for” a particular publication, for the most part Robinson appears to have sent pamphlets to Castle Howard opportunistically.\textsuperscript{87} In 1734, for example, Robinson wrote: “Pamphlets are soon expected from each Party, to be preparatory to the opening of the Sessions, when any come out well recom...”\textsuperscript{88} Robinson’s desire to fulfil his father-in-law’s desire for news is further identifiable in the following passage:

There has lately appear’d four or five very virulent Pamphlets against the Persons & actions of the Ministers, writ with great strength & in a

\textsuperscript{87} In February 1735, Robinson sent the Earl some poetry as well as “the Pamphlet you writ for”. CH J8/1/467, Robinson to Carlisle, 13 February 1735, London, p. 2v.
\textsuperscript{88} CH J8/1/462, Robinson to Carlisle, 23 December 1734, London, p. 2v.
Masterly stile, as your Lordship knowes my thinking on this head, I have not sent any of them to Castle Howard . . . I generally read all that is writ on both sides, & if your Lordship wou’d have me send you any of these anti ministerial papers I shall willingly obey your Commands[].

In this case, Robinson’s belief that he could judge his father-in-law’s political interests appears to have determined what material he sent north.

Robinson’s role as Carlisle’s supplier of political pamphlets is of interest because it offers evidence of how, once printed in London, such publications were disseminated throughout the country. Acting not just as an intermediary for Carlisle but for several people, Robinson regularly had multiple copies of a pamphlet which he would distribute to friends, family, and acquaintances. In October 1734, for example, Robinson informed Carlisle that,

I have taken the liberty to send your Lordship a pamphlet I think writ in a better stile & manner & more adapted for the present times than any thing that has been publish’d for many years, ‘tis upon a Subject I have often wondered was never attempted before, & if any thing cou’d have tempted me to write Political papers, it shou’d have been to have followed the plan of this incomparable & unknown author – I have had a very large parcell of them sent to me, & shall faithfully disperse them[].

Though Robinson never revealed where else he sent the pamphlets, it is clear that he took his role as a transmitter of political publications seriously. Giles Worsley has written that Robinson ‘engaged vigorously but unsuccessfully in politics’, failing in 1734 to be re-elected for a second time as MP for Morpeth. Writing in that same year, Lady Mary Howard informed Carlisle that her brother-in-law “would make one believe he has a prospect of comeing into parliament but I dare say he has no hopes”. The act of

---

92 CH J8/1/140, M. Howard to Carlisle, 5 February [1734], London, p. 2r.
dispersing such publications could be seen, therefore, as a way for Robinson to remain involved in politics but also to curry favour with people whom he believed might prove beneficial to his social and political advancement.\textsuperscript{93} As with the poetry and architectural prints that he sent north, the spoils from Robinson’s eager involvement in London’s political scene trickled into Castle Howard.

3.4 “Very true, and very punctuall”: The News as Historical Source

Household accounts record that the Earl bought newsbooks between 1695 and 1697, though it was never recorded which particular titles were purchased.\textsuperscript{94} Indeed, in the seventeenth century, the term “newsbook” could have encompassed any number of cheap, topical publications, for, bound in plain paper covers with loose stitching, they physically resembled many other early modern pamphlets.\textsuperscript{95} Michael Mendle has observed, ‘newsbooks were almost uniformly grey and sober, with dense text on the first page and little or no indication of interior content.’\textsuperscript{96} Deriving from the single-sheet corantos of the early seventeenth century, newsbooks were the first printed news publications to be read in England with any regularity.\textsuperscript{97} Costing 1-2d. per issue, the earliest newsbooks were

\begin{footnotesize}
\item[93] Ben-Amos has highlighted how ‘the transfer of resources was premised on the inequalities that existed between those who gave and those who received’ (Ben-Amos, The Cultures of Giving, p. 195).
\item[94] CH H/1/1/2, passim. Thereafter, only one was bought in 1698, two in 1699, and three in 1700. These entries are found in CH H/1/1/2, 15 January 1698 and CH H/1/1/3, 9 January 1699, 15 May 1699, 5 February 1700, 2 April 1700, and 30 September 1700.
\item[95] At a time when distinctions were still to be made between the format of different news items it is not surprising to find that the terminology was interchangeable. According to Peacey, in Sir Thomas Cotton’s accounts the term newsbooks denoted ‘anything from newspapers to parliamentary speeches, proclamations, and Acts of Parliament, as well as treatises on foreign affairs, domestic politics, and political thought’ (Peacey, ‘Sir Thomas Cotton’s Consumption of News’, p. 7). The link between newsbooks and literary periodicals was not, however, only physical. ‘The earliest remote ancestors of modern literary journals’, Walter Graham has written, ‘were the book notices of the seventeenth century, appearing as the first advertisements in newsbooks.’ Walter Graham, The Beginnings of English Literary Periodicals: A Study of Periodical Literature, 1665-1715 (New York: Oxford University Press, 1926), p. 1.
\item[96] Mendle notes that ‘the essence of the printed newsbook was its periodicity, not only achieved by a predictable, usually weekly, publication schedule but also by continuous signatures and pagination’, ibid, pp. 60-61. For more information about corantos, see Michael Frearson, ‘The Distribution and Readership of London Corantos in the 1620s’ in Serials and Their Readers, eds, Myers & Harris, pp. 1-25. The first newsbooks were published on Mondays, but ‘as competition developed they began to appear on different
published in northern Europe and had only a small readership in England amongst the wealthy and well-educated. In the 1640s, London publishers also began printing editions for the English market. Of particular interest is the discovery that, at the same time that Carlisle was purchasing late seventeenth-century newsbooks, he kept a number of these earlier news publications in his book collection. Their appearance in the Earl’s library catalogues challenges pre-existing conceptions regarding the types of texts which were housed in country house libraries (i.e., expensive or rare publications). Questioning why he might have kept hold of these texts, the following section considers how news publications can be both topical and historical sources of information.

A bound volume of four consecutive issues of *The Swedish Intelligencer* which date from 1632-34 survives today in the Castle Howard library. William Fenwick’s signature appears on the title page of the first issue confirming that it is this volume which was recorded in Carlisle’s 1698 library catalogue. Published in London from 1632 to 1639, the *Intelligencer* reported the King of Sweden’s military campaigns in central Europe during The Thirty Years’ War (1618-48). It is not clear whether Fenwick or the 3rd Earl collected and bound all the parts together but the very fact that they were bound at all suggests that these issues were once of importance to someone. Though we cannot ignore happenstance, as the volume was included in Carlisle’s library catalogue at a time when he was selectively incorporating the books that he had inherited into his collection there is every likelihood that he had a working relationship with these texts.

---

98 These publications, like their Continental prototypes, reported only foreign news.
99 All the issues in the bound volume were printed in London for Nathaniel Butter and Nicholas Bourne. The individual publication details suggest, however, that the items were not collected in sequence. Published in 1634, the title-page of the first part reads ‘Now the fourth time, Revised, Corrected, and augmented.’ The following issues were printed at earlier dates: the second part in 1632 and the third and fourth parts in 1633.
100 CH 1698 GC 17. Fenwick’s ownership mark indicates that at least the first issue in the volume was inherited by Carlisle from his kinsman.
Opening with the words ‘Judicious and favourable Reader’, the preface to the first issue concurrently flatters the reader whilst suggesting that prudence should be observed when reading the following news reports. Boasting of the multitude of sources from which news of the war’s progress was garnered, the preface highlights the way that news was often assembled and refracted in the early modern period.

Wee have beene made to understand much of these Actions, by discourse with another gallant Gentleman: & he also a great Commander in the army. Some printed High Dutch bookes wee have had. For some things we have had private writing, and from good hands too. In other things we have made use of Gallobelgicus[.]

Disclosing that the Intelligencer acquired its information via word of mouth, Dutch publications, private correspondence, and the Mercurius Gallobelgicus, the preface continues that ‘Very good use have we also made of the Weekly Currantoes: which if a man of judgment reads, he shall for the most part finde (especially those of latter times) very true, and very punctuall.’ Despite asserting confidence in the sources, the author again emphasizes the need for readers to be astute in judging the accuracy of the reports. Indeed, writing in the preface to the third issue, the author admitted that he had himself misjudged some sources, declaring that from now on, he would trust

. . .to no written Relations, unlesse received from a knowne hand, or confirmed by personall eye, or eare-witnesses. No, I have not singly relyed, so much as upon that diligent amasser of the Dutch Currantoes, the Gallobelgicus, and the Arma Suecia; le Soldat Sueois, I mean by it[.]
This *ad hoc* manner in which information about the war was gathered together highlights the question of trustworthiness which early modern readers faced when encountering the news.\(^{105}\) As the above passage shows, news provided by word of mouth or in a letter was seen as more reliable because the source was, in theory, more easily identifiable. Early modern readers were encouraged to approach printed news, often written by nameless journalists, critically.

For Carlisle, seventy years on, the information conveyed in the pages of *The Swedish Intelligencer* must have been a source of European history rather than a source of news. That is not to say, however, that the advice given in the prefaces to these four volumes was irrelevant to him. Despite the huge gap in time, Carlisle would have also needed to adopt a critical reading technique, perhaps even more so for he would have had the opportunity to compare and contrast the newsbook with other accounts of the war that had appeared in the intervening years. He had, for example, Samuel Pufendorf’s *The compleat history of Sweden, from its origin to this time* (London, 1702) which recounted in detail Gustavus Adolphus’s campaign on the Continent.\(^{106}\)

A second newsbook, entitled *The Diurnall Occurrences, or dayly proceedings of both houses, in this great and happy Parliament, from the third of November, 1640, to the third of November 1641* (London, printed for William Cooke, 1641), was also included in Carlisle’s book collection at Castle Howard.\(^{107}\) Printed a decade after the *Intelligencer*, this publication likewise remains in the library at Castle Howard today. An inscription on the front fly-leaf – “Ex libris Thomas Davies / 1657” – indicates that the work was likely acquired second-hand by Carlisle. The subject matter of this publication illustrates a

---

\(^{105}\) Brendon Dooley has suggested that the increased quantity of news publications in seventeenth-century England compelled readers to question the reliability of what they read. Brendon Dooley, ‘News and Doubt in Early Modern Culture: Or, are we having a Public Sphere yet?’ in *The Politics of Information*, eds, Dooley & Baron, p. 277. See also Atherton, ‘The Itch Grown a Disease’, pp. 45-47.

\(^{106}\) CH 1715/16 NG 01.

\(^{107}\) CH 1698 GC 15. Despite surviving today at the house, the newsbook does not appear in the 1715/16 catalogue.
change that took place in the mid-seventeenth century regarding the type of news which the English press reported. From the beginning of the 1640s, domestic concerns were increasingly favoured over foreign affairs, a shift sparked by the escalating conflict between Charles I and Parliament. In reaction to the turmoil which followed, a large number of newsbooks were produced in the years between 1641 and the Restoration of 1660.\textsuperscript{108} The Diurnall Occurrences was one of the first to be published from this group.\textsuperscript{109}

As the title suggests, this pioneering newsbook methodically recorded the day-to-day parliamentary activity of both Houses for the public to scrutinize. Unlike most of the other newsbooks from this period, it did not present a particularly partisan viewpoint. Interspersed with accounts of daily proceedings, one finds the speeches, letters, and articles of complaint that were presented to the two Houses of Parliament, as well as parliamentary orders, declarations, and ordinances which took place during the session. As the newsbook was released in its entirety after Parliament had dissolved, the 429-page publication acted more as a reference work rather than as a continual news stream. Bound with two other pamphlets from 1641, the volume as a whole records an important moment in English history.\textsuperscript{110}

Although we know little of how Carlisle read these old texts, Germaine Warkentin has shown how another aristocrat, Robert Sidney, 2\textsuperscript{nd} Earl of Leicester (1595-1677), entered references and quotations from newsletters and newsbooks (including the


\textsuperscript{109} Many of the newsbooks from this period bore titles that began with ‘Diurnall Occurrences’. For a full list of all these publications, see Carolyn Nelson & Matthew Seccombe, \textit{Periodical Publications, 1641-1700: A Survey with Illustrations} (London: Bibliographical Society, 1986), pp. 55-56.

\textsuperscript{110} The year 1641 saw the beginning of Charles I’s Long Parliament, as well as the Irish Rebellion and the passing of the Grand Remonstrance, all key events in the lead up to the King’s downfall. The two pamphlets are \textit{The heads of a conference delivered by Mr. Pynn. At a committee of both Houses, Junii 24. 1641} ([London], 1641), and \textit{A convocation speech, by Mr. Thomas Warmstry, one of the clerks for the diocese of Worcester: against images, altars, crosses, the new canons, and the oath, &c.} (London, 1641).
Diurnall) into his commonplace books. Though Leicester, unlike Carlisle, was drawing from current rather than outdated news items, his referencing of news alongside other texts that were traditionally included in commonplace books highlights a certain unprejudiced regard for different types of textual material. Carlisle’s inclusion of newsbooks in his library, then, could further illustrate how the boundaries between different types of reading material was often blurred in the early modern period. Having a publication which recorded the day-by-day happenings in Parliament during such a crucial period of the country’s history suggests that Carlisle recognized the use of this newsbook as a work of contemporary history rather than news. The Diurnall Occurences was a useful source that not only provided a blow-by-blow account of the unfolding crisis during the last decade of Charles I’s reign; for a politician active in the years following the Glorious Revolution, it could also guide his own decision-making.

Treated as history books rather than outdated ephemera, the presence of these two news publications in Carlisle’s library suggests that, in some cases, function took precedence over format. It is presumably for this reason that The Swedish Intelligencer and The Diurnall Occurrences were bound and not discarded like most news items. It cannot be ignored, however, that by the time that these two publications came into Carlisle’s possession they were rather old. They were, in fact, some of the oldest texts in his collection. Was it perhaps their age, then, which engendered Carlisle’s interest in them? Were these publications kept because they were important historical objects rather than historical sources?

Daniel Woolf has written that news ‘stands on the cusp between past and future’. With this statement in mind, it is worth considering at what point, for Carlisle,

---

news shifted from being a topical throwaway to an historical source worth keeping? Was this shift dependent on the usefulness of the text rather than its age? To reflect on when this shift might take place we must turn to other topical publications which Carlisle encountered.

In the postscript of a letter written in June 1733, Robinson promised his father-in-law that "I will send your Lordship the printed accounts given into the House of Lords on this subject the next post".¹¹³ Five days later, however, he wrote that “The accounts deliver’d to the Lords & which I promised to send, I shall bring down with me, they being too large to send by post".¹¹⁴ Concerning a parliamentary enquiry regarding the affairs of the South Sea Company, these printed accounts supplemented information about the debate which Robinson had provided at some length in his letters to Carlisle. For much of the seventeenth century, the English monarchy’s desire to stem rebellion, combined with parliamentary privileges, had meant that the nation’s press was restricted from reporting parliamentary debates in full.¹¹⁵ Parliamentary proceedings, like those which Robinson sent his father-in-law, were officially released by both the House of Lords and House of Commons.¹¹⁶ Votes which had been cast in the Commons were also formally published on a daily basis during each session, ready to be distributed throughout the country the

¹¹³ CH J8/1/441, Robinson to Carlisle, 2 June 1733, London, p. 2v.
¹¹⁴ CH J8/1/442, Robinson to Carlisle, 7 June 1733, London, p. 2r.
¹¹⁵ When such news was printed it tended to be ‘tantalizingly oblique’, consisting primarily of oppositional responses. Harris, London Newspapers, p. 169.
¹¹⁶ Both the House of Commons and House of Lords also produced annual journals which documented the yearly sessions. These accounts, however, were not published for public distribution until 1767 and 1802 respectively. Prior to these dates, access to the journals was via manuscript copy. Carlisle’s library catalogues record that he had in his collection two such copies. The first was from the 1628 Parliament during Charles I’s reign when the Petition of Right was debated. In the 1698 catalogue it was recorded as ‘Collection of Arguments concerning the Petition of Rights & Liberty of the Subject Out of the House of Lords Journall a Ms’ (CH 1698 EE 15); eighteen years later it was entered into the 1715/16 catalogue as ‘Collection of Debates concerning liberty & Property in Manuscript’ (CH 1715/16 LC 09). The second manuscript was recorded in 1715/16 library catalogue simply as 'Lords Journall 1685' (CH 1715/16 MD 18). The volume remains in the Castle Howard library today. Its full title is A Transcript of the Lords Journall Anno I: Jac: 2nd: Regis: 1685. Below this heading is the note: 'Private business Omitted.' The Parliament of 1685 (14 May – 20 November) was not only James II’s first session, but also the 2nd Earl of Carlisle’s.
following day.\textsuperscript{117} Carlisle’s financial records show that for at least six years, between 1696 and 1701, he received the Votes along with his other news items.\textsuperscript{118} Whilst these were not included in his library, other parliamentary publications of a similar nature were. A work which detailed the Acts of Parliament that had been passed in Queen Anne’s final year, for example, was likely considered by Carlisle a valuable set of data because it recorded, in detail, significant changes to the country’s religious, military, and fiscal laws and policies.\textsuperscript{119}

Carlisle also kept in touch with contemporary affairs via pamphlets. In 1713, for example, he paid 4s. to have “Pamphletts sent” to Castle Howard.\textsuperscript{120} At various intervals between 1699 and 1701 the accounts also record payments for the arrival of “stich’d bookes”, a term that was used synonymously with pamphlet at the end of the seventeenth century.\textsuperscript{121} Though he was neither a prolific pamphlet reader nor a dedicated collector, an entry in his 1698 library catalogue for “Collection of Pamphlets in 3 volumes” suggests that he was willing to retain some of these publications for future use.\textsuperscript{122} The survival at Castle Howard of one of the most widely circulated pamphlets of the first half of the eighteenth century, \textit{The answer of Henry Sacheverell. D.D. to the articles of impeachment. . .} (London, 1710), could be the result of Carlisle’s desire to retain news publications which reported


\textsuperscript{118} The first entry for Votes was on 26 December 1696 (CH H/1/1/2). The last was on 19 May 1701 (CH H1/1/3).

\textsuperscript{119} CH 1715/16 MD 06. \textit{Anno regni Annae reginae magnae Britanniæ, Franciæ, & Hiberniæ} (London: Printed by John Baskett, 1714). As well as detailed accounts of twenty-three Public Acts, thirty-five Private Acts were also recorded.

\textsuperscript{120} CH H1/1/7-13, 2 March 1713.

\textsuperscript{121} Raymond, \textit{Pamphlets and Pamphleteering}, pp. 81-82. See, for example, CH H/1/1/3, 7 March 1699, 12 February 1700, 4 March 1700, and 20 January 1701.

\textsuperscript{122} CH 1698 EC 16-18. These three unnamed volumes have likely become part of a collection of eight volumes of pamphlets which survives in the library today. Seven of the eight volumes contain pamphlets which bear imprints from Carlisle’s lifetime. The volumes are entitled: ‘Ecclesiastical Pamphlets 1687-1689’, ‘Ecclesiastical Pamphlets 1690-1722’, ‘Ecclesiastical Pamphlets 1699-1719’, ‘Political Pamphlets 1687-1698’, ‘Political Pamphlets 1701-1714’, ‘Political Pamphlets 1711-1720’, ‘Treatise etc 1713-1714’, ‘Miscellaneous Pamphlets 1699-1831’.
significant contemporary events. This printed version of the clergyman’s infamous sermon, which he preached from the pulpit of St Paul’s Cathedral in 1710, sold 40,000 copies within a few days; in all, fourteen editions were released within little more than a year. Viscountess Irwin referred to this crazed response in a letter to her father, proposing that Sacheverell’s sermon “only became a thing of consequence as so publick a notice was taken of it.” In her work on pamphlets, Alexandra Halasz has referred to the dual characteristics that such topical publications conveyed: whilst their ‘ephemerality associates them with the orality of gossip’, their printedness associates them with other, more ‘authoritative texts that they materially resemble.”

Irwin’s insight into why Sacheverall’s sermon reached such heights of popularity could explain why certain topical publications ended up in Carlisle’s library. The retention of some texts over others was ultimately dependent upon whether they were useful to him. This usefulness, however, had to extend beyond one sitting. For Carlisle, the early seventeenth-century newsbooks which he retained in his library provided detailed accounts of an important period of the nation’s history; certain parliamentary publications (e.g., the book of Public and Private Acts from 1713-14) could operate, in the long term, as useful reference works; and those pamphlets which he decided not to discard provided evocative records of significant contemporary events. News, then, had a multiplicity of functions which Carlisle took advantage of at Castle Howard.

---

123 The pamphlet is contained in the volume ‘Ecclesiastical Pamphlets 1699-1719’ which also includes a response to Sacheverell, _The thoughts of a country gentleman upon reading Dr. Sacheverell’s trial in a letter to a friend_ (London, 1710). Carlisle was present for Sacheverell’s trial at Westminster, and was responsible for proposing the clergyman’s sentence to the House of Lords. For a detailed account of the Sacheverell affair see Geoffrey Holmes, _The Trial of Doctor Sacheverell_ (London: Eyre Methuen, 1973).
124 Raymond, _Pamphlets and Pamphleteering._
125 CH J8/1/211, Viscountess Irwin to Carlisle, 10 March, [1729], London, p. 1v.
3.5 Castle Howard and a Republic of Newsletters and Periodicals

From the late 1690s, Carlisle stopped buying newsbooks and began receiving newsletters. The present section proposes that the Earl’s desire to be seen as well-connected and informed was manifest in his consumption of this alternative type of news publication. Carlisle’s engagement with newsletters did not last long, however. He purchased his first newsletter in January 1698, and stopped receiving them on a regular basis only six months later. Such a short period of use suggests that the Earl was trying out this different news medium and found it wanting. After examining the social and cultural role of manuscript circulation at the turn of the eighteenth century, this section will consider whether it is relevant that he acquired this exclusive form of news publication in the same year that he established himself as a serious politician and fashionable socialite in London.

First flourishing in the early seventeenth century, the newsletter was an élite news source that supplemented the Eurocentric corantos. Procuring details from a variety of sources, early newsletter writers sent personalized news reports to their wealthy subscribers. When demand was high, scribes were employed to make multiple copies of the same letter, thereby maintaining the impression that the document was a personal correspondence. Newsletters remained an expensive commodity in the second half of the seventeenth century with scribes like Henry Muddiman, Giles Hancock, and Will Unwin charging up to £10 a year for a weekly letter. Whilst the overall readership

---

127 Payments tended to be made either on Fridays or Wednesdays, days that correspond to the tri-weekly postal dispatches from London at the turn of the eighteenth century. CH H1/1/3, passim. After June 1698, just two more newsletters were recorded in the accounts: in March 1699 and April 1701.
128 Carlisle’s private carrier, Henry Bell, only delivered the news to Naworth Castle once during 1698, in June. We can deduce, therefore, that the Earl was based in London for much of the time that he received newsletters.
130 Love, *Scribal Publication*, p. 11.
131 ibid. In an endeavour to compete with the ever-growing printed news market, some newsletter writers, like Ichabod Dawkes, began to print their letters. To begin with, subscriptions for Dawkes tri-weekly newsletter were set at forty shillings a year, though this later dropped to twenty shillings. Carolyn Nelson, *British Newspapers and Periodicals, 1641-1700: A Short-Title Catalogue of Serials printed in England, Scotland, Ireland, and British America* (New York: Modern Language Association of America, 1987), pp. 51-54. See also
of newsletters declined as the seventeenth century progressed, at the beginning of the eighteenth century circulation slightly increased. Though now costing on average £3-4 for a year’s supply of handwritten news, subscription remained the preserve of the wealthy.

Staying in the country with his friend, Sir Roger de Coverley, Mr. Spectator described, in 1711, the communal reading that newsletters could prompt:

> It is our Custom at Sir Roger’s, upon the coming in of the Post to sit about a Pot of Coffee, and hear the old Knight read Dyer’s Letter, which he does with his Spectacles upon his Nose, and in an audible Voice, smiling very often at those little strokes of Satyr which are so frequently in the Writings of that Author.

Understanding why newsletters continued to be read at a time when other printed options were cheaper and more readily available sheds light on Carlisle’s interaction with the news in the late 1690s. Discussing the circulation of manuscripts in the seventeenth-century, Peter Beal suggests that when encountering handwritten documents, a reader ‘felt in some measure that he was privy to coveted and restricted access to the work in question; he was an “insider”, part of some unclearly defined coterie, or privileged network, of select readers of that kind of literature.’ Receiving the news in manuscript format, therefore, would have evoked feelings of exclusivity, uniqueness, and authority. That there was a slight elevation in newsletter circulation at the turn of the eighteenth century indicates a reaction by some news readers to the emergence of the mass-produced newspaper: as people from all literate sectors of society increasingly had access to printed

---


133 Love, *Scribal Publication*, p. 11. Love was looking specifically at the year 1709.


news, the nation’s élite wanted to reassert their social distinctiveness by receiving their news via more exclusive channels.

Considering their length and thoroughness, the news accounts that Robinson regularly wrote to Carlisle could be seen as a form of newsletter. Indeed, on two occasions in the mid-1730s, Robinson made a distinction between what news he sent via manuscript and what news was included in the public press. In 1734, he commented: “This day many Persons were presented to their new employment as your Lordship will see the particulars in publick print, I will not enumerate them here”. As this news was printed in the national press and thus widely available, Robinson presumed that Carlisle would have come across it on his own accord and the Earl would not need Robinson to relay the details to him via letter. Such a presumption highlights a growing distinction that early eighteenth-century news readers had to make. Less exclusive news was increasingly left to the print news publications to impart, whilst more private or select news continued to be transmitted by manuscript. Another remark made from Robinson to Carlisle further underlines this distinction. Writing in London, Robinson noted that “little news is stirring here but what your Lordship will see in the publick prints”. Whilst there was no news that he deemed worthy of including in his letter, what “little news” there was, he knew would be picked up by the press. Robinson’s recurring use of the phrase “publick print” emphasizes the distinction that he made between published news, a format theoretically available to all, and manuscript news, a mode of transmission which symbolized participation in socially selective networks.

Understanding the social and cultural benefits of participating in networks of manuscript circulation helps illuminate the reasons why Carlisle tried out newsletters at the end of the 1690s. For the Earl, these years not only included the consolidation of his

136 CH J8/1/455, Robinson to Carlisle, 6 June 1734, London, p. 2r.
political career but, as Smith has detailed, the fashionable improvements that he made to his townhouse in London. Part of these improvements included, as we saw in Chapter One, the commissioning of his first library catalogue in April 1698. That is, just three months after he had received his first newsletter. 1698 was also the moment when the idea of building Castle Howard first emerged. It appears, then, that during the late 1690s, Carlisle was establishing himself as a fashionable and cultured member of the nation’s élite society. Receiving news via such an exclusive format was not only a way for Carlisle to assert social distinction, however. To enter into, and remain part of, a specific coterie (in this case, London’s élite, socio-political circles) one was obliged to adopt the methods and customs of that group.

Literary journals and periodicals provided a reader with intellectual as well as social distinction. They were commercial access points through which wealthy and educated men like Carlisle could connect to a variety of intellectual communities based in England and abroad. Like the newsletter, then, reading these publications was a way to associate oneself with a select group of people who shared similar interests.

Literary journals first emerged in the 1680s with Pierre Bayle’s *Nouvelles de la République des Lettres* (founded in Paris in 1684). Their distribution across Europe echoed the epistolary-based ‘republic of letters’ which, in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, linked scholarly figures who were geographically scattered. Late seventeenth-century English examples included the *Athenian Mercury* and the Royal Society’s *Philosophical Transactions*. In two of the most successful early eighteenth-century periodicals, the *Tatler* and the *Spectator*, Joseph Addison and Richard Steele brought

---

139 Carlisle visited Yorkshire with his initial architect, William Talman, in July 1698.
together news, reviews, and morally enlightening essays. More than any other journal, these publications had 'an immediate and lasting influence on British society, journalism and literature, creating a whole new style of conversational criticism and engagement with contemporary culture.'\textsuperscript{141} Despite their popularity, and Carlisle’s connection – via the Kit-Cat Club – to Addison and Steele, there is no evidence that Carlisle read either the \textit{Tatler} or the \textit{Spectator}.

\textsuperscript{142} Nor is there evidence that he read the \textit{Gentleman’s Magazine}, another popular periodical that emerged in the first half of the eighteenth century.

We do know, however, that the Earl read another periodical, \textit{The Present State of the Republic of Letters}.\textsuperscript{144} Consisting of published letters, essays, and book reviews, this literary journal would have informed Carlisle of cultural and intellectual developments occurring in Britain and Europe. Highlighting the educated readership that its writers and publishers hoped to attract, quotes in French, Latin, and Greek pepper all the issues. The earliest of the issues at Castle Howard contains essays on a diverse selection of topics including ‘the chief transactions and revolutions in Italy, from the year 1402 to 1506’, ‘the state of physick in the Old and New Testament, and the Apocryphal interval’, ‘the primitive language’, and the ‘history of printing’. The issue also contains ‘An epistle in verse from the late Mr. Congreve, to the Right Honourable Lord Cobham’. In addition, advertisements provide details of where readers could buy newly published books or


\textsuperscript{142}The \textit{Gentleman’s Magazine} was a similar publication released during Carlisle’s lifetime. A collection of uniformly bound issues are in the Castle Howard library today. It is likely, however, that they were bought as a set at a later date.

\textsuperscript{143}It seems unlikely that Carlisle did not engage with this publication, for both Viscountess Irwin’s poem, \textit{Epistle to Mr Pope. By a Lady. Occasioned by his Characters of Women} (1736), and his own advice poem to Morpeth were printed within it (the latter, albeit in 1739, following his death). See Chapter Two, p. 140, p. 145, fn. 157, & pp. 148-49 for Irwin’s poem, and the same chapter, p. 127, for Carlisle’s advice poem.

\textsuperscript{144}Four issues of this journal survive at Castle Howard today, three of which have Carlisle’s name on their title-page. Printed in March, July, August, and December of 1729, the survival of these non-consecutive issues indicates that either Carlisle tended to dispose of issues once he had read them or he did not receive the journal regularly. Priced at 1s., \textit{The Present State of the Republic of Letters} was printed monthly between January 1728 and December 1736 for William and John Innys at their printing house near the west end of St. Paul’s Cathedral. In 1736 \textit{The Present State of the Republic of Letters} merged with \textit{Literary Magazine} (London, 1735) to form \textit{The History of the Works of the Learned}. 
subscribe to soon-to-be printed works. Carlisle would have found, for example, details about Colen Campbell’s English folio edition of Andrea Palladio’s *Four books of architecture* (London, printed by Samuel Harding, 1729), Jacob Tonson’s folio edition of Thomas Rymer’s *Feodera* (London, 1727-29), and the catalogue to the library that belonged to the French Minister and Secretary of State, M. Le Blanc. This issue of *The Present State* is of particular interest because it illustrates an intersection of the social, intellectual, and textual networks in which Carlisle participated. Not only did Carlisle have works by Campbell, Congreve, and Tonson in his library, but the latter two men, along with Cobham, were also members of the Kit-Cat Cub with Carlisle.

Research suggests that the readership of literary periodicals like *The Present State* was made up of both scholarly and non-scholarly members of society. Carlisle’s reading habits confirm that intellectually curious aristocrats made up a significant proportion of the readership of these journals. Indeed, library catalogues from a variety of National Trust properties reveal that other country house residents alongside Carlisle encountered these types of publications. The library at Ickworth, for example, holds ten volumes of the literary periodical *The Athenian Gazette* (London, published 1691-96) with annotations in the hand of John Hervey, 1st Earl of Bristol (1665-1751); issues of the Royal Society’s *Philosophical Transactions* (London, begun in 1665) are held at Hardwick Hall, Belton House, Felbrigg, and Blickling Hall; and the first ever academic periodical, the *Journal des Sçavans* (Paris, published between 1665-1792), turns up at Wimpole Hall and Kingston Lacy.

---


147 Ibid. Goldgar refers to a study conducted by Françoise and Jean-Claude Waquet of the mid-eighteenth century Italian journal – the *Nouvelle Letterarie* – has discovered that its readership consisted chiefly of ecclesiastics, nobles, and dottori. See Françoise & Jean-Claude Waquet, ‘Presse et société: le public des “Nouvelles Letterarie” de Florence (1749-1769)’, *Revue française d’histoire du livre*, n.s. 22 (1979), pp. 39-60.
Carlisle’s engagement with *The Present State of the Republick of Letters* at Castle Howard can be seen as a demonstration of how country house residents, situated apart from cultural and intellectual urban centres, could remain engaged with literary, scientific, antiquarian, bibliographic, or historiographic developments. Details of recent publications, for example, likely influenced the addition of books to country house libraries; controversial topics could have prompted aristocrats, in the studies of their great houses, to write letters to the editors of such publications; and book reviews might have provoked heated debate or conversation amongst residents and their guests. In this way, literary journals stimulated a variety of exchanges that linked country houses and different cultural spheres. Receiving cultural and intellectual news via these exclusive channels turned country houses into nodes within a print-based republic of letters.148

### 3.6 Encountering Carlisle in the News

As the news modernized, so Carlisle developed his news-reading habits. Sending a poem to Carlisle in 1733, Viscountess Irwin told her father that she hoped it entertained him “in the same manner the news papers do, which is rather to amuse than inform”.149 Despite Irwin’s rather disparaging impression of newspapers, this format became the Earl’s preferred source of news from 1698 until his death forty years later. Newspapers not only provided cheaper and more regular news updates, they also reinforced the socio-political identities of politically active men like Carlisle. By featuring in national and local newspapers, connections could be forged between these figures and the communities over

---

148 Though it is tempting to see the textual networks in which Carlisle participated as bringing the Habermasian public sphere into the more private space of the country house, I am in agreement with Darnton who suggests that though ‘Habermas’s notion of the public sphere [is] valid enough as a conceptual tool . . . some of his followers make the mistake of reifying it, so that it becomes an active agent in history, an actual force that produces actual effects’. Darnton, ‘An Early Information Society’, fn. 42, p. 26-27. The permeability of the public and private spheres has most frequently been discussed in women’s history. See Barker & Chalus, eds, *Gender in Eighteenth-Century England*, Armstrong, *Desire and Domestic Fiction*, and Ann-Louise Shapiro, ed., *Feminist Revision History* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1994).

149 CH J8/1/247, Viscountess Irwin to Carlisle, 1 February, [1733], London: 2v.
which they presided. Frequently housebound at Castle Howard with gout, such an opportunity was particularly useful for Carlisle.

In 1695, England’s budding national newspaper trade was dominated by three tri-weekly publications printed in London: the *Flying Post*, the *Post Boy*, and the *Post Man*. Published on Tuesday, Thursday, and Saturday to coincide with the delivery of post out of London, “their titles alone suggest their symbiotic relationship with the Post Office.” At this early stage of their development, these newspapers would have been sent to the provinces from London via the same tri-weekly postal routes as newsletters. Readers like Carlisle thus had little reason to switch to this new format. It is likely that the sudden and dramatic increase in newspaper production at the turn of the eighteenth century, however, motivated Carlisle’s decision to switch from reading newsletters to newspapers in 1698.151

From the last years of the seventeenth century, certain news-readers like Carlisle began to substitute cheaper, more reliant newspapers for the newsbooks and newsletters that had previously dominated news culture. Whatever feelings of exclusivity that newsletters brought to readers, they could not compete with the cost and frequency of newspapers. By 1702, the demand for news had intensified enough to sustain the country’s first daily newspaper, the *Daily Courant*.152 It is at this moment that the newspaper began to outstrip the newsletter.153 By 1713, the sale of newspapers in England reached 2.5 million issues per annum.154 Forty years on, in the mid-1730s, there were

151 The very last entry for a newsletter in his accounts was in 1701, from which point the records are dominated by entries for “newes”. Carlisle’s agent applied the term “newspaper” sporadically in the accounts. One of the few entries reads, for example: “Newespapers & Lettres for 5 weeks now ending”. CH H1/1/4, 27 March 1703.
nineteen newspapers in London alone, including three dailies and four evening posts.\textsuperscript{155} Carlisle appears to have followed this national trend towards favouring newspapers as his main source of news.

Newspapers were distinct from newsbooks and newsletters primarily because of their seriality and periodicity. Unlike other forms of news publications, newspapers appeared ‘in a sequence, usually numbered, and . . . with a predictable frequency’.\textsuperscript{156} They also had fixed titles. Such characteristics made it easier for readers to identify individual publications and be certain at what point of the week they would be issued. Serialization also encouraged readers to purchase successive issues and the technique of ending news stories with leading sentences had a similar effect. The Earl’s decision to receive newspapers over other types of news indicates his preference for frequency, reliability, and variety, all characteristics which newspapers offered their readers.

Furthermore, the low price of newspapers – in 1700, an issue would cost 1d. – was a novel incentive, particularly in comparison to the high fee customarily paid for newsletters.\textsuperscript{157} Over the first two decades of the eighteenth century prices slowly increased. It was not until the Stamp Act of 1725, however, that prices reached 2d. per issue.\textsuperscript{158} Recorded in the accounts prior to Carlisle setting up his monthly subscription, a rare sequence of payments from early 1705 shows the individual price that he paid for his newspapers:

\begin{quote}
13 January: Newes l[.]I[.]l[.]d. – Lettres 3d.
20 January: Newes l[.]I[.]l[.]d. – Lettres 2d.
27 January: Newes l[.]I[.]l[.]d. –[–]Lettres 3d.\textsuperscript{159}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{156} Raymond, Pamphlets and Pamphleteering, p. 101.
\textsuperscript{157} This figure could be halved if the size of the paper was reduced. Harris, London Newspapers, p. 19.
\textsuperscript{158} Black, English Press, p. 107.
\textsuperscript{159} CH H/1/1/5.
Paying 1s. 2d. for his weekly supply of newspapers, these account entries record the incremental price increase which took place in the first decade of the eighteenth century. The amount that Carlisle paid for newspapers was not always this small, however. In March 1703, a one-off bill for five weeks worth of newspapers and letters cost the 3rd Earl a colossal £11 14s. 10d.\textsuperscript{160} Once the Earl had switched in late 1705 to paying for his news on a monthly basis he was paying anywhere between 3-14s. per month.\textsuperscript{161} The variable amount indicates that the quantity of newspapers which he received was not fixed.

The appearance of figures like Carlisle in evermore widely circulated newspapers reinforced social relationships and identities, on a local and national level. Lists detailing the members of various civic, military, and political sectors were regularly printed in newspapers and, because of his social and political position, Carlisle frequently appeared in them.\textsuperscript{162} News of his appointments to official posts were also included in the national press. A 1721 letter from Philip Wharton, 1st Duke of Wharton (who was under the Earl’s guardianship until he reached majority), refers to one such notice: “I am glad to see by the Publick prints that my good Guardian is honoured with a title”.\textsuperscript{163} Carlisle appeared again in the news when, three years later, he was appointed by George II as ‘Constable of the Castle of Windsor; and Keeper of the Parks, Forrests, and Warrens there’, and as

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{160} CH H1/1/4, 27 March 1703.
\textsuperscript{161} For price variation across Carlisle’s monthly payments, see, for example, CH H/1/1/5, 28 December 1710 (3s.) and 27 February 1710 (8s. 6d.).
\textsuperscript{162} Carlisle featured in, amongst others, ‘An Exact List of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal’ (British Weekly Mercury (London, England), 12 March 1715 – 18 March 1715, issue 507), ‘A List of the Principal Officers of Great-Britain, both Civil and Military; as well as the Principal Persons Ecclesiastical’ (Weekly Journal or British Gazetteer (London, England), Saturday, 2 November 1717), and ‘A Complete and True List of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, as also of the Knights and Commissioners of the Shires, Citizens and Burgesses, of the Present Parliament’ (Weekly Journal or British Gazetteer (London, England), Saturday, 3 February 1728, issue 141).
\textsuperscript{163} CH J8/26/12, Wharton to Carlisle, 9 September 1721, n.p., p. 1v. No account has been found of an appointment made to Carlisle in the days leading up to the date of the letter. His most recent appointment had been reported eight months earlier. On 28 January 1721, the Weekly Journal or British Gazetteer noted that Carlisle was honoured in ‘The Christmas Roll of the Honourable Lieutenancy, for the Royal Hamlets of the Tower’. Weekly Journal or British Gazetteer (London, England), Saturday, 28 January 1721. Given that Wharton, a known Jacobite, was living a notoriously dissolute lifestyle at this time, it could well have taken him some time to send congratulations to his guardian.
\end{flushleft}
‘Governor and Captain of the Castle of Windsor, and the Forts and Fortifications thereunto belonging.’\textsuperscript{164} As well as adding to our knowledge of his political career, such records of the Earl’s appointments and duties at Court reveal that his connection to the nation’s news network was multifaceted. He was not only a consumer of newspapers but featured as the news itself.\textsuperscript{165}

As a leading family in Yorkshire it is not surprising to find that details of the Earl’s political activities and social movements, as well as those of his family, were reported regularly in the \textit{York Courant}.\textsuperscript{166} A notice from the late summer of 1729, for example, reads: ‘On Monday Thomas Robinson, Esq; Member of Parliament for Morpeth, and the Right Honourable the Lady Lechmere, were at Kinsington, to take Leave of her Majesty, being soon to set out for France, in their way to Italy.’\textsuperscript{167} The following year another issue of the \textit{York Courant} reported Carlisle’s participation in a local horse-racing event:

The River Ouse having overflowed the Ings so much on Wednesday, (occasion’d by the great Rains which have lately fallen) the 40l. Plate which was to be run for that day was put off to Saturday. The Company had tolerable Sport, the chief of which were as follows, the Duke of Rutland, the Earls of Sheffield, Carlisle, Portmore, Jerfey, and Carberry[.]\textsuperscript{168}

At the same time as reinforcing social identities, such news reports contributed to the collapse of the social barriers which had traditionally segregated élite families from the common public. When Carlisle began acquiring news on a regular basis in the 1690s there

\textsuperscript{164} \textit{London Gazette} (London, England), 28 May 1723 – 1 June 1723, issue 6168.

\textsuperscript{165} Accounts of his family were also regularly reported, contributing to the construction of their own social identities. An issue of the \textit{London Journal}, for example, reported Lady Carlisle’s imminent and definite demise (\textit{London Journal} (London, England), Saturday, 19 October 1723, issue CCXXI). A subsequent issue informed readers of her miraculous recovery (\textit{London Journal} (London, England), Saturday, 14 December 1723, issue CCXXIX).

\textsuperscript{166} The \textit{York Courant} commenced publication from 1725. Competition between provincial newspapers was rife. Indeed, the \textit{York Courant} was issued as a rival to York’s other paper, Thomas Gent’s the \textit{Original York Journal}. In 1741, another paper, the \textit{York Gazetteer}, declared that it was founded ‘to correct the weekly poison of the \textit{York Courant}’ (Black, \textit{English Press}, p. 22). Prior to Gent’s involvement, the \textit{Original York Journal} was known as the \textit{York Mercury} which began publication in 1719. Carlisle was acquainted with Gent. See Chapter One, p. 73, fn. 116.

\textsuperscript{167} \textit{York Courant} (York, England), Tuesday, 26 August 1729, issue 207.

\textsuperscript{168} \textit{York Courant} (York, England), Tuesday, 11 August 1730, issue 257.
were no publications which specifically reported from the regions. By 1720, forty provincial newspapers were in print, including six in northern England.\footnote{Wiles, Freshest Advices, table insert between pp. 372-73. The six northern publications were the Newcastle Gazette (1710), the Newcastle Courant (1711), the Leverpoole Courant (1712), the Leeds Mercury (1718), the Manchester News-Letter (1719), and the York Mercury (1719).} Available to anyone who could get hold of a newspaper, the rise of the local press helped, in the words of one newspaper historian, ‘to define and integrate communities around the dominant social and economic groups’.\footnote{Harris, London Newspapers, p. 21.} Not only were local newspapers a vehicle through which Carlisle could connect with different levels of society, but they were also a way for local communities in and around York to engage with the county’s élite. Contrary to suggestions that from the late seventeenth century country houses and their residents were increasingly disengaged from surrounding communities, the arrival of the provincial press forged new links between those who lived in country houses and those who lived around them.\footnote{For the view that country houses became increasingly estranged from the communities around them, see Nigel Everett, The Tory View of Landscape (New Haven: Published for the Paul Mellon Centre for Studies in British Art by Yale University Press, 1994); Timothy Mowl & Brian Earnshaw, Trumpet at a Distant Gate: The Lodge as Prelude to the Country House (London: Waterstone, 1985); Tom Williamson, Polite Landscapes: Garden and Society in Eighteenth-Century England (Stroud: Alan Sutton, 1993); Mandler, The Fall and Rise of the Stately Home; and Michael McKeon, The Secret History of Domesticity: Public, Private, and the Division of Knowledge (Baltimore & London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2005).}

As a member of William III’s ministry, Carlisle’s political activities were also reported regularly in the national press, including the only named newspaper that we know he read, the London Gazette. Despite having a low print run of between 11,250 to 15,250 per issue, the bi-weekly Gazette was the most widely circulated national newspaper in the middle years of the first decade of the eighteenth century.\footnote{Black, English Press, p. 93; Thomas O’Malley, ‘Religion and the Newspaper Press, 1660-1685: A Study of the London Gazette’ in The Press in English Society, eds, Harris & Lee, p. 31.} Initially issued in November 1665 as the Oxford Gazette (due to Parliament’s brief relocation to Oxford in order to avoid the plague), it became the London Gazette a year later. Subsidized by the government, the Gazette was known for having the most reliable news as it drew its
content directly from governmental officials, including foreign diplomats. Comprising royal proclamations, official addresses (from towns, counties, companies, corporations, and individuals), trading information, and formally sanctioned sermons, the Gazette’s main purpose was to disseminate consistent and trustworthy information concerning the rule of the country. In consequence, the Gazette spoke primarily to the élite of society, to government and local officials, to merchants, and to clergymen. Carlisle first purchased the paper on 2 January 1698, when 1s. 6d. was “payd for votes, gazette, and Letters”. For a young man forging his political career, the Gazette would have been an invaluable source of up-to-date information direct from the heart of government.

As well as reading the Gazette, Carlisle paid for both private and public notices and advertisements to be published in it. Holding jurisdiction over a large part of the north of England, it was the Earl’s responsibility to officially represent certain communities from the region. Newspapers were an ideal medium through which he could record and demonstrate this role. Illustrating Harris and Lee’s proposal that newspapers offered ‘a channel of communication into the community at large’, in May 1708, Carlisle paid for two addresses from Morpeth and Cockermouth to be included in the paper. On the 3 May just over 4s. was paid for the “posted Morpeth address” and then “putting it in the Gazette”. Appearing in the 3–6 May issue of the London Gazette, this address, from ‘the Bailiffs, Aldermen, Burgesses and other Inhabitants of your Majesty’s ancient Corporation of Morpeth, in the County of Northumberland’, had been presented to
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175 Ibid, p. 32. ‘London newspapers were’, according to Harris, ‘consistently directed toward the upper and middling social levels and more particularly to those engaged in areas of commerce and politics.’ Harris, London Newspapers, p. 165.
176 CH H1/1/3, 2 January 1698.
177 CH H1/1/5 On 26 June 1707, for example, 10s. was paid for “Entering an advertisement in the Gazette”.
179 CH H1/1/5, 3 May 1708. Black has noted that from 1712 newspaper advertisements were taxed at 1s. each. He has further observed that in 1724 the York Mercury and the Leeds Mercury charged 2s. for the placement of an advertisement. Black, English Press, p. 61.
Queen Anne at St James’s Palace on 4 May.\footnote{London Gazette (London, England), 3 May 1708 – 6 May 1708, issue 4433.} On the 21 May, Carlisle retrospectively paid a similar sum of money for the “postedge of the Cumberland address”.\footnote{CH H1/1/5, 21 May 1708.} The second address had appeared in the Gazette at the beginning of April 1708 with the heading ‘The humble Address of the Honour and Borough of Cockermouth, in the County of Cumberland’.\footnote{London Gazette, (London, England), 1 April 1708 – 5 April 1708, issue 4424.} By paying for the inclusion of these addresses in the Gazette, Carlisle was demonstrating to both the local communities of Morpeth and Cumberland, and to the nation, his commitment as a local figurehead.

It is of note that two issues of the London Gazette which we know that Carlisle bought in the 1690s contain accounts of official duties that he had performed at Court. The possibility of finding an account of oneself in the national press was a recent and novel event. Indeed, it might well indicate why Carlisle purchased these specific issues of the Gazette. Printed at the end of 1697, both publications record the New Year’s addresses which had been presented to William III at Kensington Palace on 28 December. A ‘public ceremony of political and social importance’, according to Daybell, these addresses were an opportunity for diverse figures, communities, and institutions to pay their respects to the monarch.\footnote{James Daybell, ‘Henry VIII (1491-1547) Elizabeth I (1533-1603)’ in “The Pen’s Excellencie”, ed. Wolfe, p. 35.}

The earlier of the two Gazette issues records an address from the city officials of Carlisle. Introduced to William III by the Earl, it was then presented by James Lowther.\footnote{Considering the frequency of publication, it is likely that a payment for a gazette entered into the Earl’s accounts on 2 January 1698 relates to an issue of the London Gazette which covered news from Monday, 27 December to Thursday, 30 December 1697. CH H/1/1/2. London Gazette, (London, England), 27 December 1697 – 30 December 1697, issue 3353.} The second Gazette issue, which Carlisle purchased a week after the first, provided an account of his introduction of ‘the Honourable the Comptroller’ to the King, as well as a
number of students from the Inner Temple. Such reports underlined publicly the Earl’s official position as a key figure at Court. Encountering one’s actions in the press, just days after such an event took place, is, even today, a novelty for many people. Cheap to buy, quick to access, and easy to share, widely read newspaper accounts offered a different sort of posterity to that which was achieved by, say, the building of a great country house. Whilst both were vehicles for enhancing an aristocrat’s reputation, the prestige which was enhanced by favourable newspaper reports was seemingly transient in contrast to the permanence which a building offered. Seemingly transient, that is, because, in reality, a newspaper report can remain in circulation indefinitely. In comparison, a building can all too easily crumble to the ground and be lost forever.

3.7 Conclusion

Whatever format he read, it is clear that the Earl’s desire for news remained consistent. Reading the news on a regular basis kept him informed of local and national matters of importance; it also notified him of social events and cultural trends, and offered entertainment and topical advice. As a result, Castle Howard was an interface through which conduits of information, in print and manuscript form, passed. That the Earl had to adapt, in the course of his lifetime, to a completely different mode of news transmission is a fascinating example of the changing relationship between country houses, their residents, and emerging news networks.

This chapter has shown how one man’s reading of the news can be used to draw out new insights into the intellectual culture of country house living. To be begin, we saw how the arrival of printed news at Castle Howard stimulated epistolary conversations with family members. The chapter then discussed how different news items could function as

185 CH H/1/1/2. *London Gazette*, (London, England), 6 January 1697(/8) to 10 January 1697(/8), issue 3356. ‘The Honourable the Comptroller’ likely referred to the Comptroller of the Household which, at the beginning of 1698, was Thomas Wharton, 1st Marquess Wharton, Carlisle’s friend and neighbour.
useful sources of both historical and contemporary events, a feature which meant some were deemed worthy of a place in the Earl’s library. Carlisle’s involvement in specific social and intellectual communities via the reading of certain types of news – the newsletter and the literary periodical – was then discussed. The Earl’s participation in the élite, ‘republic of letters’-style networks that brought these publications into Castle Howard highlights the ways in which country houses could be seen as important sites of intellectual exchange and engagement. Finally, we saw how reading about figures like Carlisle in the news forged connections between country house residents and communities beyond the estate’s boundaries. Completing this thesis, the present chapter has shown that the frequent and regular arrival of news at Castle Howard, along with the books and letters which the 3rd Earl received, counters the suggestion that Carlisle lived an isolating existence in Yorkshire.
As we opened with a letter to Carlisle, so we close. In the autumn of 1717, the Duke of Kingston wrote to the 3rd Earl at Castle Howard with the hope that he might persuade his friend to return from Yorkshire to a political life in London:

I have heard it said none are so fit for a Place [in national government] as those who don’t desire one[,] but ‘tis certaine none serve their country so well as those who take a place with no other view, and there is not a man who knows Lord Carlisle but knows that to be his case.¹

Two years earlier, Kingston had sent another letter to Castle Howard, expressing his sadness that Carlisle had chosen to retire to the country:

I was sorry yesterday when I open’d your letter to find a Proxy in it. . . . I had much rather, for my pleasure and satisfaction, and for the good you can, and will do the Publick, that at this time you wou’d come to London. a man who with a disinterest’d mind will search the good of his Country, and is capable of judging what is so, is allwaies wanted.²

Prompted by Carlisle’s retirement from political activities in Parliament and at Court, Kingston expressed in these letters two interesting views: firstly, that political office is suited to those who do not desire such a position, and, secondly, that “a man with a disinterest’d mind” is “capable of judging what is so” and is thus “allwaies wanted.” Carlisle’s “disinterest’d mind” (i.e., one which was uninfluenced by personal interest) was, I propose, directly the result of his relocation to Yorkshire.

Carlisle’s distance from London was beneficial in that it provided him with a unique perspective from which to observe “the World”. As the three chapters in this thesis

¹ CH J8/26/2, Kingston to Carlisle, 23 September 1717, London, pp. 2v-1r (of new sheet).
² CH J8/26/1, Kingston to Carlisle, 16 December 1715, London, p. 1r.
have shown, Carlisle was not disengaged from society following his move to Castle Howard. He learnt of current affairs, recent events, and cultural shifts via his engagement with the news publications, letters, and books that arrived at Castle Howard. Yet the distance between Yorkshire and London meant that his experience of what was happening in the Capital was at one remove. Although he was engaged, he was also detached. According to Kingston, such detachment was a valuable asset. Colonel Douglas, the second husband of Viscountess Irwin, also shared this belief. Writing to his father-in-law from London in 1737, eight months before Carlisle’s death, he mused: “I can see what it is to be an old Courtier; you have made a righter judgment of things at a distance, than most people, and those of Consequence too, have done here.”² Being on the margins, in other words, was constructive. Aware of the machinations at Court, but not involved in them, the Earl was better qualified to judge arising matters in an impartial way.³ We are led to believe from Kingston and Douglas, that, when called upon, Carlisle was able to offer more objective advice to his political colleagues than if he had been in London.

Central to my reconstruction of Carlisle’s textual life at Castle Howard, then, is the recognition that detachment has its benefits. The Introduction showed how being detached from city-living engendered “idle hours” which needed to be filled with meaningful leisure time pursuits. In order to best structure his own free time, Carlisle participated in a number of different textual networks. As the previous chapters have demonstrated, the Earl’s participation in these epistolary, news, and book exchange networks meant he was well-connected to a variety of cultural and socio-political spheres whilst living in Yorkshire, despite being geographically apart from London and other centres of urban activity. Living at Castle Howard not only led to a new and distinct phase of book-buying, letter-writing, and news-reading for Carlisle; it also meant that he could

engage with these activities in a new and distinct way (i.e., in a more objective manner, and from a position of meaningful idleness).

The deployment of ‘textual networks’ as an analytical tool in this thesis is doubly significant. Firstly, it has been used to support a specific argument (i.e., Carlisle’s connectedness). Secondly, it has identified a new research path for country house historians. In what is left of this afterword I seek to answer those research questions first laid out in my Introduction: are networks useful methodological tools with which to study England’s country houses? How does this methodological approach benefit country house historians and students of the history of networks and the transmission of ideas? Can country houses be seen as key sites within networks of information exchange? And, if yes, how does this reading subsequently change our historical understanding of the social and cultural role of the English country house?

A networks-based approach brings to light various aspects of country house living which have been neglected in previous studies of these great residences. Earlier studies, whether focusing on architecture, interior décor, or libraries, have interpreted country house living either as displays of power or as a site of conspicuous consumption. The virtue of the networks-based approach is that it offers an alternative perspective, one that is not centrally defined by issues of power, wealth, and socio-political and intellectual status. Let us take for example the country house library. Scholarship in this area has focused primarily on the bibliographical habits of a few unique figures, interpreting their book collections as intellectually exemplary. In other studies, the expensive and finely bound volumes found in many aristocratic libraries have been seen as evidence of the conspicuous consumption of books in the setting of the country house. A networks-based approach, in contrast, encourages us to ask how books entered into the country house
library as well as who was involved in this process, thereby opening up new areas of enquiry that have been stymied by readings of the country house as an isolated bastion.

Indeed, my particular line of enquiry has shown that the textual networks in which country house residents like Carlisle participated reached far and wide in geographical and social terms, a reading that counters traditional interpretations of country houses as secluded islands of élite living. Throughout this thesis I have demonstrated how Carlisle’s participation in epistolary, news, and book exchange networks connected him to non-élite as well as élite cultural spheres. In Chapter One, for example, we encountered evidence of Carlisle’s participation in the provincial book trade of northern England at the same time that he was patronizing London booksellers. We saw in Chapter Three that he had penny pamphlets sent to him at Castle Howard, items that are rarely considered in the context of aristocratic country house living. In the same chapter, we also saw how the appearance of the Earl in the provincial press brought about a new type of text-based engagement with local communities.

By linking Castle Howard into the same textual networks (postal, news, and bibliographic) that supported the emergence of other early eighteenth-century sites of intellectual engagement, we have seen how a country house could serve as an important node of cultural exchange. What distinguishes the country house from these more well-recognized sites (e.g., the coffee house and the salon), however, is both their distance from urban society and its essentially familial character. Certain key features of country house living facilitated its unique integration into these networks: leisure time, a wealthy and interested individual, space, well-connected friends and conscientious assistants, and obliging family members. These qualities have come to light in the course of this thesis.

Take, for example, the importance and distinctive nature of space in a country house. In Chapter One, I identified three separate locations in which books were stored at
Castle Howard (though other parts of the house were also likely utilized), each a distinct space where Carlisle, his family, and his guests could engage with items from his library. In Chapter Two we learnt that no less than seventeen writing-desks furnished all manner of rooms at Castle Howard in the mid-eighteenth century. Having under one roof such a diversity of spaces in which residents could engage with textual material meant country houses were sites in which a variety of text-based interactions could occur: in private, or in more public parts of the house; alone, alongside family members and friends, or in the company of less well-known guests and visitors.

The intermediary role played by Carlisle’s agents and members of his family has also been a key theme throughout the three chapters. Carlisle’s dependency on others to relay texts to Castle Howard meant that much of what arrived was necessarily selected by other people. To take but two examples: Viscountess Irwin and Sir Thomas Robinson, driven by their own interests and agendas, sent poetry, political pamphlets, and other texts to Yorkshire; Irwin with the desire to impress and please her father, Robinson with the hope of ingratiating himself with his father-in-law. An awareness of Irwin’s feelings about contemporary poetry and her less than fulfilling experiences at Court, for example, explains why she so frequently included verse within her letters. Knowledge of Robinson’s overly enthusiastic character as well as his failed political career provides an enlightening backdrop to the extensively detailed letters that he sent Carlisle regarding parliamentary activities. We must therefore acknowledge that the material which Carlisle engaged with at Castle Howard did not always reflect his own interests or intellectual preferences. In consequence, country houses became receptacles for a variety of material, some wanted, and some unwanted.

The union of country house history with a textual networks framework, then, alters our broader historical understanding of country house living, for it brings to light
connections between people, spaces, and texts which have remained undetected. There is, however, much more that can be done. Whilst I have provided a new framework through which scholars might consider country houses and their position in society, this thesis has only been about one man and one country house. We must therefore ask: is this case study representative? Though I would be hesitant to claim that Carlisle’s lifestyle at Castle Howard was indicative of other aristocrats’ lifestyles in other country houses, one benefit of having the 3rd Earl as the subject of this case study is that his life and textual habits were rather unremarkable. Carlisle may have lived in one of the grandest residences in England, but he was not an extreme book-buyer, letter-writer, or news-reader. Exploring the rather ordinary relationship that he had with textual material has thus provided an opportunity to explore the everyday textual interactions that occurred within a country house. Directed by the archive, this thesis has also been primarily concerned with the transmission of material to Castle Howard rather than from it. More could be done, therefore, to explore what textual material was sent from Castle Howard to London, thereby firmly establishing the residence as part of a two-way system of exchange. In addition, though little evidence remains, I am sure that in some cases Castle Howard was not the final destination for the textual material that the Earl received. Finding evidence to support this supposition would only add to our sense of the connectedness of this house.

The question remains, however, whether the networks-framework is useful for the analysis of other country houses. Although using this methodology to better understand the connectedness of Carlisle at Castle Howard has been a fruitful exercise, merely adopting a networks framework in order to investigate other individual houses would, in short, counter a central idea underpinning this thesis, namely that country houses do not exist in isolation. If they do not exist in isolation, nor, then, should they be
studied in isolation. Implicit to my approach is the fact that country houses are but one site of textual exchange within far-reaching networks. An ever-increasing number of studies of individual country houses and the networks that they were connected to would therefore be self-defeating. A more sophisticated analysis would seek to identify how multiple country houses functioned as nodes within one specific network of textual exchange or to explore how different textual networks linked together a number of different country houses together. Such studies would uncover the kind of rural, aristocratic networks investigated by Giles Mandelbrote in his study of a West Midlands bibliographic network.

To end this thesis, I must ask whether a networks-based approach has successfully changed our view of the 3rd Earl of Carlisle and the life that he lived at Castle Howard? Providing a comprehensive understanding of how information was transmitted to and from Castle Howard via different textual formats, this thesis has called into question Smith’s evaluation of Carlisle’s life in Yorkshire as ‘circumscribed’. Another historian of Castle Howard, Kerry Downes, has written that ‘[t]here may have been personal reasons for his decision for early retirement, but the development of the Henderskelfe estate and the building of the most expensive English country house of its date were not the undertakings of a man tired of life and activity.’ The three chapters of this thesis confirm Downes’s impression that Carlisle remained full of life once he had moved to Yorkshire. Indeed, the textual networks to which the Earl was connected reveal that he was keen to remain engaged with society despite retiring from public office. Constituting the infrastructure of Carlisle’s local and national, personal and public connections whilst living at Castle Howard, these networks mobilized a different type of active participation in socio-political spheres. That we have been able to reconstruct a picture of Carlisle’s life by

---

5 Arnold has observed that ‘to consider a building in isolation as a total history in itself . . . is to denude it of much of its meaning.’ Arnold, ed., The Georgian Country House, p. xiii.

6 Kerry Downes, Vanbrugh, p. 20.
tracing the books, letters, and news that arrived at Castle Howard indicates the significance of his participation in these networks. Much of what has been established derives from letters written by other people, something which highlights the social element of these textual networks.

And what have we learnt of Castle Howard? In an explication regarding the house’s differing styles of the south and north façades, its architect, Hawksmoor, explained to Carlisle that,

> when a machine is composed of different parts, Limbs, or members, one would not have them, blend and melt into one mass, so as not to be able, to distinguish the Noble parts from the inferior, the Basement from the order that rests upon it. or as in human bodys, the Trunck from the Limbs.  

Hawksmoor’s evocation of “a machine composed of different parts, Limbs, or members” recalls Alberti’s metaphor of a spider sitting at the centre of its web, waiting for the threads to alert it to any business that needs to taken care of. Both these images speak to broader questions regarding the best way to investigate the social and cultural position of Castle Howard in the early eighteenth century. These concerns have, I hope, been addressed in this thesis. To study the historical significance of this building, particularly from a cultural point of view, requires the willingness to embrace the intricate and often asymmetrical interlacing of social and cultural interactions, engagements, and exchanges. Like Hawksmoor’s image of a machine composed of different parts, so Castle Howard was brought to life by its connection to different networks.

---

7 Hawksmoor to Carlisle, 13 July 1734, printed in Downes, Hawksmoor, pp. 254-55. The South front of Castle Howard has a Tuscan order and a rusticated basement whilst the North front is Doric and fully rusticated except for the basement.
APPENDIX A

CH H/2/3/6

“My Laydes Bookes att Noward August 31: 1693”

1. a Large New Testament
2. Parable of the Pilgrim
3. The Reasonableness of [Christian] Religion
4. Antidoats against temptacon
5. Direcions to praye
6. The worthy Communicant
7. Treatise of the Knowledge of God
8. The worthy communicant
9. Death desected
10. A Treatise of Conversion
11. Saints ever lasting Rest
12. The Reasons of [Christian] Religion
13. La (?) om to unconverted sinners
14. Mensa mistica about the sacrament
15. La (?) com unconverted sinners
16. Dr Stillingfleets sermons
17. Moses in the mount Mr Murcott
18. Contemplacons of Death
19. A treatise to direct week [Christians]
20. Suppliications of saints
21. method for meditacons
22. Harts Ease or a remedy against troubles
23. Life & death of Mr Alleine
24. Paradise Lost
25. Sacraleage arraigned
26. Divine & morall contemplacons
27. The second pt of the same
28. The souls narrow search
29. The Guard of the tree of Life
30. The Balme of Gillead
31. The Communicants duty
32. The [Christians] defense against death
33. Sharp showers of meditations
34. Warning for death
35. A [Christians] exercise
36. A Guide to divotion
37. Practise of pietye
38. Sighs of the Church of England
39. St Barnards meditations
40. The house of weeping
41. Considerations upon eternity
42. Gods Judgments by Ford
43. The Gentile sinner
44. Antidoats against distractions
45. Devout communicant
46. Sacred principles
47. Hand maid to prevat [private] devotions
48. Ladder to Heaven
49. How to Live & that well
50. A week Soliloque & prayers
51. Conferences
52. The holy state
53. The plaine mans practise
54. Entertainments for Lent
55. Resurrection Rescued

1. Shakespeares history & Comedyes
2. The Grand Syrus
3. Diana of George of montemayer
4. The Life of Buscan the Spaniard
5. Mr Brooms songs
6. A view of London
7. Remarks upon Remarks
8. The life & Raigne of Henry 8th
9. Herodian of Allexandria
10. The Lives of sundry great men
11. English adventures
12. Collection of Poems
13. Don Carlos Reflections
14. Admirable Curiositthes
15. Ovidius exulans mock poem
16. Remarks upon the Humours
17. A voyage to athens
18. The fifth volume of Celicia
19. Three plays by Killigrew
20. Epigrams of all sorts
21. Cleavlands poems
22. The good housewifes office
23. Publick Imployment or active Life
24. A Comical Romance
25. The French Rouge [Rogue]
26. The Life of queen Eliz:
27. Scarrens Citty Romances
28. Homers odyssees
29. Womans Booke
30. The history of Cardinall mazarine
31. Ovids Epistles
32. The Case of Bankers
33. The English Rouge [Rogue] Heroe
34. The unfortunate Heroe
35. Humane Reason
36. Sir Francis Bacon's essays
37. Wallers Poems
38. Letters monsure d Balzac
39. Heroik woman
40. Sir John Sucklings fragments
41. The obleiging mistress
42. Phillips poems
43. The life of King Charles
44. The primitive fathers
45. Memoryes of Duc Rohan
46. The yeare of wonders
47. Fortunate foole
48. The happy Slave
49. Memoryes dutchs mazaraine
50. A Blow at witchcraft
51. Sir Henry Wottons Collections
52. Cicero against Catiline
53. Royall Romances
54. Ceaser & Pompye
55. Clelia Romance
56. The same of fourth volume
57. Loves master peece
58. The minister of moderaine politye
59. Lucians Dialogues
60. The Illustrious Bassae
61. The History of Thucydides
62. The History of Barbadoes
63. Clelie a third Romance
64. The Generall Historye
65. Parthenissa Romance
66. Homais quenne
67. Foure New playes
68. The Great Cyrus
69. The faire one of Tunis
70. The witty spaniard
71. A Cronick Booke
72. The fortunate foole
73. The French Rouge [Rogue]
74. A kiana
75. Don quikott
76. Love Letters from a nun
77. English Rouge [Rogue]
78. La [?] com For London
79. Academy of Complements
80. Cleaves Romance
81. Pilgrims novill
82. Journeye to spaine
83. The faithfull shepherd  
84. States werthyes  
85. Discourse of watters  
86. The skilfull phisian  
87. A manuell of Phisick  
88. A discourse of Jamaica
CH F4/1, f. 78-79

Extract from “An account of the Books, China, Pictures and other household furniture brought from the late Earl of Carlisle’s house in London to Castle Howard in the year 1759”

- A Report of the Committee of the House of Commons concerning chris’ Layer and other (1722)
- Brandts History of the Reformation in the low Country 2 Vols in Boards (1720, 1721)
- D’itto the second vol (1721)
- Dictionnaire pa: Bayle Tom 4° (1720)
- The Ruins of Balbeck folio (1757)
- Academie de L Espie de Girrard P Thibault (1628)
- A Large Map of Hudson’s Bay
- Cartes History of England 4 Vol: (1747)
- Clanrichardes Memoirs (1757)
- Swammerdam on Insects by Hill (1758)
- La Gallerie du Palais du Luxemburg (1710)
- Daltons Antiquities (1751)
- Urbis Veneti arum prospectus celebriores ex antonii Canale Fabulis 38 (1742)
- Le Magnifique Chasteau de Richelieu en General & en particular (1698)
- Fryers new Account of East India & Persia (1698)
- Acta Fratrum unitatis in Anglia (1749)
- Pote’s ist & Antiquities of Windsor Forrest 4° (1749)
- Guicciardini’s History of Italy 9 Vols 8° (1755)
- Parliamentary Debates in England 8 Vols
- Collin’s Peerage of England 5 Vols (1756)
- Reaumers Art of Hatching (1750)
- Parliamentary History of England 18 Vols the 1st and last Vols: wanting (1751)
- Bolingbrokes Letters 2 Vols (1752)
- A Collection of Reports (1737)
- D’Avenants Essays of Peace and War (1704)
- [D’Avenants] Ways and means (1696)
- [D’Avenants] Essays on Trade (1699)
- [D’Avenants] Essays on Grants (1700)
- [D’Avenants] Discourse on the Publick Revenues and of England 2 Vols (1698)
- Antiquities of Palmyra (1696)
- Bibliotheca Smithiana (1755)
- Histoire D’L. Amerique (1600)
- Voyage de Guinea 4 Tom (1739)
- Voyage de Hennepin (1704)
- Voyage de Lucas 3 Tom (1719)
- Relation du Voyage de P. Jo. Tipanier (1663)
- Du Royaume de Siam par M’de Le Loubac 2 Tom (1691)
- A Manuscript Book of the Exchequer
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